

The New Structure of Rural Economy in Lithuania

Dr. Stanislaw HEJBOWICZ

In the last 10 years Lithuanian agriculture has covered a complicated road of structural changes. These changes would have been impossible without the support of a strong public movement. The powerful public movement “Sajudis” was such a movement, born on the wave of Gorbachev's restructuring. The word “sajudis” means joint or collective movement.

Initially the movement actually supported the restructuring carried out by Mikhail Gorbachev, which focused on the acceleration of economic development in the country (then still the Soviet Union). Owing to clever strategy, the movement received national support for its actions. Unlike the Polish solidarity movement (Solidarnosc) where the driving force was the working class and some sections of the intelligentsia, in the Lithuanian movement Sajudis, the educated intellectuals prevailed from the beginning. With the development of Sajudis movement, the ideas of reforming the economy began to be supplemented by concepts of economic independence of the republic (from Moscow), which found their voice in the Law on the Grounds of Economic Independence of the Lithuanian SSR that was adopted on 18 May 1989. The next important step was the adoption of the Law on Rural Economy (which will be described later). During this period a number of legal acts were adopted that did not follow the official line of the CC CPSU.

Thus a conflict developed between the central Moscow and Vilnius. The leaders of Sajudis (supported by the majority of the people) decided to make the dream of their nation a reality – the re-establishment of Lithuanian independence. It was also formally declared by the USSR Constitution, which proclaims the sovereignty and independence of union republics. However, the reality was quite different: the bloody events in Tbilisi (Georgia) and in Vilnius showed the necessity of fighting persistently for freedom, and demonstrated how the struggle for freedom can demand the ultimate sacrifice - human life. The first act of the newly elected parliament dated 11 March 1990 was the proclamation of the country's independence (Lithuania was the first Soviet republic to withdraw from the composition of the USSR) and it became an act for the restoration of historical justice. The events of January 1991 in Vilnius demonstrated both the strength of the nation and the unfounded nature of the Soviet Empire's claims to the whole of the republic's territory.

1. The Emergence of Privately Owned Farms

From the scale of the legislation and the determination with which the Lithuanian Parliament addressed the issue of the legal regulation of privately owned farms, the outside observer might be forgiven for thinking that there had been a thorough public debate on the subject. However it was not a topic of discussion in the mass media, nor was there any evidence of in-depth elaboration and discussion of the subject within an exclusive political circle. No mention of the topic is made in any of the memoirs that have already been published by politicians and economic leaders of the period. Therefore could be suggested that there was no broad debate about the privatization of agriculture within political circles, however, the deputies of the Supreme Council of Lithuania felt intuitively that there was a need for agricultural privatisation. Until that period no general conditions existed for the implementation of even a concept of agricultural privatisation. These conditions were created during the so-called “restructuring” and on 4 July 1989 the Supreme Council of the Lithuanian Socialist Republic adopted a Law on Privately Owned Farm. Agriculture¹. It should not be assumed that the general outlines of this law had been proposed in the previously valid Law on the Short-term (up to 5 years) Lease of Land. Those farms were connected with a collective or State farm by lease agreements and could take only certain narrow economic decisions, whereas fundamental issues such as changes in production, choice of the direction of development, etc, depended completely on the collective farm.

Lease farms were not numerous in the republic, and in some districts of the country only single farms could be counted. However, the possibility of a private person running a farm, the dimensions of which could considerably exceed the dimensions of a private plot², to a certain extent led to the emergence of the agricultural privatisation concept. Many shared the opinion that: if the existence of a relatively high number of households based on lease agreements is possible in a Socialist republic, the next step must be taken and the existence of those households with a guaranteed future should be legalized, i.e. farms based on agreement (for 99 years).

Thus the 4 July 1989 and the Law on Privately Owned Farm could be considered the starting point of Lithuanian agricultural privatisation and the first attempt to change the

¹ Law of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic
Law on Farmer's Farm of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic
Vilnius, 4 July 1989, No. XI-3066

² Dimensions of the private plot were regulated by the appropriate legislative acts and constituted 0.5 ha for State farms and 0.6 ha for collective farms. Dimensions of lease farms were considerably higher and the author of the present paper when questioning the first population households in the Vilnius district met farms that cultivated on the basis of leases as large as 40 ha of land.

existing agrarian structure of that period. Article 2 of the General Provisions of this Law stated that “privately owned farms like State and collective enterprises and organizations are a part of the economic system of the Lithuanian SSR enjoying equal rights.” Thus, the three-sector system of agriculture was established and the State declared its equal approach to private and public farms. Farmers’ farms were granted the right to choose independently the trend of activity, structure and scale of production, to grow, produce, process and sell products. Land and other areas of economic significance (forests, water reservoirs) were transferred to a farmer’s farm for free (Article 7). The family character of farmers’ farms was defined by a record that their activity must be based on the individual labour of the owner and the members of his/her family (Article 1), although the employment of other persons by contract was also permitted (Article 10). Social insurance and social security was made available for both members of the farm and persons employed by contract. The Law on Farmer’s Farm also attempted to introduce a progressive structure for private farms, and introduced a limit on the area permitted for the establishment of farm buildings (house and farm buildings), to ensure that the layout of the land would meet the requirements of modern agriculture. The law specified the size of Privately owned farms, with a minimum of 10 ha and a maximum 50 ha of agricultural lands, only specialized farms could have an area of less than 10 ha (Article 7). According to the same Article it was envisaged that the land-tenure regulations of privately owned farms would be carried out at the expense of State funds. The plan was to designate money from the budget to carry out land improvement, and the design and construction of access roads. (Article 8). It was also expected that the electrification, and connection to gas and telephone networks for farmers’ farms would be funded by the state (Article 13). Thus all the conditions and prerequisites were being established for the successful development of private farmers’ farms. Since the Law came into force on 1 August 1989, it was also necessary to adjust the Constitution (the Basic Law), and an amendment was made which stated that a land plot acquired in accordance with the Law could not be sold, altered or leased.

2. Decision on the Increase of Private Plots

It may seem a paradox to the outside observer, that in July 1989, the Supreme Council of the Lithuanian SSR adopts a Law on Privately owned Farm, a very progressive one for that period (in the opinion of many from the right-wing), while the Supreme Council of independent Lithuania through its act dated 26 July 1999³ introduces miniature farms into the agricultural structure by restructuring the former collective and state private

³ Resolution of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania No. 1-411 “On the Increase of Private Plots of Rural Population”.

plots of the rural population. However, despite appearances there are no contradictions in the actions of the legislative bodies of Lithuania. A decision on the increase of private plots attached to a farmer's house was predicted by the spirit and needs of the time. This Law was necessary since:

- 1) In effect the state simply legalized the cultivation of those land areas already being used by the rural population, by recording this land use in the State Land Register;
- 2) It created favourable conditions in which the rural population were able to increase their private farms, thus considerably improving their family income and increasing the supply of agricultural products to the society (at that time there was a distinct lack of agricultural products).

The Legislative acts of the Government were to be enforced on 1 September 1990, but they were not adopted since that resolution faced resolute opposition from some of the heads of the socialized Collective and State farms and also from some scientists as well. Despite that opposition the executive act still came into force in October 1990. Land for private farm use by the rural population was allotted on the basis of a decision of the rural-district council with consideration given to the interests of both the socialized farms and the candidates for private farms.

Up to 3 ha of land per family for a private farm was allocated to the workers of socialized farms, residing in rural localities, as well as to pensioners who could work these farms before retiring if they wished. Up to 2 ha of land per family for use as a private farm could be allotted to other persons and pensioners residing and working in rural localities. Collective and State farms had to keep records of the land allocated to private farms. Control over land usage and the accuracy of its accounting was delegated to the rural-district council and the geodetic service of regional self-government. Thus we can see how the Resolution of 26 July 1990 involved a very broad circle of people, since it affected all the owners of private plots and other people residing and working in rural localities, giving them the right to increase the size of their private plot or to be allocated a plot if they had not had one before. The right to increase or acquire a plot of land was outlined without the appropriate executive orders and so was not quite valid, since general meetings of collective farmers or State farm workers defeated that resolution, by referring to the fact that, in any case there was no free land available for increasing private plots, because all the available land was necessary for agricultural production.

Those who had proposed the Resolution of 26 July 1990, had expected a much wider response to the offer of creating smaller in size private plots than it was the case with

private farms with an area from 10 to 50 ha. Making the decision to run a full-fledged farm is much more difficult than simply deciding to increase the size of the plot one is already farming.

The resolution on the increase of private plots was to a certain extent a retreat from the ambitious goal of creating private farms with areas of not less than 10 ha in principle. The only exception to this rule pursuant to the Law on Privately owned Farms was in the case of specialized farms. In fact the resolution assumed that farms would be created with an area of 2-3 ha. According to this resolution, anybody living and working in the rural locality could establish a two-hectare farm not related to a collective or State farm, i.e. economically independent.

The resignation of the ambitious goal of creating well-structured farm areas can be seen as a result of the relative flaws and failures that were revealed during the year of the Law on Privately owned Farm's validity. This failure could be attributed to the poor response to the law from the peasants (private farms accounted for only 1-2 percent of the land designated for agricultural purposes by the individual regions). The weak response to the law could be explained by the peasants' inability to take independent decisions, their fear of risk and an unwillingness to reject fixed steady work, vacations and perhaps even the fear of losing the illusory psychological comfort of not being responsible for the final result of their labour, but only for one's own narrow area of work. In summary, it is necessary to note that in the period of 1989-1991 in Lithuania it was not full-fledged households that were the main components in the development of private agriculture but rather the private plots of the rural population.

3. The Period of General Transformations

The previously presented legislative acts predetermined the evolutionary character of the development of agriculture in Lithuania. These acts due to their short-term validity could not and did not bring a sharp acceleration in agricultural development nor a quick satisfaction of the of the populations demand for agricultural products. Thus the law-makers decided to speed up the course of events by adopting a number of legislative acts, which curtailed the natural course of agricultural development and put the revolutionary transformations in Lithuanian agriculture at risk.

The first act of general transformations was the Resolution of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania No. 1-1454 of 18 June 1991 "On the Procedure and Conditions for the Restoration of Ownership Rights to Existing Real Property". By this

act historical justice was restored and both real estate nationalized by the Soviet power, and real estate lost as a result of other unlawful acts was restored to Lithuanian citizens. Article 3 determined the right of ownership on the remaining real estate:

- 1) lands;
- 2) forests;
- 3) structures of economic-trade designation with appurtenances;
- 4) dwelling houses with appurtenances.

Documents confirming the right of ownership could be statements from unlimited land books (mortgage), agreements made on the transfer of property, court rulings, protocols of national property, or certificates issued by the archives (Article 9).

The main theme of the land reform conducted in accordance with the Resolution of 25 July 1991⁴ was the restoration of land property to the citizens of Lithuania. Property which was lost under Soviet law, could now be restored by way of reprivatization or the purchase of land. The Resolution allowed for the existence of State-owned land in the form of lands designated for non-agricultural purposes, lands afforded for educational institutions and still unprivatised lands. Land that after privatization was not used for its designated purpose could be transferred to State property and according to that act would be transferred to the State Land Fund. In other cases land must be in private ownership and should be used by households.

The Resolution of 25 July 1991 recognized that the right to land ownership belonged only to Lithuanian citizens who were permanent residents of the country. On the basis of that resolution the owners or their direct heirs could claim for the return of land that they had lost in the period of Soviet power; it was also possible to buy land for private ownership in order to establish a household or private enterprise.

The Resolution determined the maximum area for farms as 50 ha of agricultural land, 10 ha of forest and 50 ha of water basins (in several months after the adoption of that Resolution the norm for forest area was increased to 25 ha). Minimum areas were not established. The land acquired in accordance with the resolution could not be sold, altered or leased for 5 years.

The Resolution on Land Reform left the Resolution of the Supreme Soviet of 26 July 1990 on the increase of private plots still in force. Farms on such plots are called private

⁴ Resolution of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania No. 1-1608 of 25 July 1991 “On Land Reform”

farms in the Resolution on Land Reform. Article 16 specifies that persons residing in rural localities may lease private farms of 2-3 ha of land (not taking into account areas occupied by farmsteads) from the State Land Fund which in practice is land that is at the disposal of rural-district (town) self-governments. Land reform was to be implemented by agrarian reform rural-district services and regional privatization commissions. The Land Reform Commission under the Government of the Republic of Lithuania and the Ministry of Agriculture coordinated and controlled their work. The design of land-tenure regulation projects for land reform was delegated to the State Institute of Land-Tenure Regulation. These projects had to be reviewed at meetings of those candidates who wanted to obtain land, and to be coordinated with the State institutions concerned. The coordinated complex projects had then to be confirmed by the regional self-governments.

Alongside the afore-mentioned resolutions on land reform, a resolution on the privatization of the property of agricultural enterprises⁵ was important for structural changes in the countryside. This Resolution predetermined the privatization of collective and State farms. The property could be acquired by employees of the agricultural enterprises having the right to reprivatization, and also people employed in other fields (medicine, education, culture, etc.) who were residing in that rural locality. The property of collective and State farms could be privatized by their workers for privatization coupons and money (provided that not less than 10% of the value of the property was paid in cash).

The characteristic feature of all three of the above-mentioned resolutions forming the legal framework of land reform, is that not one of them supports collective and State farming. However, almost the entirety of Lithuanian agriculture at the moment of adopting these resolutions was socialized. This silence is evidence that the fate of collective and state farms was predetermined. And even though a resolution on land reform declared a free choice of the form of farming undertaken on privatized lands, agrarian policy, however, was based on the conviction that privatization was a necessity and peasants were often coerced into accepting this without being offered any alternatives.

Land privatization on the basis of the Resolution on Land Reform was initiated in November 1991 and from 1 November of the same year the work was halted by the State and collective farm authorities who were in charge of creating the temporary

⁵ Resolution of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Lithuania No. 1-1629 of 30 July 1991 "On the Privatization of Property of Agricultural Enterprises".

administration which was to conduct the liquidation of these structures according to governmental recommendations. By Government decree the collegiate authorities of collective and State farms were deprived of their powers, and the socialized farms themselves were subject to liquidation. All the powers of the collegiate bodies were then transferred to a temporary liquidation administration, which consisted of a head administrator, his deputy and a chief accountant, and this administration was given the task of regulating the liquidation and resolving issues of production, finance and personnel. The powers of the temporary administration in respect of the privatization of the property were particularly emphasised.

Some of the former chairmen of the collective farms and the directors of the State farms were appointed by the heads of the agricultural enterprises under liquidation. Thus the people who organized the economic life in the collective-State farm system could now play the role of the liquidators of that system. In many cases “liquidators” were people from outside. After the adoption of these decisions, there was much chaos in the restructuring of agricultural production. There were many cases in which socialized enterprises’ property was stolen before their privatization. Cases of forgery or destruction of property documents also took place. But the greatest obstacle was the mentality of the people who had grown up under the collective-State farm system, and as a result, did not know how to work in the new way and take important decisions independently, and who feared to take risks and undertake responsibility for the future of their families.

Nevertheless, agricultural companies began to be formed on the foundations of the collective and State farms under liquidation, and in the initial years of land reform they were the most characteristic element of transformation in the countryside.

Gradually still more people decided to run farms independently and created their own farms. However the agricultural companies could no longer expect the state financial support that had once been given to state and collective farms, and many were unable to survive under these new conditions and quite a number of them went bankrupt and were dismissed.

In the course of time the legal basis of structural transformations in agriculture was amended and elaborated. In 1977 amendments were introduced into legal acts, as a result of which areas of lands to be returned to the owners of land and forest increased from 80 to 150 ha. In the same year, 1977, a discriminatory provision on “grey zones”,

anticipating the mandatory leasing of the land to the stock-breeding complexes of agricultural companies, was cancelled.

In the past years a tendency to decrease the share of agricultural companies and promote the growth of privately owned farms is being observed. The importance of private plots attached to houses (farm buildings) is slowly decreasing. As of 1 January 2000 the following situation in land use⁶ has been established (Table 1).

Table 1. **Agricultural land (1000 ha)**

| | Agricultural land | Of which arable land |
|---|-------------------|----------------------|
| Land used for agriculture | 3371.2 | 2882.5 |
| Private land | 1478.5 | 1311.7 |
| Of which: | | |
| Land used for agricultural activity | 1465.7 | 1311.6 |
| Land owned by horticulturist's associations | 12.8 | 0.1 |
| State or state owned land | 1892.7 | 1572.8 |
| Of which: | | |
| Land of households | 649.1 | 549.7 |
| Land of agricultural partnerships and enterprises leased from the state | 209.8 | 179.4 |
| Land of other natural and legal entities leased from the state | 599.9 | 488.2 |
| Land owned by horticulturists associations | 3.7 | 0.2 |
| Land non-grated for usage or not leased | 430.2 | 353.3 |

The results of the economic activity of restructured agriculture are shown in the following tables (Table 2-14), the information is based on Data of from the Ministry of Agriculture and the State Land Cadastre. These numbers represent the situation so clearly, that no further comments are needed.

The constant changes from left-wing orientation to right in the Lithuanian Government had, as a matter of fact, the effect on introducing legislative acts which were not always consistent in reforming Lithuanian agriculture.

In spite of this, the main aim of agricultural privatization was achieved.

⁶ Statistics Lithuania. Agriculture in Lithuania in figures. Vilnius, 2000.

Table 2. **Brief information about Lithuania**

| | 1990 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 |
|---|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Territory, 1000 sq. km | 65.3 | 65.3 | 65.3 | 65.3 | 65.3 | 65.3 |
| Average annual population, 1000 | 3722.3 | 3714.8 | 3709.5 | 3705.6 | 3702.4 | 3699.7 |
| of which share, %: | | | | | | |
| urban population | 68.3 | 68.0 | 68.4 | 68.3 | 68.2 | 68.2 |
| rural population | 31.7 | 32.0 | 31.6 | 31.7 | 31.8 | 31.8 |
| Population per one sq. km | 57.2 | 56.9 | 56.8 | 56.7 | 56.7 | 56.6 |
| Ha per capita: | | | | | | |
| agricultural land | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.95 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.95 |
| arable land | ... | 0.79 | 0.79 | 0.79 | 0.80 | 0.79 |
| Average annual number of employees engaged, 1000: | | | | | | |
| in agriculture | 343.5 | 375.6 | 383.5 | 348.0 | 341.4 | 316.0 |
| in forestry | 6.0 | 14.4 | 15.6 | 15.0 | 13.2 | 15.1 |
| in fishery | ... | 1.8 | 1.6 | 1.7 | 1.4 | 1.4 |
| Share of employees engaged in agriculture | | | | | | |
| And services for agriculture in total number of employees, %: | 18.5 | 22.9 | 23.1 | 20.8 | 20.6 | 19.2 |

Table 3. Economic accounts for agriculture
(at current prices; in mill. litas)

| | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999* |
|--|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Total output | 6086.3 | 7727.7 | 7582.7 | 7161.7 | 6037.6 |
| Intermediate consumption | 3669.6 | 4431.9 | 3855.5 | 3535.7 | 3016.4 |
| Gross Value Added | 2416.7 | 3295.8 | 3727.2 | 3626.0 | 3021.2 |
| Share in Gross Value Added, % | 10.9 | 11.3 | 10.9 | 9.5 | 7.9 |
| Change in Gross Value Added (at 1995 prices) compared with previous year, % | ... | 14.6 | 8.9 | -2.6 | -9.0 |
| Gross Value Added per one employee: | | | | | |
| LTL | 6583 | 8594 | 10710 | 10621 | 9561 |
| USD | 1646 | 2149 | 2678 | 2655 | 2390 |
| * provisional data | | | | | |

Table 4. Crop area in all farms
(1000 ha)

| | 1990 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 |
|---|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Total crop area | 2918.7 | 2359.2 | 2455.3 | 2562.3 | 2563.0 | 2421.3 |
| Total cereals | 1001.9 | 1026.7 | 1078.9 | 1161.8 | 1107.5 | 1012.7 |
| Wheat | 349.4 | 260.6 | 347.7 | 375.6 | 359.6 | 333.7 |
| Barley | 399.9 | 544.5 | 473.8 | 503.0 | 462.9 | 421.2 |
| Rye | 167.9 | 134.7 | 152.2 | 158.7 | 174.3 | 134.8 |
| Triticale | ... | 22.5 | 34.1 | 40.6 | 36.9 | 45.0 |
| Oats | 77.4 | 47.4 | 51.6 | 56.1 | 49.6 | 51.2 |
| Mixed cereals | 7.0 | 16.0 | 17.6 | 23.4 | 15.9 | 11.7 |
| Buckwheat | 0.3 | 1.0 | 1.9 | 4.4 | 8.3 | 15.1 |
| Dried pulses | 82.2 | 26.3 | 36.7 | 52.3 | 66.1 | 49.3 |
| Flax | 22.7 | 13.2 | 5.6 | 6.1 | 6.2 | 8.8 |
| Rape | 11.2 | 13.9 | 11.8 | 22.1 | 38.6 | 83.8 |
| Sugar beet | 32.1 | 24.3 | 31.2 | 35.2 | 30.0 | 30.6 |
| Potatoes | 112.5 | 124.5 | 125.3 | 121.2 | 136.3 | 121.1 |
| Vegetables grown into the open field | 16.2 | 25.8 | 29.4 | 26.8 | 28.1 | 24.9 |
| Fodder beet | 54.4 | 64.6 | 54.0 | 51.3 | 58.3 | 46.8 |
| Total fodder from arable land | 1511.1 | 1023.0 | 1072.1 | 1077.8 | 1087.5 | 1036.0 |

Table 5. Crop production in all farms
(1000 t)

| | 1990 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 |
|---|---------|---------|--------|--------|---------|--------|
| Cereals grain | 3064.9 | 1906.5 | 2615.1 | 2945.3 | 2716.8 | 2048.6 |
| Wheat | 1183.7 | 637.3 | 936.2 | 1127.4 | 1031.0 | 870.9 |
| Barley | 1196.4 | 891.5 | 1176.6 | 1193.5 | 1104.3 | 741.6 |
| Rye | 470.2 | 239.3 | 286.8 | 348.2 | 348.7 | 260.9 |
| Triticale | ... | 46.6 | 77.6 | 114.1 | 94.9 | 85.1 |
| Oats | 195.7 | 66.7 | 101.6 | 111.7 | 97.2 | 67.1 |
| Mixed cereals | 18.7 | 24.5 | 34.8 | 46.9 | 32.7 | 14.4 |
| Buckwheat | 0.2 | 0.6 | 1.5 | 3.5 | 8.0 | 8.6 |
| Dried pulses | 200.2 | 47.5 | 87.4 | 106.4 | 104.1 | 63.8 |
| Flax fibre | 10.1 | 9.4 | 6.2 | 5.0 | 5.6 | 4.3 |
| Flax seed | 10.2 | 6.5 | 3.2 | 2.9 | 2.7 | 3.7 |
| Rapeseed | 24.3 | 18.9 | 22.6 | 37.2 | 71.9 | 115.1 |
| Sugar beet | 912.4 | 692.4 | 795.5 | 1001.9 | 949.2 | 869.9 |
| Potatoes | 1573.1 | 1593.5 | 2044.3 | 1829.8 | 1849.2 | 1708.1 |
| Vegetables | 295.0 | 368.7 | 432.6 | 415.0 | 436.9 | 325.1 |
| Fodder beet | 2678.8 | 2188.9 | 1718.4 | 1829.7 | 2026.0 | 1573.3 |
| Total fodder from arable land converted into green fodder | 15554.3 | 10095.8 | 9290.1 | 9438.0 | 10211.5 | 7422.4 |

Table 6. Livestock and poultry in all farms
(as 1 of January; 1000 heads)

| | 1991 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 |
|-----------------------------------|---------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Cattle | 2321.5 | 1065.1 | 1054.1 | 1016.3 | 922.8 | 897.8 |
| of which cows | 842.0 | 586.0 | 589.9 | 582.8 | 537.7 | 494.3 |
| share of cows in cattle stocks, % | 36.3 | 55.0 | 56.0 | 57.3 | 58.3 | 55.1 |
| Pigs | 2435.9 | 1270.0 | 1127.6 | 1200.1 | 1159.0 | 936.1 |
| of which sows | 210.3 | 92.3 | 83.8 | 92.1 | 76.7 | 63.2 |
| share of sows in pig stocks, % | 8.6 | 7.3 | 7.4 | 7.7 | 6.6 | 6.8 |
| Sheep | 56.5 | 32.3 | 28.2 | 24.0 | 15.8 | 13.8 |
| Goats | 5.2 | 14.6 | 16.9 | 18.5 | 23.7 | 24.7 |
| Horses | 79.9 | 77.6 | 81.4 | 78.5 | 74.3 | 74.9 |
| Rabbits | 73.4 | 84.2 | 94.0 | 119.3 | 102.5 | 85.4 |
| Poultry | 16815.0 | 8444.2 | 7775.4 | 7423.2 | 6749.3 | 6372.6 |
| Beehives | 260.5 | 95.9 | 77.4 | 80.2 | 79.5 | 73.0 |

Table 7. Livestock and poultry in all farms per 100 ha agricultural land
(as 1 of January; 1000 heads)

| | 1991 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 |
|--------------------------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Cattle | 67.8 | 36.2 | 34.8 | 33.5 | 31.1 | 30.5 |
| of which cows | 24.6 | 19.9 | 19.5 | 19.2 | 18.1 | 16.8 |
| Pigs per 100 ha arable land | 108.6 | 50.0 | 43.1 | 45.5 | 45.2 | 37.0 |
| Poultry per 100 ha grain crops | 1551.1 | 801.9 | 697.0 | 611.4 | 577.4 | 600.1 |

Table 8. Animal production in all farms
(1000 t)

| | 1990 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 |
|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Meat | | | | | | |
| Live weight | 761.0 | 302.0 | 286.0 | 291.4 | 293.6 | 273.7 |
| Carcass weight | 530.1 | 208.2 | 198.6 | 200.9 | 202.3 | 192.9 |
| Milk | 3157.0 | 1818.9 | 1831.5 | 1949.7 | 1929.9 | 1714.2 |
| Eggs, mil | 1272.6 | 793.1 | 750.9 | 798.2 | 792.6 | 728.2 |
| Wool, t | 141 | 80 | 57 | 56 | 48 | 33 |

Table 9. Productivity of cows and poultry

| | 1990 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 |
|---|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Milk yielding per cow, kg | 3734 | 3010 | 3093 | 3205 | 3384 | 3228 |
| Number of eggs per hen in agricultural partnerships, pieces | 243 | 245 | 254 | 246 | 271 | 259 |

Table 10. Meat production by kind in all farms
(1000 t)

| | 1990 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 |
|-----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Beef and veal | | | | | | |
| Live weight | 369.3 | 146.2 | 139.1 | 150.0 | 141.1 | 127.5 |
| Carcass weight | 230.5 | 86.9 | 83.0 | 89.6 | 81.4 | 77.3 |
| Pork | | | | | | |
| Live weight | 311.3 | 115.5 | 109.9 | 107.7 | 116.6 | 112.7 |
| Carcass weight | 240.6 | 93.1 | 88.5 | 87.1 | 95.6 | 91.0 |
| Mutton and goat meat | | | | | | |
| Live weight | 4.1 | 3.1 | 2.6 | 2.2 | 2.3 | 2.2 |
| Carcass weight | 2.1 | 1.6 | 1.4 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 |
| Poultry meat | | | | | | |
| Live weight | 74.0 | 36.1 | 33.7 | 30.8 | 32.8 | 30.6 |
| Carcass weight | 55.5 | 26.0 | 25.2 | 22.5 | 23.6 | 23.0 |
| Other meat | | | | | | |
| Live weight | 2.3 | 1.1 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.7 |
| Carcass weight | 1.4 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.4 |

Table 11. Purchase of agricultural production
(1000 t)

| | 1990 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 |
|-----------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Grain | 357.2 | 488.6 | 639.2 | 631.8 | 735.4 | 680.7 |
| Flax fibre | 10.2 | 9.7 | 5.7 | 2.7 | 5.4 | 4.2 |
| Sugar beet | 712.3 | 619.6 | 659.7 | 962.4 | 929.1 | 852.3 |
| Rapeseed | 11.6 | 2.3 | 11.0 | 8.7 | 63.5 | 89.3 |
| Potatoes | 244.8 | 10.9 | 17.0 | 10.1 | 7.0 | 8.4 |
| Vegetables | 113.1 | 16.6 | 9.6 | 14.9 | 23.3 | 17.7 |
| Fruit and berries | 37.3 | 76.5 | 25.9 | 79.1 | 21.1 | 58.8 |
| Livestock and poultry | 709.3 | 193.4 | 219.1 | 206.8 | 186.6 | 190.5 |
| of which: | | | | | | |
| cattle | 357.2 | 90.2 | 104.3 | 112.9 | 98.4 | 96.4 |
| pigs | 254.7 | 32.5 | 45.4 | 44.7 | 49.0 | 51.4 |
| poultry | 61.4 | 20.7 | 20.4 | 18.7 | 22.2 | 22.4 |
| Milk | 2884.6 | 1215.5 | 1331.9 | 1415.6 | 1476.7 | 1208.6 |
| Eggs, mill | 773.1 | 554.1 | 488.7 | 458.3 | 486.4 | 461.0 |

Table 12. Purchase prices of agricultural production
(in litas per t)

| | 1990 Rb | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 |
|--------------------|---------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Grain | 283 | 480 | 685 | 571 | 448 | 518 |
| of which subsidies | - | - | - | - | 59 | 61 |
| Flax fibre | 1833 | 3020 | 4585 | 3718 | 4215 | 3284 |
| of which subsidies | - | - | 2458 | 2363 | 1999 | 2121 |
| Sugar beet | 74 | 174 | 185 | 182 | 185 | 168 |
| of which subsidies | - | - | - | - | - | 95 |
| Rapeseed | 817 | 885 | 1121 | 852 | 943 | 658 |
| of which subsidies | - | - | - | - | - | 32 |
| Potatoes | 294 | 575 | 267 | 300 | 501 | 315 |
| Vegetables | 745 | 738 | 827 | 934 | 1492 | 1178 |
| Fruit and berries | 727 | 238 | 413 | 137 | 394 | 321 |
| Cattle | 3028 | 2901 | 3479 | 3318 | 3447 | 2936 |
| of which subsidies | - | 551 | 697 | 693 | 661 | 539 |
| Pigs | 3065 | 4406 | 5534 | 5788 | 4938 | 3989 |
| of which subsidies | - | - | 272 | 163 | - | 127 |
| Poultry | 2461 | 4460 | 5247 | 5535 | 5413 | 4595 |
| Milk | 371 | 482 | 600 | 583 | 584 | 581 |
| of which subsidies | - | - | 53 | 53 | 47 | 88 |
| Eggs, 1000 | 93 | 192 | 247 | 232 | 169 | 173 |

Table 13. Production of main agricultural production per capita
(in kilograms)

| | 1990 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 |
|-----------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Grain | 876 | 526 | 729 | 824 | 762 | 571 |
| Potatoes | 422 | 429 | 551 | 494 | 499 | 462 |
| Vegetables | 79 | 99 | 117 | 112 | 118 | 88 |
| Fruit and berries | 23 | 35 | 26 | 74 | 32 | 32 |
| Sugar beet | 245 | 186 | 214 | 270 | 256 | 235 |
| Flax fibre | 2.7 | 2.5 | 1.7 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 1.2 |
| Meat (carcass weight) | 142 | 56 | 54 | 54 | 55 | 52 |
| of which pork | 65 | 25 | 24 | 24 | 26 | 25 |
| Milk | 847 | 490 | 494 | 526 | 521 | 463 |
| Eggs, pieces | 342 | 213 | 202 | 215 | 214 | 197 |

Table 14. Consumption of main foodstuffs per capita
(in kilograms)

| | 1990 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 |
|---|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Bread and grain products | 108 | 136 | 142 | 148 | 146 | 135 |
| Potatoes | 146 | 127 | 133 | 124 | 131 | 125 |
| Vegetables | 79 | 65 | 71 | 70 | 78 | 83 |
| Fruit and berries | 33 | 48 | 52 | 60 | 60 | 55 |
| Meat and meat products | 89 | 52 | 51 | 49 | 53 | 53 |
| of which excluding offals and category II sub-products | 78 | 43 | 42 | 41 | 44 | 45 |
| Milk and dairy products | 476 | 238 | 213 | 208 | 187 | 200 |
| Eggs, pieces | 304 | 172 | 167 | 174 | 172 | 168 |
| Sugar | 43.2 | 22.2 | 23.5 | 22.6 | 21.0 | 20.0 |
| Oil and margarine | 7.3 | 11.5 | 12.8 | 12.8 | 12.8 | 12.5 |
| Fish and fish products | 18.6 | 9.9 | 11.4 | 11.4 | 12.5 | 12.6 |