

European Parliament Information

The Sittings

April 1978



THE SITTINGS

LUXEMBOURG, 10th – 14th APRIL 1978

THE WEEK

Although the announcement that the first European elections are to take place from 7 – 10 June 1979 probably counts as the main news item of Parliament's April session, the continuing preoccupations of most EMPs this week have been with the state of the economy, the prospects for recovery and the chances of making an impact on unemployment.

The week began badly with Commissioner Vredeling holding out little prospect of a return to full employment in the medium term. Some four million young people are going to be looking for jobs every year for the next few years and only about two and a half million will be retiring. With six million already out of work the prospect looks grim.

It is true that Council President K B Andersen did say the European Council in Copenhagen (7 – 8 April) had spoken of a growth rate of four and a half per cent (Presumably assuming a fixed capital investment of at least double the 1976 figure of 260bn EUA) in 1979 – the minimum, apparently, that is needed to make any impact at all on jobs – there was not much optimism it could be achieved. Geoffrey Rippon called it 'a glimmer of hope' and Lord Ardwick suggested that the Copenhagen meeting may have helped evolve a new economic strategy for the western nations – possibly to culminate at the western economic summit in July.

Concern about the economy, of course, has made EMPs far more sensitive about the EC's trade relations, particularly with Japan, and about what should be sources of strength within the Community itself: the customs union and Community preference – both highly relevant to present discussions over the CAP, proposals for the Mediterranean and negotiations for enlargement.

MONDAY, 10th April 1978

Election date set: 7th – 10th June 1979

President Colombo read a message from Mr K B Andersen, Council President, informing Parliament that the Heads of State or Government had agreed at their meeting in Copenhagen on 7th – 8th April that the first European elections will be held from 7th – 10th June 1979.

Welcome to new Member

The Folketing has appointed Mr Ib Christensen to take the place of retiring EMP, Mr Uwe Jensen.

Action taken on Parliament's advice

Commissioner Henk Vredeling reminded the House that Parliament considered eleven Commission proposals at its session in March. Of these eleven, ten had been approved and the eleventh, concerning the second three-year action programme on scientific and technical documentation, had now been amended as requested by Parliament.

Mr Vredeling took advantage of the opportunity to inform the House that the Commission had decided that 500,000 EUA in emergency assistance was to be made available to the Brittany disaster areas affected by oil pollution.

Mr Spicer then asked whether an amended Commission proposal concerning illegal immigration would be referred back to Parliament for further consideration. Mr Vredeling said he understood that the Council would be seeking Parliament's advice again on the directive in question.

Equal pay and equal opportunities for women

Mrs Dunwoody's interim report on equal pay (Doc. 6/78). Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti's question on discrimination against women at work (Doc. 21/78).

Article 119 of the EEC Treaty lays down that each Member State shall apply the principle 'that men and women should receive equal pay for equal work'. Mrs

Gwyneth Dunwoody (UK, S), introducing her interim report, wanted to know were the concrete results of the Council directive of 12th February 1976, which implemented this Treaty provision. Her motion called in particular for the publication by the Commission of statistical data covering all Member States on the subject of equal pay for women and equality of opportunity. The size of the problem had, she thought, been seriously underestimated.

One of the most unfortunate aspects of lack of opportunity affected women who, after raising their families, attempted to re-enter employment after several years of absence and found themselves offered, at best, semi-skilled work which was both boring and underpaid.

Commission Vice-President Henk Vredeling welcomed Parliament's interest in this question. His services were at present engaged in checking on infringements of the Council directives. He also pointed out that the Commission now had the answers to the questionnaire (regarding implementation of the directive on equal pay) which had been sent to Member States. 'We will not hesitate to take action where non-implementation arises', the Commissioner said, adding that equal pay could only be fully implemented in conjunction with equal opportunity.

Commission proposals to help young people

Commissioner Henk Vredeling explained to Parliament the proposals adopted by the Commission on Wednesday last week. These will involve spending 110 million EUA in 1979 (a 20 per cent increase in the Social Fund budget at the least), according to highly selective criteria, in the hope of providing 150,000 new jobs.

In his reply to questions, Mr Vredeling said that 55 million EUA would come under Article 4 of the Social Fund and 55 million EUA under Article 5. While these proposals were, in general, welcomed by the House, Mrs Squarcialupi found it particularly disturbing to hear Mr Vredeling say that he saw little hope of a return to full employment in the medium term.

Cocoa and chocolate products

Mr Lamberts's report (Doc. 15/78). Motion tabled welcomes the proposal subject to amendments.

Mr Johannes Lamberts (Du, S), for Parliament's Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, was concerned about the imbalance in children's calcium-phosphate ratio resulting from eating chocolates containing large quantities of P₂O₅ – the neutralizing agent used in making chocolate in Denmark, Ireland and the UK (the other Six use citric acid and tartaric acid).

Under a proposed amendment to the 18 June 1974 Council Directive (OJ L 189: emulsifiers, stabilizers, thickener and gelling agents used in foodstuffs), phosphoric acid, emulsifiers and artificial flavouring substances may now be used in all the Member States. He hoped the Six will not take advantage of this or, if they do, that the use of these additives will be shown legibly on the label.

To this end, he asked for the Commission proposal to be amended to allow for a review of the legislation of additives to be completed by July next year.

In reply, Mr Vredeling said the Commission would accept the amendments tabled.

European Parliament's Budget for 1977

Mr Cointat's report. The motion called for the decision on the discharge to be given in respect of Parliament's actual 60,619,805 ua (25,258,454 pounds) appropriations for 1977 to be deferred until the Court of Auditors has scrutinized the expenditure involved. There was no debate.

TUESDAY, 11th April 1978

Dumping

Lord Brimelow's report (Doc. 551/77). Motion called for a firm EC response to dumping and the threat to Europe of uncontrolled competition.

In the motion he had tabled on behalf of Parliament's Committee on External Economic Relations, Lord Brimelow (UK, S), rapporteur, recalled the Community's Rome Treaty commitment to free trade and its responsibilities as the world's largest importer and exporter. The Community was bound by the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), particularly Articles VI

(coping with dumping) and XIX (rocking the market). Lord Brimelow's motion supported the Commission's bid to get Article XIX re-written to give the Community a better escape clause, and, more generally, called for a firm response to dumping and the threat to Europe of uncontrolled competition. Lord Brimelow's motion supported the Commission's efforts but called for further steps, including, for example, a European Export Bank to help EC exports.

Introducing his report, Lord Brimelow said his motion was in response to an earlier motion (tabled last July) by Mr Inchauspé, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, on the question of dumping. This motion was, in the rapporteur's view, somewhat alarmist and underestimated the dangers of protectionism.

This view was shared by a number of other speakers. Mr Willem Albers (Du, S) felt that unilateral Community measures would lead to 'a wave of protectionism' and he pointed out that we often had ourselves to blame for what we liked to describe as 'dumping' by not producing cheaply or efficiently enough ourselves.

Mr Ernst Müller-Hermann (Ge, CD) gave the report the backing of the Christian Democrats. He agreed with Mr Albers that we could not blame countries which produced more cheaply than ourselves for our problems: Germany had shown that, despite a high wage economy, it could remain competitive internationally. The answer lay in exploiting technology.

Mr Paul De Clercq (Be, L), for the Liberals, emphasized the complexities of world trade. As an example of what he meant, he cited Australian pressure to make deliveries of uranium to the Community contingent upon special trade measures which discriminated in its favour.

The spokesmen for the European Progressive Democrats, including Mr Liogier and Mr Cousté, expressed disappointment at reactions to the motion they had tabled. Their group was in favour of free trade; but this, today, had to be organised at world level. The EPD group's objection to Lord Brimelow's motion was that it simply did not go far enough. They wanted to draw attention to the abusive practices in the holding of stocks, the exploitation by multinationals of low wage economies and the dangers of a disindustrialization of Europe.

Fair trade practices

European Conservative spokesman Mrs Elaine Kellett-Bowman agreed. She felt that Europe's concern should not be with blocking the imports of the very poor

countries but of critically appraising imports from countries like Taiwan, Hong Kong, Japan, Korea and Brazil, which were in a position to smash Community industry.

The EC group was in favour of fair trade practices but the same fairness should be observed by all. Mrs Kellett-Bowman did not agree with Mr Müller-Hermann that high technology was the answer; European industry was already highly sophisticated.

For the Communist and Allies group, Mr Altiero Spinelli pledged his support for the motion, while urging the House to avoid a condition of protectionist paranoia.

Mr Tam Dalyell (UK, S) raised the question of trade roles within an enlarged Community. He asked about the monitoring of sensitive imports and he wanted to know what answer could be given by EMPs to questions about EC methods in protecting Member States against threats to their market.

Replying to the debate for the Commission, Mr Haferkamp stressed that the Community was the world's largest trading bloc and was dependent on its exports for economic survival. Protectionism, for Europe, was therefore unthinkable, even when this or that sector might benefit from it in the short term. Protectionism engendered protectionism and it was imperative to avoid a chain reaction. However, Mr Haferkamp went on, protectionism need not be equated with protection, and the Community had every right to protect its industries against unfair trade practices, dumping, or violations of international trade rules.

The answer for Europe lay in improving its competitiveness. It would be ludicrous to help the developing countries to industrialize, only to close our markets to their products once they had done so. Open markets meant a chance of greater world growth and it was that which was needed to pull the whole world out of recession. Turning to the present GATT negotiations in Geneva, Mr Haferkamp said that progress towards further tariff reductions was being made. The Community was especially keen to see the higher rates reduced.

EC relations with COMECON

Mr Jahn's question to the Commission.

Introducing his question, which asked the Commission for a general summary of present EC relations with the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance

(COMECON), Mr Hans-Edgar Jahn (Ge, CD) drew particular attention to what he saw as the alarming degree of COMECON's indebtedness vis-à-vis the Community.

In reply, Mr Haferkamp said that a draft report on relations between the EC and COMECON was at present being drawn up. It was the Community's aim to develop relations not only with COMECON as a whole, but also with its individual member states. In a multilateral context, relations already existed between the Community and those members of COMECON which were also members of GATT (i.e.: Hungary, Poland and Czechoslovakia). He agreed on the need to establish guidelines for export credits.

For the Socialist Group, Mr Manfred Schmidt said the level of COMECON indebtedness should not be exaggerated – Brazil's debt, for example, alone equalled nearly half of that of all the COMECON countries put together.

Mr Kai Nyborg (Da), for the European Progressive Democrats, disagreed. We were digging our own grave by providing COMECON with the money it needed to successfully compete with our own industries. There were already examples of COMECON bad faith in this area – the speaker referred to shipping – and if they wanted our help they should stop these practices.

Mr Tom Normanton (UK), for the European Conservatives, felt the same. We were financing our political and economic executioners, he said. We should not regard negotiations between the EC and COMECON as being between friendly partners. Community money was being used to finance Russia's armaments programme. Mr Normanton also called on the Commission to bear in mind the human rights issue when negotiating.

Communist group spokesman Mr Altiero Spinelli (It) said the USSR was not an aggressive economy. Like the rest of the world, the state-trading countries were experiencing serious economic difficulties. One option was for them to return to a closed economy, or they would be to the advantage of the Community and the rest of the industrialized world. Moreover, we would do well to remember that many of the COMECON states had important reserves of raw materials which could be of benefit to the Community.

Before opening Question Time at 3 p.m., the President welcomed Mr Antonio Hernandez Gil, President of the Cortes of Spain, to the distinguished visitors gallery. This announcement was greeted with applause. Later, at the close of Question Time, Mr Colombo welcomed a delegation from the New Zealand House of Commons.

QUESTION TIME

Questions to the Commission

Labelling of cosmetic products (Guillaume Schyns)

Mr Schyns (Be, CD) asked why Community legislation regarding the labelling of cosmetic products was less stringent than that enforced in the United States. Mr Raymond Vouel replied that although the American Act of 31 May 1977 required all ingredients to be stated on the labels of cosmetic products, these were expressed in chemical language which was beyond the understanding of the uninitiated. What Community legislation did under the directive on cosmetics of January this year was to provide for amendments in the light of new findings, particularly regarding the toxic nature of ingredients used.

Parliamentary Association for Euro-Arab Cooperation (Mrs Gwyneth Dunwoody)

President Roy Jenkins informed the House that 270,000 Belgian francs had been granted to this Association in the 1977 budget. No application for funds had been made during the current year. Mrs Dunwoody (UK, S) expressed concern at the idea of help being extended to what she described as a 'racialist platform'. Mr Jenkins said he was not sure that this was the universal view of the Euro-Arab Parliamentary Association. Although the Commission was anxious to be guided by Parliament in these matters he thought it proper to point out that Parliament had made facilities available in the past to the association concerned.

Customs clearance (John Osborn)

Commissioner Davignon said that the Commission had referred, regarding responsibility for security, to an inter-governmental group. Several Members raised complaints and criticisms about the controls practised in Europe today, particularly at some airports.

Levies on Greek agricultural products (Lord Reay)

Mr Haferkamp told the House that the imposition of EC levies on imports of Greek agricultural products was not in conflict with the Community's

Association Agreement with Greece. Lord Reay (UK, EC) pointed out that the largest opposition party in Greece has come out against membership of the Community and that a generous gesture on agricultural levies could be of great psychological value.

Blackmail and boycott of Community companies (Tom Normanton)

Commissioner Vouel made it clear that the Community had included a non-discrimination clause in its agreement with Arab countries. Where, on the other hand, findings could be produced of firms being discriminated against because of their ties with Israel, the Commission was willing to act, either pursuant to the Agreements concerned or under Articles 85 and 86 of the Rome Treaty. He did point out, however, how difficult it was to establish beyond all reasonable doubt that discrimination was taking place. Mrs Gwyneth Dunwoody expressed some surprise that no case had yet been sufficiently substantiated for the Commission to act.

Mr Bob Mitchell (UK, S), at this point, asked whether in view of Israeli aggression against its neighbours the Commission would suspend the present Community agreement with that country. Mr Vouel replied that this was not germane to the point under discussion.

Competition in the aviation sector (Kai Nyborg)

Mr Vouel told Mr Nyborg (Da, EPD) that the Commission had now decided to draw up a draft regulation to give the Commission greater scope in dealing with possible violations of Rome Treaty Articles 85 and 86 on competition. The regulation should be ready to go to the Council this year.

Vote

The House agreed, with some amendment, to the motions contained in Mrs Dunwoody's report on equal pay (Doc. 6/78) and Lord Brimelow's report on dumping (Doc. 551/77), and, without amendment, to the motions in Mr Lamberts's report on cocoa and chocolate products (Doc. 15/78) and Mr Cointat's report on Parliament's expenditure in 1977 (Doc. 14/78).

Trade with Japan

Mr Müller-Hermann, for the Christian Democrats, asked Mr Haferkamp about his recent talks in Tokyo.

With the Community's trade deficit standing at 13,000m dollars at the end of the current Japanese fiscal year, Mr Müller-Hermann asked Commissioner Haferkamp what the prospects were for redressing this adverse balance of payments. In reply Mr Haferkamp said that Japan planned to reduce its surplus by one-third to bring it down to 9,000m dollars at the end of the next financial year.

Japan was also planning to triple its aid to developing countries over the next five years. This said, when expressed as a proportion of the GNP would then be higher than that given by the Community. Japan also accepted that its imports of finished products needed to be more than 20 per cent of those absorbed by its market.

Mr Haferkamp found it encouraging that Mr Nobuhiko Ushiba had spoken of raising these imports to a 'normal level'. At the same time the Japanese had agreed that their trade relations with the Community should be subject to regular review.

This statement was greeted with some scepticism in the European Parliament. Lord Castle (UK, S) described it as 'putting a pretty good face on a pretty poor bargain'. Both he and his Socialist colleagues Mr Willy Hamilton and Mr Tam Dalyell were sceptical both about the Japanese intentions and their sincerity. Mr Hamilton warned that protectionist pressures could now grow greater.

Mr Jan Baas (Du), for the Liberals, found the talks had yielded little. He wondered how the deal between the Community and Japan compared with that agreed between Tokyo and Washington.

European Progressive Democrat spokesman, Gabriel Kaspereit (Fr), also found the outcome of the Tokyo talks unsatisfactory. He was concerned about Japanese trade practices which seriously affect Community exports. This point was taken up by Mr Dalyell, who spoke of last minute changes in design requirements for products trying to penetrate the Japanese market. Mr Dalyell raised the question of Japanese lorries being put together in Ireland and then exported to the rest of the Community and evading normal duties.

Outline Agreement with China

Lord Bessborough's question (Doc. 27/78).

This afternoon's debate on the Community's outline agreement on trade with China was concerned less with the substance of Lord Bessborough's question – what progress had there been in setting up a Joint Commission and what working groups would be established – than with the broader question of EC relations with China.

Lord Bessborough (UK, EC) himself welcomed the agreement as imparting 'a political impetus to Europe's relationship with China'. The Chinese now seemed bent on modernizing and industrializing their economy, and this held out greater hopes for Europe's industry and exporters – particularly in the fields of raw materials extraction, chemicals, fertilizers, computer technology, electronics, aircraft, and deep-sea drilling equipment. (The 1975 trade figure was approx. \$2,000m).

Replying, Mr Haferkamp said he could say little at present about the frequency of Joint Commission meetings or the possibility of working groups. But he agreed that China provided an immense opportunity for European industry, and the outline agreement provided the basis for contacts.

Lord Kennet (UK, S), in a maiden speech, said the Socialist Group warmly welcomed the conclusion of the agreement and pointed out that no such agreement existed between the EC and the USSR or COMECON. He agreed that, with an almost unlimited growth potential, China offered Community industry a major chance.

Mr Luigi Noè (It), for the Christian Democrats, described the type of activities the Joint Commission's working groups might tackle. Mr Cornelis Berkhouwer (Du), speaking for the Liberals, pointed out that we should not lose sight of the fact that China had its own good reasons for seeking closer ties with Europe – in particular, he suggested, the Chinese might be interested in copying European products so as to be able to manufacture them itself.

Mr Gabriel Kaspereit (Fr, EPD), chairman of Parliament's External Economic Relations Committee, felt that a fuller debate on the subject needed to be held. For the European Conservatives, Mr John Corrie warned that Japan remained Europe's main competitor on the Chinese market, and called on the Commission to help mobilize Community firms to seize the opportunities which the agreement offered.

Mr Andrea Mascagni (It), Communist spokesman, stressed the implications of the agreement for political détente, and Mr Lucien Radoux (Be, S) called for extension of the agreement to cultural and political questions.

Mr Tam Dalyell (UK, S) wanted to know whether the Chinese were now willing to accept credit, without which large-scale trade was scarcely possible. This had not been discussed, said Mr Haferkamp in reply. He added that the Commission would make efforts to alert EC firms to the opportunities which presented themselves.

Phasing out frontier formalities

Mr Nyborg's report (Doc. 557/77). Motion tabled urged faster phase out of frontier formalities within the EC. Mr Nyborg's question (Doc. 23/78) to the Commission asked when an outline directive on customs clearance was to be submitted.

One of the most serious irritants within the European Community today is the continuing existence, twenty years after the Treaty of Rome, of formalities at the Community's internal frontiers. Speakers in today's debate voiced their support for suggestions made by Mr Nyborg (Da, EPD) for finally phasing out these unwelcome restrictions.

Welcoming the report Commissioner Davignon agreed with Mr Nyborg that the absence of the Council was to be regretted, for the Council was an essential party to this discussion. He found it unacceptable that Community nationals should still be treated in exactly the same way as third country nationals when crossing frontiers within the Community. It was always being suggested that some kind of control was needed for statistical reasons, tax reasons, health reasons, agricultural reasons and other reasons. And because checks were needed for these purposes the whole customs structure was retained.

But, he said, there were no formalities between Colorado and California and it was still possible to obtain statistics on trade between the two states more quickly than on trade between, say, France and Germany.

However, the Commission would be submitting an outline directive on building materials by June 30th in an attempt to clear away some of the remaining formalities.

More protectionism over patents and licences

Mr Van Aerssens's question to the Commission.

In reply to Mr Van Aerssens's question, Commissioner Raymond Vouel said the Commission was at present preparing a regulation on the global exemption for patent licences.

EC loans

Mr Spinelli's report. (Doc. 36/78). Motion welcomed proposal to empower Commission to raise loans but wanted proposal amended to ensure budgetary powers of Parliament and Commission are not undermined.

To promote investment in the Community, the Commission is proposing (Doc. 546/77) that the Council empower it to raise loans worth up to one billion EUA (651,186 million pounds) on the capital markets. It sent this proposal to Council on 31st January and Council has consulted Parliament.

Mr Altiero Spinelli (It, CA), for Parliament's Committee on Budgets, welcomed the proposal but wanted all six of its articles amended.

Mr Spinelli felt that this new loan-raising facility could help the EC progress to Economic and Monetary Union but argued that until EMU became a more-clearly defined EC objective the new facility was liable to look like 'just one more banking instrument'.

Accordingly Mr Spinelli felt this need for a policy should be spelled out in the Council decision. As for the amount, he asked that this should be subject to review: 1,000m EUA should be the ceiling for the first year of application.

Mr Spinelli's most serious quarrel with the proposal, however, concerned its powers aspect: as now worded, the proposal was liable to undermine the budgetary powers of both Parliament and Commission -- especially article five. Mr Spinelli felt it should be for the EIB to administer the loans raised but it should be for the Commission -- being answerable to Parliament -- to decide which loans to grant.

Although Vice-President Ortoli defended the role of the European Investment Bank in granting loans from the Community facility, much of the subsequent

debate centred on the question of the Commission's competence to handle the loans itself. As Lord Bruce (UK, S) pointed out, the Commission had had plenty of experience in allocating loans, and nobody suggested that the EIB should be responsible for handling the 7,000m EUA paid out by the EAGGF.

The issue was pursued by Mr Heinrich Aigner (Ge, CD) and Mr Martin Bangemann (Ge, L), but Mr Ruairi Brugha (Ir, EPD) and Sir Brandon Rhys Williams (UK, EC) concentrated their remarks on the use to which the loans should be put. 'They should be used for viable propositions rather than for political purposes,' Sir Brandon said.

Other speakers – who included Mr Radoux, Mr Shaw, Mr Ripamonti, Mr Dalyell, Mr Ellis and Mr Brown – discussed both the use to which the loans should be put and how they should be administered.

Vice-President Ortoli replied.

WEDNESDAY, 12th April 1978

The European Council meeting in Copenhagen on 7 – 8 April

Council President K B Andersen and Commission President Roy Jenkins made statements. Some scepticism in the House about the economic targets set.

Mr K B Andersen, Danish Foreign Minister and current President of the Council, gave an account of the European Council meeting held in Copenhagen on 7 – 8 April. The most important decision as far as the European Parliament was concerned was that the first European elections should be held from the 7 – 10 June 1979. The European Council regarded this date as final.

Mr Andersen then reviewed the wide range of points that had been dealt with in Copenhagen: the declaration on democracy; the decision to set up a European Foundation in Paris; the determination to adopt a common approach to dealing with marine pollution; a declaration on Namibia; a reaffirmation of the Nine's support for the UN's resolution 242; and a determination to deal with terrorism.

Referring to Zimbabwe, Mr Andersen said that the European Council did not regard the present situation as satisfactory, nor did it approve the solution arrived at.

The main burden of the Council meeting, however, was the economic and social situation confronting the Nine. The European Council decided to double the capital of the European Investment Bank from 3,500m EUA to 7,000m EUA giving the bank a borrowing capability (two and a half times its capital) of 17,500m EUA as part of a common strategy to promote growth and, hence, to create jobs. This strategy would be further developed at the next European Council meeting at Bremen in July and would have an important bearing on the Western Economic Summit to be held in Bonn on 16-17 July.

Terrorism

There was general support for a motion expressing solidarity with Italy, condemning terrorism, and calling for action to combat it from Mr Hellmut Sieglerschmidt (Ge, S), Mr Richie Ryan (Ir, CD), Mr Cornelis Berkhouwer (Du, L), Mr Hector Rivierez (Fr, EPD), Mr Charles Fletcher-Cooke (UK, EC) and Mr Andrea Mascagni (It, CA) on behalf of their groups.

Mr Pierre Joxe, for the French Socialists and Mr Gustave Ansart, for the French Communists, said French members of their groups would abstain because paragraph five of the motion – calling for intensification of co-operation between Member States in the fight against terrorism – could prejudice Member States' sovereign independence, particularly of the judiciary. Mr Egon Klepsch (Ge, CD), taking this point up, noted that paragraph five contained a proviso – 'while respecting the democratic rights and the guarantees embodied in the individual constitutions' – which made the French objections impossible to understand.

Question Time

Mr K B Andersen, Danish Foreign Minister and current President of the Council, replied.

Questions were put to the Council by Mr Nyborg (frontier formalities), Mr Damseaux (the IMF negotiations), Mr Ryan (lack of a common industrial policy) and Lord Reay (the ratification of the financial protocol with Portugal).

On industrial policy Mr Andersen outlined what the Council was doing, stressing the need for a pragmatic approach. Mr L'Estrange insisted that at a time when

six million people were out of work the Council should be doing more. Mr Cointat asked if the Council would strengthen Community preference. Mr Andersen demurred.

Concerning Portugal Mr Andersen said that Denmark, France, Italy and the United Kingdom had ratified the financial protocol of September 1976. Lord Reay (UK, EC) suggested that the fact that five Member States still had to ratify this protocol showed a lack of interest in Portugal's application to join.

Questions were addressed to the Foreign Ministers by Mr Dondelinger (on persecution of the Jewish community in Argentina), Mr Sieglerschmidt (on areas of tension) and Mr Ryan (on the export of armaments).

Mr Andersen replied.

Vote

The House agreed to the motions contained in the reports by Mr Nyborg on frontier formalities (Doc. 557/77) and Mr Spinelli on EC loans (Doc. 36/78) and to the motion on terrorism (Doc. 50/78).

Community legal policy

Mr Calewaert's (Be, S) questions to the Commission (Doc. 570/77) and the Council (Doc. 569/77).

Both the Commission and the Council were lagging behind in regard to Community laws not connected with the harmonization of trade. What, Mr Calewaert wanted to know, was the present position with regard to a number of directives and regulations and how did the Commission and Council think things could be speeded up?

In reply, Council President Mr K B Andersen gave specific replies regarding progress on proposals and agreed the delays were unfortunate.

For the Commission, Mr Jenkins said he would provide a written reply on progress on the 15 laws referred to in the question. On special rights for Community citizens, Mr Jenkins said that the Commission would concentrate on

the right of nationals of one Member State to be treated in the same way as nationals of any other Member State. Politically the main points were the right to vote, to stand for election and to hold public office. Mr Jenkins agreed it took too long to get legislation through but he pointed out that the EC's resources (particularly staff) were limited.

Farm price proposals

Mr Hughes (UK, S) report (Doc. 35/78). The House turned its attention to a report by Mr Hughes on the rest of the Commission's farm price package for the year beginning on 1 May. The essence of these proposals:

- suspending of intervention buying of skimmed milk from 1 October 1978 to the end of the milk year;
- enlarging the liquid milk scheme for schools;
- providing 50 million u.a. to promote butter sales;
- continuing the non marketing/beef conversion scheme.

These proposals had the same mixed reception as the earlier parts of the farm price package that were discussed in the House in March. Some speakers, including EPD spokesman Patrick Power and CD spokesman Isidor Früh, saw these proposals as an attack on the CAP itself and they were not prepared to accept them. Socialist spokesman M. Hughes and EC spokesman J. Scott-Hopkins, on the other hand, were ready to approve the proposals, but they were almost the only speakers to do so.

In reply, Vice-President Finn Gundelach said that the Commission was not trying by means of what Mr Früh called salami tactics to undermine the CAP but to attack unwanted surpluses and to attack the whole problem of low farm incomes. 'I utterly refute any idea that we are trying to attack these surpluses by jeopardising farm incomes. We want to support incomes by developing and diversifying markets. It is only by adapting our policies to market needs that we can restore our policies' credibility and assure the future of our farmers'. And Mr Gundelach concluded it would be no service to agriculture if intervention were the only customer for it would not be a good customer at all. But Mr Cointat later warned that if there were any further tampering with the CAP his group would table a censure motion.

THURSDAY, 13th April 1978

Developing the Mediterranean regions

Mr Ligios's report (Doc. 34/78).

The per capita GNP of people living in the Mediterranean regions of France and Italy is much lower than the Community average. More people work on the land, but productivity is low. Farms are small and there is high unemployment. Over the last twenty years, the birth rate has been higher here than in the rest of the Community. More young people are looking for work than jobs can be found for. And emigration no longer holds out the same prospects.

The Commission's proposals for developing these regions are part agricultural and part social and regional: a better organized market and better marketing for Mediterranean products (fresh fruit and vegetables, wine, peas and field beans, olive oil, processed fruit and vegetables) and Community backing for (a) water control programmes (b) schemes to help small and medium-sized firms (c) schemes to help tourism, especially in the off season and (d) schemes to help skilled tradesmen improve their potential.

These regions would also be eligible for a higher rate of assistance from the Social Fund.

Rapporteur Giosuè Ligios (It, CD) said that his committee generally endorsed the Commission's proposals. He spoke of the difficulties of Mediterranean farming, from weather conditions and soil quality to irrigation and basic services.

On olive oil, Mr Ligios said that he had no objections to modifying the market organization, but the Commission's proposals were unsatisfactory.

Budgets Committee rapporteur James Scott-Hopkins (UK, EC) said his committee had been unanimous in endorsing the proposals. The cost would be high – 168 million EUA in 1979 and upwards of 1,000 million EUA in the longer term – and this was something of a new departure for the Guidance Section of the EAGGF. Moreover, these costs could be expected to increase after enlargement.

Continuing as spokesman for the European Conservatives, Mr Scott-Hopkins repeated his Group's view that the Mediterranean area should be helped not only by the EAGGF but also by the regional and social funds. He repeated Mr Rippon's call for a Marshall Plan for the area. He added that British industry could not accept the minimum price system for tomato concentrate from third countries. British health standards made it essential that such imports continued.

Part of an overall strategy

Replying, Mr Gundelach said the proposals had to be seen as part of an overall agricultural strategy. The Mediterranean was not the only disadvantaged area – Western Ireland was another glaring example and could, in due course, expect similar treatment. The present proposals were aimed at dealing with imbalances in the present Community and took no account of enlargement.

The proposals assumed that Mediterranean farming had a future only if it adapted to the market. While recognizing the need for Community preference, he opposed protectionist measures which could increase prices and thwart attempts to expand markets. Mr Gundelach then went on to discuss some of the specific problems. In the case of olive oil, there was no intention to dismantle the old system but simply to ensure survival of the market. As for wine, he agreed that there might be some increase in production, but this would be of higher quality and should find a ready market.

Crass differences

For the Socialist Group, Mr Mark Hughes (UK) welcomed the proposals as a major step towards solving one of the EC's biggest problems. Referring to a study on the Mediterranean region just completed by the European Parliament's secretariat Mr Hughes noted the differences within the Mediterranean region. For example, there were major differences in income between French and Italian wine growers. Moreover, the Mediterranean region as a whole showed a high level of inconsistency from year to year in the amount it produced and the incomes of its farmers.

The Socialist Group, he said, objected to the generally protectionist tone of Mr Ligios' report. We could not force consumers to buy inferior qualities by keeping out imports from third countries. Mediterranean agriculture should be helped to become more competitive by enabling it to improve the quality of its products. This applied particularly in the case of tomato concentrates, and he agreed with Mr Scott-Hopkins on this point.

Mr Peter Brugger (It), for the Christian Democrats, noted that the measures proposed – to stretch over five years – would involve a new use of Community funds. He found it disappointing that some of those proposed, such as establishing an agricultural advisory service, had not been decided upon already.

Such a service would win over the confidence of farmers at a time when this confidence was being undermined by the level of imports of third country agricultural products. Mr Cifarelli, for the Liberals, shared this concern about the weakness of the Community's defences, a point which Mr Liogier took up with some concern. Mr Giuseppe Vitale (It, CA), on the other hand, said that his group would abstain because the debate did not allow of any serious discussion of what was a fundamental problem.

Mr Francesco Albertini (It, S) discussed implications of enlargement for Italy and Southern France. Referring to the persisting imbalances at regional and sectoral levels, he saw the solution in overhauling the CAP.

Mr Patrick Power (Ir, EPD) drew the attention of the House to the parallels between the Mediterranean region and Western Ireland, and welcomed Mr Gundelach's earlier comments on the subject. He hoped the Commission would soon be bringing forward proposals similar to the package it was now presenting on the Mediterranean. He added that 27,000 farming families in Ireland would probably have to leave the land in the near future, and a further 64,000 would have to increase their production to remain viable. A massive effort was needed.

Mr Marcel Lemoine (Fr, CA), who said his Group would abstain in the vote on the proposals emphasized that Mediterranean farming was a centuries old way of life and could not be tampered with in order to accommodate the accession of new Member States.

Replying, Mr Gundelach agreed that the imbalances between the Community's various regions were centuries old, it was not the Community's fault, but it was the EC's duty to do all it could to narrow the gaps. It would mean a sustained effort by the Community and the people themselves.

Moving approval of the proposals Mr Ligios said he was not calling for protectionism, but merely for Community preference – which was, after all, a cornerstone of the common agricultural policy.

QUESTION TIME

Questions to the Commission

Starch proposals (Lord Bessborough)

Mr Gundelach agreed with Lord Bessborough on the need for a stable, long-term starch policy. Present proposals relating to potato starch were ad hoc measures unrelated to longer term considerations.

Public discussion on nuclear energy (Liam Kavanagh)

It was not the Commission's task to organize public discussion on nuclear energy, Mr Giolitti said, but that did not stop the Commission's information offices from providing relevant information material.

Temporary Employment Subsidies (TES) (Patrick Power)

Mr Giolitti told Mr Power (Ir, EPD) that the UK's revised TES scheme was acceptable to the Commission because it was linked to a definite restructuring commitment. The Commission was aware of the concern of Irish industry at the UK TES.

Benefits from enlargement (Ruairi Brugha)

Experience had shown that the more developed countries had done better out of the Community than the less developed ones, said Mr Natali. The Commission would introduce proposals with a view to correcting this situation on enlargement.

European schools (Pierre Deschamps)

Mr Natali pointed out that the responsibility for appointing teachers to the European schools lay with the national authorities.

Vote

The House agreed to the motion in the report by Mr Calewaert (legal policy) (Doc. 52/78), and, after amendment, to the motions in the reports by Mr Hughes (farm price package) (Doc. 35/78) and by Mr Ligios (Mediterranean measures) (Doc. 34/78).

Amoco Cadiz

Mr Cointat's question to the Commission (Doc. 28/78). Mr Kofoed's motion (Doc. 37/78/rev.)

The European Community has already agreed that help worth 500,000 EUA (325,593 pounds) should go, under Chapter 59, to help in cleaning up the coast of France following the Amoco Cadiz disaster. As Mr Cointat pointed out, this is the 213th accident of this type and possibly the most serious. One professor had described the effect as being equivalent to an atomic explosion. The harm done to the marine environment was incalculable and there were great numbers of Bretons today who were now out of work.

To cope with the problem of cleaning up the oil, something like 15 million pounds would be needed. And there had been a very encouraging response from the public – thousands of volunteers were involved – and from the Community. But the 500,000 EUA were simply insufficient. Mr Cointat suggested that one million EUA (651,186 pounds), sent direct to the Regional Council of Brittany, would be more appropriate. Taking the longer view, Mr Cointat pointed out that some six million tonnes of oil had been spilt into the sea over the last few years creating a truly international problem. He urged the development of a Community policy and called on the Member States to ratify the conventions already agreed to.

Introducing his motion on the Amoco Cadiz disaster, Mr Niels Anker Kofoed (Da, L) stressed that disaster of this kind were more than one country could be expected to deal with alone. Hence the need for joint Community action. There were now three priorities: (1) immediate action to help the victims, (2) action to prevent recurrence of similar incidents and (3) establishment of Community machinery to deal with future accidents.

Lack of ratification

Commissioner Natali reminded the House of the existing agreements on marine pollution. Their effect, however, had been minimal, the Commissioner said, and many agreements had still to be ratified. Other points from his speech:

- accidents accounted for only 5 per cent of hydrocarbon pollution of the sea
- all vessels, regardless of country of registration, should be subject to international standards
- countries could impose unilateral regulations on vessels using their waters
- Community action should include: setting up an information system regarding the availability and location of anti-pollution facilities in Member States; a communications system providing permanent information on the whereabouts of tankers in Community waters; joint production of vessels to

clean up oil spills and the development of dispersants; legal provisions covering insurance and salvage.

Mr Natali also confirmed that the Commission had made 500,000 EUA available to the people of Brittany in emergency aid.

There were a number of other suggestions for Community action to deal with marine pollution in the debate that followed. Mr John Prescott (UK, S) suggested that there should be a European coastguard facility combining rescue operations with pollution control. His main suggestion was that access to Community ports should be denied to vessels failing to comply with minimum standards, both as to the competence of the crew and the working conditions under which they operated.

He reminded the House of the correlation between the rate of loss and the level of incompetence. Twenty-five per cent of the world's tonnage sailed under flags of convenience and accounted for forty-four per cent of all ship losses.

Mr André Colin (Fr), Christian Democrat spokesman, thought the Community should refuse entry to ships failing to observe EC rules. He thought that the sea lanes used by tankers should be further out into the Channel – a point made by Mr Pierre Bourdellès (Fr, L), who said some 10,000 tankers a year went past Brest up the Channel.

Mr James Spicer (UK, EC) suggested that some master control room be set up where information would be available hour to hour on tug movements and from which salvage operations could be directed.

All speakers agreed in deploring the terrible damage done to the coast of Brittany and in insisting on the need for urgent Community action.

French Communist Marcel Lemoine took the French Government to task for 'negligence and complicity'. Negligence in its inaction since the Torrey Canyon disaster eleven years ago, and complicity by allowing its own state oil company to conduct one-third of its business under flags of convenience.

Lord Bruce, who said 'the coasts of Brittany are the coasts of Europe', announced that the Regional Committee intended to hold a public enquiry in Paris within the next two months to determine the best means to prevent accidents in EC waters and prevent damage to the coastal and marine

environment. A number of organizations active in this field had agreed to give evidence, including IMCO (Inter-governmental Maritime Consultative Organization), the Conference of Peripheral Maritime Regions of the EEC, the Liaison Committee of EEC Shipowners, the Committee on Transport Workers Unions in the EEC and the EEC Shipbuilding Linking Committee.

Mr Georges Carpentier (Fr, S) pointed out that the Amoco Cadiz disaster was not bad luck, it was inevitable. Just as the next such disaster was inevitable unless action was taken.

Djibouti accedes to Lomé Convention

Mr Lezzi's report (Doc. 568/77). Motion tabled 'welcomed the Republic of Djibouti to the Convention of Lomé as an independent state.'

The Republic of Djibouti used to be one of the Overseas Countries and Territories (the former French Territory of the Afars and the Issas). It became independent on 27th June 1977. As of that date, it was eligible to accede to the Lomé Convention. Djibouti accordingly applied to do so. The ACP-EC Council approved this request on 21 December 1977. Djibouti is now eligible for aid amounting to some 2,750,000 EUA (1,790,761 pounds).

Human rights in the next EC-ACP convention

Sir Derek Walker-Smith's question (Other signatories Mr Ib Stetter and Mr Charles Fletcher-Cooke) to the Commission.

Mr Charles Fletcher-Cooke (UK, EC) asked Commissioner Cheysson whether the Commission would include a specific reference to Articles 1 – 14 of the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights in its proposals for a new convention to replace the one signed in Lomé on 28 February 1975 and due to expire on 1 March 1980.

Mr Claude Cheysson replied that it would propose a specific reference to the obligation of signatory states to respect human rights and a unilateral declaration, by the Community, to the effect that it reserved the right to denounce human rights violations and to change the nature of its aid under the convention. It would, after making such a denunciation, give aid only to meet the fundamental needs of the people at large and not for any other purpose.

Mr Cheysson thought it inadvisable to make reference to the Universal Declaration. He shared the concern of Parliament about democracy. The Commission had made this clear time and again. At the same time he doubted the wisdom of condemning charismatic leaders such as Amin Dada. Such condemnations had only served to strengthen his personal position and much had been done to strengthen his power in this way in the last two years.

Mr Cheysson suggested that some of the Member States might be reluctant, for various reasons, to include any reference to human rights in the new convention.

Speakers in the ensuing debate gave their broad endorsement to Mr Cheysson's statement. However, Mr Charles Fletcher-Cooke (UK, EC) did not agree that Mr Cheysson's proposal to go above the heads of tyrants in giving aid to the people would work. Mr Jan Broeksz (Du, S) thought that a distinction should be drawn between flagrant distortions – i.e. torture or political murder – and lesser infringements: these countries had to learn democracy, as we ourselves had had to do. Mr Gert Petersen (Da, CA) wondered how the Community intended to check on human rights violations – it was hardly practical to send investigators.

In a short reply Mr Cheysson cited the example of Chile, to whom the Community had granted food aid on condition that it was distributed by the World Council of Churches. We had to be careful, he said, that we did not exclude four-fifths of the world by enforcing unrealistic conditions.

FRIDAY, 14th April 1978

Mr Dalyell, for the Socialists, moved that Mr Hamilton's report be deferred and taken at a later session in prime time. The House agreed.

Regional development programmes

Mr Damseaux asked the Commission if all programmes for 1977 were submitted in time.

Mr Antonio Giolitti, replied that the Commission had received all the regional development programmes within the time limit of 31st December 1975.

Mr Charles Fletcher-Cooke moved that Mr Corrie's report on surveillance of fishing waters be deferred. The House agreed.

Trade unions' drive against unemployment

Mr Santer moved a motion expressing solidarity with the trade unions' campaign to overcome unemployment.

Vineyard surveys

Mr Liogier asked the House to approve a Commission proposal on vineyard surveys. A single viticultural land register, as required by a regulation of 28 February 1964, must, he insisted, remain the ultimate objective.

OECD farm ministers on food policy

Mr Bersani asked the Commission what line the EC had taken at the OECD farm ministers meeting in Paris on 10 February 1978. Mr Giolitti said most of the ministers were in favour of an international agreement and of the creation of buffer stocks.

Aid for hops producers for 1977 harvest

Mr Früh asked the House to approve a Commission proposal laying down how much aid be extended to hops producers for the 1977 harvest. (Total returns from hops went down from 77.2 mua in 1975 to 73.8 mua in 1977 but, with fewer growers, the average return per grower went from 8.945 ua in 1976 to 9.470 ua in 1977).

Parliament's budget guidelines for 1979

Mr Bangemann's report (Doc. 54/78).

Introducing his report on the Commission's appraisal of the EC's budgetary problems, Mr Bangemann began by saying that the Community's budget

represented only 0.66 per cent of total EC gdp, compared to the 30 per cent of gdp accounted for by Member States central budgets.

These limited funds he said, should be used for structural not cyclical purposes in the social, regional, industrial and energy sectors.

Lord Bruce, for the Regional Committee, said the Commission must have enough money to pursue a dynamic regional policy.

Mr Giolitti replied for the Commission.

Negotiations with Yugoslavia

Mr Adam's report (Doc. 32/78)

Introducing the report for Mr Adams, Mr Willem Albers (Du, S) asked that social security for Yugoslav migrant workers in the Community form part of the Commission's negotiating mandate for a new EC-Yugoslavia agreement. There were, said Mr Albers, some 800,000 Yugoslavs living in the Member States, and it was wrong to treat them differently from other migrant workers over social security entitlements.

Mr Giolitti took his point.

Mr Nyborg asked that his report (on bringing hot water meter laws in line) be referred back to Committee.

Mr Albers's report on navigability licenses for waterway vessels was taken without debate.

Vote

The House agreed to the motions by:

Mr Cointat (1m EUA aid requested to help clean up after Amoco Cadiz disaster)

Mr Schyns (solidarity with trade unions' drive against unemployment)

Mr Liogier (vineyard surveys)

Mr Früh (aid for hops growers)

Mr Bangemann (1979 budget guidelines)

Mr Adams (including migrants' rights in negotiations for agreement with Yugoslavia)

Mr Albers (waterway vessel licences)

Next session: 8 – 12 May, in Strasbourg

SUMMARY

10th – 14th April 1978

(Document numbers in brackets)

MONDAY, 10th April 1978

The House sat from 5.10 p.m. to 8.10 p.m.

Commission statement on action taken on Parliament's advice.

Equal pay and equal opportunities for women

Mrs Dunwoody's interim report on equal pay (Doc. 6/78). Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti's question on discrimination against women at work (Doc. 21/78). Mr Vredeling replied.

Commission proposals to help young people

Commission statement. Mr Vredeling explained proposals adopted by Commission on youth unemployment.

Cocoa and chocolate products

Mr Lambert's report (Doc. 15/78). Motion tabled welcomed the proposal subject to amendments. Mr Vredeling replied.

European Parliament's Budget for 1977

Mr Cointat's report (Doc. 14/78). Motion called for deferment of discharge of decision until Court of Auditors had scrutinized figures.

TUESDAY, 11th April 1978

The House sat from 10.05 a.m. to 1.05 p.m. and from 3 p.m. to 10.45 p.m.

Dumping

Lord Brimelow's report (Doc. 551/77). Motion called for a firm EC response to dumping and the threat to Europe of uncontrolled competition. Mr Haferkamp replied for the Commission.

EC relations with COMECON

Mr Jahn's question (Doc. 19/78). Mr Haferkamp replied.

Question Time

Seven questions to the Commission (Doc. 33/78).

Vote

The House agreed to the motions contained in the reports by Mrs Dunwoody (Doc. 6/78), Lord Brimelow (Doc. 551/77), Mr Lamberts (Doc. 15/78) and Mr Cointat (Doc. 14/78).

Trade with Japan

Mr Müller-Hermann's question (Doc. 24/78). Mr Haferkamp replied.

Framework Agreement with China

Lord Bessborough's question (Doc. 27/78). Mr Haferkamp replied.

Eliminating customs barriers

Mr Nyborg's report (Doc. 557/77) and question (Doc. 23/78). Motion tabled called for faster phasing out of internal EC frontier formalities. Viscount Davignon replied.

Protectionism over patent licences

Mr Van Aerssen's question (Doc. 22/78). Mr Vouel replied.

EC loans

Mr Spinelli's report (Doc. 36/78). Motion called for preservation of Commission and EP's budgetary powers. Mr Ortoli replied.

WEDNESDAY, 12th April 1978

The House sat from 9.30 a.m. to 1.40 p.m. and from 3 p.m. to 8.20 p.m.

European Council meeting in Copenhagen

Statements by Council President K B Andersen and Commission President Roy Jenkins, followed by general debate.

Terrorism

All-group motion expressed solidarity with Italy and called for more cooperation in combating terrorism (Doc. 50/78).

Question Time

Mr K B Andersen answered questions to the Council and Foreign Ministers.

Vote

The House agreed to the motions contained in the reports by Mr Nyborg (Doc. 557/77), Mr Spinelli (Doc. 36/78) and the motion on terrorism (Doc. 50/78).

Legal policy

Mr Calewaert's questions to the Council (Doc. 569/77) and Commission (Doc. 570/77) on the adoption of Community legislation. Mr K. B. Andersen and Mr Roy Jenkins replied.

Farm markets proposals

Mr Hughes' report (Doc. 35/78).

THURSDAY, 13th April 1978

The House sat from 10.05 a.m. to 1.20 p.m. and from 3.05 p.m. to 8.55 p.m.

Developing the Mediterranean regions

Mr Ligios's report (Doc. 34/78). Motion tabled gave broad approval to Commission's proposals. Mr Gundelach replied.

Question Time

Five questions to the Commission.

Vote

The House agreed to the motions in the reports by Mr Calewaert (Doc. 52/78), Mr Hughes (Doc. 35/78) and Mr Ligios (Doc. 34/78).

Amoco Cadiz

Mr Cointat's question (Doc. 28/78) and Mr Kofoed's motion (Doc. 37/78/rev.). Mr Natali replied.

Djibouti accedes to Lomé Convention

Mr Lezzi's report (Doc. 568/77). Motion tabled welcomed Djibouti to the Convention of Lomé.

Human rights in Lomé II

Sir Derek Walker-Smith's question (Doc. 26/78). Mr Cheysson replied that the Commission would propose a specific reference to human rights.

FRIDAY, 14th April 1978

The House sat from 9.00 a.m. to 12.10 p.m.

Regional development programmes

Mr Damseaux's question (Doc. 25/78). Mr Giolitti replied.

Trade unions' drive against unemployment

Motion by Mr Schyns and other signatories (Doc. 48/78) expressed solidarity with the unions' campaign to overcome unemployment.

Vineyard surveys

Mr Liogier's report (Doc. 38/78). Mr Giolitti replied.

OECD farm ministers' meeting

Mr Bersani's question (Doc. 31/78) on OECD farm ministers meeting on food policy. Mr Giolitti replied.

Aid for hops producers

Mr Früh's report (Doc. 40/78). Motion tabled called for approval of proposal on amount of aid to hops producers for the 1977 harvest.

Parliament's budget guidelines for 1979

Mr Bangemann's report (Doc. 54/78). Motion called for use of budgetary funds for structural purposes. Mr Giolitti replied.

Negotiations with Yugoslavia

Mr Adams's report (Doc. 32/78). Motion tabled called for inclusion of migrant workers' social security provision in negotiations on new EC-Yugoslavia Agreement.

Hot water meters

Mr Nyborg's report (Doc. 29/78).

Inland waterway vessels

Mr Albers's report (Doc. 580/77).

Vote

The House agreed to the motions contained in the reports by Mr Cointaat (Doc. 53/78/rev.), Mr Schyns (Doc. 48/78), Mr Ligios (Doc. 38/78), Mr Früh (Doc. 40/78), Mr Bangemann (Doc. 54/78), Mr Adams (Doc. 32/78), Mr Nyborg (Doc. 29/78) and Mr Albers (Doc. 580/77).

THE SITTINGS

The Sittings is available free of charge on request.

A complete record of the proceedings of the House is given in the the 'Debates of the European Parliament' which is published as an Annex to the Official Journal of the European Communities.

The 'Debates' and other documents may be obtained either from the Secretariat of the European Parliament (P.O. Box 1601, Luxembourg) or from the Office for Official Publications of the European Communities (P.O. Box 1003, Luxembourg).

The Debates

Annual subscriptions: 19.20 pounds

Single copies:

up to 32 pages 0.60 pounds

up to 80 pages 1.20 pounds

Information Offices

The Information Offices of the European Parliament in Dublin and London distribute regular press releases on parliamentary business, and deal with specific requests for information. Lectures to various groups, organisations and schools about the structure and functions of the European Parliament are available on request.

Dublin Office: 29 Merrion Square, Dublin 2

London Office: 20 Kensington Palace Gardens, London W 8 4QQ

If you find 'The Sittings' interesting and would like to receive it regularly, will you please fill in the form below. 'The Sittings' will then be sent to you each month free of charge.

**Directorate-General
for Information and Public Relations
European Parliament, P.O. Box 1601
Luxembourg**

Please send The Sittings to (*):

Name:

Christian Name:

Street No.

Postal Code: Town:

Country:

(* Please use block letters