



european  
parliament

information series

the sittings

LIBRARY

7

july 1975

### **The Sittings**

'The Sittings' is intended to give the gist of proceedings in the European Parliament.

A complete record of the proceedings of the House is given in 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).

### **Dublin Office**

The Dublin Office of the European Parliament is situated at No. 29 Merrion Square (Tel. 761913). The office distributes regular press releases on parliamentary business, and deals with specific requests for information. Lectures to various groups, organisations and schools about the structure and functions of the European Parliament are also arranged.

Publications on the European Parliament are available on request.

### **London Office**

Further information, including booklets and leaflets, about the European Parliament may be obtained in the United Kingdom from: European Parliament Information Office, 20, Kensington Palace Gardens, London W8 4QQ.



## C O N T E N T S

	Page
Introduction . . . . .	5
Political Affairs . . . . .	6
Statement by Council President . . . . .	6
European Union . . . . .	7
Parliament's powers . . . . .	16
Changes in EC Treaties . . . . .	17
Energy . . . . .	19
Statement by Commissioner Guido Brunner on energy research policy . . . . .	19
Motion on Council meeting of 26 June . . . . .	19
Statement on Council meeting of 26 June . . . . .	20
Guidelines for coal . . . . .	21
Community policy on hydrocarbons . . . . .	21
External relations . . . . .	22
EC-Turkey Joint Committee's recommendations . . . . .	22
Terrorism . . . . .	22
Customs Union . . . . .	23
Simplifying customs clearance . . . . .	23
Business . . . . .	23
Indexing savings . . . . .	23

<b>Budget</b> . . . . .	23
<b>ECSC Auditor's report</b> . . . . .	23
<b>European Parliament</b> . . . . .	24
<b>Motion on setting up a procedural committee</b> . . . . .	24
<b>Motion on committees</b> . . . . .	24
<b>Environment</b> . . . . .	24
<b>Motion on relevant sections in 8th General Report</b> . . . . .	24
<b>Birds</b> . . . . .	25
<b>Agriculture</b>	
<b>Farm fund</b> . . . . .	25
<b>Wines</b> . . . . .	25
<b>Question Time</b> . . . . .	28
<b>Action taken on Parliament's advice</b> . . . . .	31
<b>References and abbreviations</b> . . . . .	33
<b>Notes</b> . . . . .	34
<b>Postscript</b> . . . . .	37

## Introduction

With the overwhelming vote of the British people in favour of staying in the Community and the Labour Party's lifting of its boycott of the Community's institutions, the European Parliament was this week able to welcome a full delegation from the United Kingdom for the first time. The eighteen new Labour Members were warmly welcomed by President Georges Spénaie, by Mr Finn Gundelach on behalf of the Commission and by spokesmen on all sides of the House. Another welcome newcomer was Mrs Winifred Ewing who took her seat among the independent Members. The arrival of the new British Members



*Labour Members take their seats*

was not without incident, however. Mr Russell Johnston the Liberal Member registered a sharp protest at the way the British delegation had been selected. He thought it unacceptable that he should have to represent five and a quarter million people on his own.

It was a busy enough week in all conscience. The House spent two days debating European Union, held a six hour debate on the wine market on Thursday evening and had to grapple with the complexities of budgetary powers on Friday morning, usually reserved for far less controversial issues. The Friday debate afforded Mr Willie Hamilton an opportunity to make a warmly applauded speech calling for full parliamentary control over all aspects of Community expenditure. It was also a week in which Mr Tam Dalywell was to ask, with the 'innocence of a newcomer', 'why Parliament is meeting in Strasbourg and not in Brussels where the Commission is?'

Lastly it was a week in which Parliament was able to welcome Mr Mariano Rumor, Italian Foreign Minister and President of the Council, Mr Adolfo Battaglia, Secretary of State at the Italian Foreign Ministry, and Mr Leo Tindemans, Belgian Prime Minister responsible for drawing up a report on European Union for consideration by the Council before the end of the year.

## **POLITICAL AFFAIRS**

### **Statement by Mr Mariano Rumor**

Mr Mariano Rumor, Italian Foreign Minister and President of the Council, began by stressing the importance he attached to close cooperation between Parliament and Council. This was now taking a new dimension on the entry into force of a concertation procedure that would enable Parliament to participate in all deliberations having major financial implications.

Mr Rumor spoke of the difficulties facing the Community but added that the success of the British referendum had given Europe a new impetus. He then turned his attention to matters of immediate concern.

He spoke first of changes in the Treaty to give Parliament greater powers of control over the budget. These did not go far enough but were evidence of the Council's will to cooperate. They should be seen as one step forward. Mr Rumor pledged his government's firm support for direct elections to the European



*Mr Mariano Rumor, the new President  
of the Council*

Parliament. Turning to European Union he paid tribute to Mr Leo Tindemans and hoped the Council would be able to consider his report by the end of the year. He hoped too that Parliament and Council would be able to work together successfully in the preparation of the 1976 budget.

In terms of integration Mr Rumor referred to fiscal harmonisation and work on European company law. Reappraising the CAP and using the Social Fund to help unemployed and migrant workers were also important; a common policy for energy was vital.

Lastly, as regards external relations, Mr Rumor said that the Lomé Convention had demonstrated the Community's outward-looking attitude. But more must be done, particularly through a common policy on raw materials and Europe must be as one nation in the world large, as indeed it had been at the Security Conference, the Gatt negotiations and in its links with China, Canada and Comecon.

The European Parliament, he concluded, was a bastion of democracy. He hoped that the combined efforts of Parliament and Council would make peoples of the Community European-minded.

Mr Rumor's statement was applauded and President Georges Spénale expressed to him the thanks of the European Parliament for his statement to the House.

## **European Union**

### **Introduction**

One of the underlying assumptions of the European Community has always been that its Member States would ultimately come together in some kind of union.



This can be read between the lines of the Preamble to the Treaty of Paris (18 April 1951) when it recognises that Europe can only be built through practical achievements which first create a sense of common purpose. The Preamble to the Treaties of Rome (25 March 1957) was more explicit. There the Member States begin by saying they are 'determined to lay the foundations of an ever closer union among the peoples of Europe'. Later, at the Summit Conference in Paris (19-20 October 1972), the Heads of Government issued a statement saying they had 'assigned themselves the key objective of converting before the end of the decade and in absolute conformity with the signed Treaties, all the relationships between Member States into a European Union. They are, therefore, asking the Community Institutions to prepare before the end of 1975 a report to be submitted to a further Summit Conference'. At the Copenhagen Summit (14-15 December 1973) the Heads of Government of the Community 'decided to speed up the work required to define the European Union which they set themselves as their major objective at the Paris Summit'. And, lastly, at the Second Paris Summit (9-10 December 1974) the Heads of Government came out boldly with the following statement: 'They consider that the time has come for the Nine to agree as soon as possible on an overall concept of European



*Mr Albert Bertrand: "Progress to European Union is bound to be a gradual process".*

Union. Consequently, in accordance with the requests made by the Paris meeting of Heads of State and of Government in October 1972, they confirm the importance which they attach to the reports to be made by the Community Institutions. They request the European Assembly, the Commission and the Court of Justice to bring the submission of their reports forward to before the end of June 1975. They agreed to invite Mr Tindemans, Prime Minister of the Kingdom of Belgium, to submit a comprehensive report to the Heads of Government before the end of 1975, on the basis of the reports received from the Institutions and of consultations which he is to have with the Governments and with the wide range of public opinion in the Community.'

It was against this background that Mr Alfred Bertrand (Be, CD), who was acting for Parliament's Political Affairs Committee, drew up his report on European Union. He did so in the knowledge of a European Commission poll published this week which showed that 59 per cent of the people of Europe are in favour of progress towards European Union and only 21 per cent against. Thus in the Community at large there is both a long-standing commitment to European Union and widespread support for it.

Mr Bertrand realised, however, that there would be reservations, some general and some specific. The opinion poll referred to showed 54 per cent of Danes to be against going on to European Union as were 38 per cent of the Irish and 46 of the people of Britain. The percentages in favour for were 21 in Denmark, 37 in Ireland and 36 in Britain. Against these general reservations were specific reservations about, for example, including defence within the scope of European Union.

**Mr Bertarand's motion** (See Postscript for full text of motion finally agreed to)

Mr Bertrand's response to these reservations was to appeal to the House not to lag behind public opinion. He put down a fifteen point motion calling for a European Government which would be responsible for foreign policy and defence as well as matters already within the Community's terms of reference and which would be more directly answerable to the European Parliament. The notion also called for the Council to give up the principle of unanimity and for the Council to be obliged to reach agreement with Parliament on all Commission proposals. Parliament would, of course, be directly elected. After discussion of a substantial number of amendments the motion was agreed to with 71 votes in favour, 8 votes against and 19 abstentions.

## **Attitudes of Parliament's Political Groups**

The Socialist Group broadly supported the motion, but Danish, Dutch and Irish members of the group were adamant that any reference to defence should be deleted. The new British members decided to abstain.

The Christian Democrat Group accepted the motion as a compromise. They would like to have gone further but regarded it, in Mr Bertrand's phrase, 'as a worthwhile step forward'.

The Liberals and Allies Group accepted the motion. The European Conservative Group had a number of reservations, particularly as regards Member States' giving up their right of veto on the Council. The House as a whole could not accept the amendment the group moved on this point. It was, however, able to accept a fair number of other, significant, European Conservative amendments.

The European Progressive Democrats found the motion an unsatisfactory compromise full of unrealisable aspirations. The group tabled a number of amendments.

The Communist and Allies Group found the motion unacceptable.

## **The debate**

There were forty-three speakers in Parliament's twelve hour debate on Mr Bertrand's motion. They included Mr Leo Tindemans, Belgian Prime Minister, whose task it is to draw up a financial report on European Union by the end of the year and Mr François-Xavier Ortoli, President of the Commission, whose own report on European Union had just been published.

Opening the debate Mr Bertrand, rapporteur, said what European Union was about was doing together what individual Member States could no longer do on their own. And the whole debate hinged on what the various speakers thought the Nine could or should be doing together or alone. But the main emphasis of Mr Bertrand's own remarks was that progress towards European Union would be a gradual process.

Mr Giovanni Giraud (It, CD), Chairman of the Political Affairs Committee, bemoaned the fact that the Community policies tended to take second place to

domestic interests. Mr Peter Corterier (Ge, S) Socialist spokesman, on the other hand, thought the British referendum result and France's return to the monetary 'snake' were encouraging signs.

Mr Hans-August Lücker (Ge, CD), Christian Democrat Chairman, argued that Member States would gain greater sovereignty by acting together. Lord Gladwyn (Br, L), Liberal spokesman, spoke of European unity as something 'which most of us feel in our bones is essential if our various democracies are to survive in an increasingly totalitarian and extremely dangerous world'. Mr Peter Kirk (Br, EC), European Conservative Chairman, was more pessimistic. He believed in a federal Europe just as he believed in a federal Britain but thought these might very well not come into being in his lifetime. He added that it would be a grave error to assume that the British referendum had been a referendum in favour of a federal Europe. 'It was a referendum and a massive majority in favour of the Community as it is today. I believe that as we advance naturally and properly along the road towards Europe union we shall be able to bring public opinion with us. But I believe, too, that if we try to go too fast and too far at this stage we may run into considerable difficulties.'

Mr Christian de la Malène (Fr, EPD), European Progressive Democrat Chairman, thought the power of the European Union to secure support was liable to be in inverse proportion to the scope of its responsibilities. He saw little point in the institutional developments envisaged without proof of a sustained political will as would be evidenced, for example, in bringing the economic and monetary union into being. He thought the approach should be more modest and more pragmatic. Mr Gérard Borde (Fr, CA), Communist and Allies spokesman, was even more sceptical. Was it reasonable to talk of integration when there was not even real cooperation? 'We are not masters of our fate' he said.

## **The Commission**

Mr François-Xavier Ortoli, President of the European Commission, said it was reasonable to ask whether it was not time for a breathing space, now that the British referendum was over. But he thought 'we must go beyond the present stage both as regards the Community's responsibilities and its institutions.' In a world which was beginning to be one of confrontation, Europe had to be able to exercise its legitimate influence, to express its identity and defend its prosperity. 'We must be able to face up as best we can to a changing world. Europe is a good answer to this problem and we must go further'.



*Mr Leo Tindemans at the debate on European Union*

### **Mr Tindemans**

Mr Leo Tindemans, Belgian Prime Minister and member of the Council, contrasted the pre-war patterns of treaties to the institutional dispensation of today. This had achieved a great deal but it had only gone half way. 'The task of our generation is to go on and finish this job'. But was the Community's system still adequate to the exercise of power? Mr Tindemans thought direct elections to the European Parliament had to come soon so that the people of Europe could be involved in making the changes that had to be made. But he reminded the House how much depended on the political will of the governments. The challenge, he thought, was twofold: to solve today's problems and to say what kind of Europe we wanted to move into.

### **The legal aspect**

Mr Franco Concas (It, S), spokesman for the Legal Affairs Committee, outlined the various ways of bringing about European Union in legal terms and suggested

the procedure laid down in Article 236 would be most appropriate. This would involve a conference of representatives of member governments and ratification of any treaty changes by the national parliaments.

### **Other speakers in favour of the motion**

Mr Achille Corona (It, S) was in favour of European Union because he thought it would be in the interest of the working man. Mr Egon Klepsch (Ge, CD) said that the motion before the House was a test case as to whether the action advocated and likely to be welcomed on all sides would actually be taken. Mr Augusto Premoli (It, CD) asked how the Community was going to move on from the present arrangement where every decision dependent on agreement between Member States. Sir Derek Walker-Smith (Br, EC) pointed out that 'What those who wish to retain a proper degree of national autonomy wish to guard against is an imbalance which would concentrate all power at the centre'. This concern about centralisation was shared by Mr Ove Guldberg (Da, L).sMr Brian Lenihan (Ir, EPD) thought the emphasis should be on direct elections and on consultations between the institutions. He felt a lot could be done here. But what really mattered was that the peoples of Europe should, in May 1978, vote for an institution they could understand in a bid to build a better society for all.

### **Danes dissent**

Mr Jens Maigaard (Da, CA) said very few people in Denmark were in favour of European Union. They had not seen the motion before the House so they had had no chance to express an opinion. No Dane therefore had any mandate to agree to the motion. He stressed there had been no reference to European Union during the Danish referendum campaign in 1972 and he noted Mr Finn Gundelach's reservations on this subject. Mr Ortoli replied that he had not invented the Paris Summit (which called for progress to European Union). Mr Gundelach had said to him: 'I don't altogether agree with you on some points but I am prepared to go a long way with you on many others.' Mr Maigaard's view of the motion was shared by Mrs Edele Kruchow (Da, LA) and Mr Knud Nielsen (Da, S). Mr Kai Nyborg (Da, EPD) on the other hand, asked rather pointedly what matters were to remain the responsibility of the Member States.

## **Four maiden speeches**

Mrs Winifred Ewing (Br, Ind) speaking for the Scottish National Party and Plaid Cymru, expressed reservations about including defence within the scope of European Union. 'Military blocs or military super-blocs have not, in the history of mankind, usually contributed much to world peace.' Mr Michael Stewart (Br, S) said he was convinced 'that there are several important things which will be done on the scale of the European Community or not at all, or will be done so timidly or unsatisfactorily as to be of no benefit to any one.' He referred to energy, scientific research, a common economic policy. 'The real choice before the peoples of Western Europe is not between joint sovereignty and national sovereignty. It is a choice between joint sovereignty and no sovereignty'. Mr John Prescott (Br, S), on the other hand, explained the reasons behind some of the British reservations about Europe. The desire for economic integration would, it was feared, bring about political changes leading to a Europe with the trappings of a super-power. For this reason, he challenged the basic assumptions of the motion before the House. He was also unconvinced of the virtues of a Community based on the capitalist philosophy of competition.

Mr Mark Hughes (Br, S) said that the question of political union could become a meaningless and hollow gesture unless it were translated into action by the creation of an effective series of economic institutions ..... 'unless the economic effectiveness of European Union is seen by ordinary people as having an immediate relevance to their everyday life, no improvement in the parliamentary institutions will come about and those institutions themselves will tend to fall into disrepute'.

## **A former President's opinion**

Mr Mario Scelba (It, CD) President of the European Parliament from 1969-1971, thought Europe had no need of a government if all it had to do was to set the year's farm prices. But if there were political decisions to be taken then it had to have one.

## **Other speakers**

Lord Reay (Br, EC) spoke of what Parliament could do now. It could make a start on the problem of a single seat for the Community institutions and and it

could devote some attention to developing a uniform procedure for the direct election of its Members.

Mr Jan Broeks (Du, S) thought the Paris Summit of 1972 had put forward European Union as a sop to public opinion. He reminded the House of the 200 Commission proposals on which Parliament had delivered its Opinion and which were still awaiting a Council decision. Mr Hans Edgar Jahn (Ge, CD) did not see how Member States could oppose the transfer of responsibilities. Mr Ernest Glinne (Be, S) was concerned that the Community of the future should remain open to new members.

Mr Helmut Artzinger (Ge, CD) drew a parallel between European Union and Economic and Monetary Union. The latter had come to amount to little more than the 'little snake', a failure he ascribed to the over-technical nature of EMU. It had been looked upon as a way to union. But it needed an economic policy decision-taking centre to make it work. And this is what the Commission should press for today.

Mr Ralph Howell (Br, EC) was disappointed with the debate and the motion. 'I believe we must be ready to make a very bold step in the direction of monetary union and a common currency.' Mr Frans van der Gun (Du, CD) was more concerned with Europe's immediate problems, particularly inflation. He did not think the general public would have any idea what Europe meant until Parliament were directly elected. Mrs Mary Kellett-Bowman (Br, EC) believed very strongly 'that the backing of public opinion is absolutely vital and that the emphasis in Mr Bertrand's motion on gradualness in the political sphere is the key to success. I am sure that one thing which public opinion fears most is sudden leaps into the political unknown.'

Mr Luigi Noè (It, CD) thought the main problem was the use Europe made of its raw materials resources. Mr Giovanni Bersani (It, CD) looked for closer links between the institutions and the regions. Mr Gerd Springorum (Ge, CD) argued that energy was the key issue. It was as vital as air or water. He had welcomed the Copenhagen Summit decision to operate a common policy; but no action had followed. Mr Erwin Lange (Ge, S) felt that a common economic and monetary policy should be the first priority. Mr Heinrich Aigner (Ge, S) argued on similar lines that budgetary policies should first be harmonised; this meant reappraising incomes policies and anti-inflation measures.



Lord Bethell (Br, EC) was disturbed by the reluctance of some Members to discuss defence. He reminded the House that 'we are on a state of confrontation with the Warsaw Pact countries.' He pointed out that they had one million men under arms compared with 750,000 in Western Europe, 15,000 tanks compared with fewer than 7,000 and a grave superiority in aircraft. 'There is a disparity in armed forces which is extremely great and which is growing as the Warsaw Pact, led by the Soviet Union, increases its forces and as we, pressed by certain political forces to believe that money can be saved by disarmament, reduce our own'. Lord Bethell concluded: 'We may become a European Union; but if we cannot guarantee our own security we have nothing'. Mr Eric Blumenfeld (Ge, CD) agreed that with the threat hanging over Europe at least those countries that wanted to should have a common policy for defence. Mr Pierre Deschamps (Be, CD) was surprised there had been so little reference to the Third World.

In conclusion, Mr Bertrand said he thought that on balance the debate had shown Members felt there were many things the Nine could not do on their own. Herein lay the point of working together. He thought the motion before the House would serve as a pointer to the joint action the Member States could take.

## **PARLIAMENT'S POWERS**

### **Introduction**

Under the treaty of 22 April 1970 the European Community was to become self-financing on 1 January 1975 and Parliament's powers of budgetary control were to be increased accordingly; this, by virtue of Council Declaration 4(b) recording the Commission's intention to submit proposals on this subject within two years. No such proposals were forthcoming and so on 16 November 1972 Mr Georges Spénale tabled a motion of censure. Had this been agreed to, the Commission would, of course, had to resign. But Mr Sicco Mansholt, then President of the Commission, informed the House that the Commission had thought it better to wait until after Enlargement so that the relevant proposals could be made by a commission including members from the acceding states as well. On an assurance that these proposals would be made in 1973, Mr Spénale withdrew his motion. On 12 June 1973, the Commission finally produced its proposal.

This was followed by the first major debate in Parliament in October 1973. A motion was agreed to calling on the Commission to reconsider its proposals. This

it duly did and in June 1974 the Council began having discussions with a delegation from Parliament on the form the relevant treaty changes would actually take.

A first agreement was reached later in the year on what was to be called a 'concertation procedure', whereby Parliament would be involved in the framing of all measures having financial consequences. A joint statement on concertation was issued on 4 March 1975. The next stage was the stage now reached: that of discussion of actual treaty changes.

### **Changes in EC Treaties**

Two reports were submitted for the Committee on Budgets on changes in the Treaty concerning Parliament's powers. The first concerned amendments to Treaty Articles 201, 203, 204 and 209. Mr Erwin Lange (Ge, S) expressed disappointment about changes to these articles proposed by the Council 'which allow no more than a relative and provisional increase in Parliament's budgetary powers'.

The draft Treaty revision proposed by Council would increase the European Parliament's powers in four ways: (1) by giving the European Parliament the right to reject the draft budget in its entirety (2) by making the fixing of the VAT rate a matter for EP-Council agreement (3) by establishing a concertation procedure and (4) by changing the rules for the Council's rejection of Parliament's modifications to the budget. N.B. The European Parliament may modify the budget in respect of expenditure further to the Treaty and amend it in respect of discretionary expenditure. Council may not set aside amendments but has until now been able to set aside modifications. The present text means that five out of nine Member States will now have to support rejection. Until now it has been sufficient for just one Member State to object to a modification, hence the term 'majority of one', provided, of course, the effect of the modification is not to increase expenditure. Mr Lange's motion called for the same Council majority to be required for these modifications too. It also criticised the arbitrary and ambiguous distinction between the two classes of expenditure. The motion was agreed to. The second report by Mr Heinrich Aigner (Ge, CD), concerned setting up a European Court of Auditors. Mr Aigner noted with satisfaction that the draft treaty seeks to guarantee the complete independence and freedom of operation of the Court of Auditors but he asked the House to withhold its approval unless the Parliament's



*Mr Erwin Lange: "The Council is not Parliament's boss".*

agreement is sought for the appointment of members of the Audit Court, subject to which Mr Aigner pressed for the necessary treaty changes to be made at once. The motion was agreed to. The motions will be forwarded to the Council which will now draw up a final text for ratification by the Member States. What seems now to be accepted, however, is that increasing Parliament's powers is an ongoing process and in the context of this ongoing process Parliament's opinion is that it must have full budgetary powers by the end of 1976. Among the points Parliament is likely to return to are that it should have the right to reject individual heads in the budget as well as the budget as a whole. As Mr Peter Kirk (Br, EC) put it: 'The trouble is that we have once again been given nuclear weapon instead of a tactical one, as we were in the case of the vote of censure against the Commission. It is very unlikely that Parliament would reject the whole budget, although there could be cases when it would like to reject part of it. We, the Political Affairs Committee, share the disappointment of the Committee on Budgets that this problem has been left unresolved and we hope that in the next round of discussions we shall come back to it.'

Another pointer to the future was perhaps a speech by Mr Willie Hamilton (Br, S) who said: 'This Parliament is of no account unless we can get control and keep control of all aspects of public expenditure, and that, I feel, is the great constitutional fight that we have to embark on, and there can be no delay in its

implementation.' He concluded: 'We must never forget that democracy can never survive unless the elected representatives of it control the purse strings.'

## **ENERGY**

### **Statement on research policy**

Mr Guido Brunner, Commissioner for Research, reporting on Community research policy, said that the Council of Ministers had dealt with the energy research programme on June 26, discussing the equalization of the cost of inflation for the Community research programme and the new programme for the common research centres, without reaching a final decision. The Commission, however, believed that on July 15, the Foreign Ministers meeting would be able to establish a programme for three years at a cost of 59 m units of account. This would be in two phases with a review by the Foreign Ministers after 18 months when they could make changes. The common centres, which had at one time lacked programme perspectives, had done better work, although there were still some shortcomings. Much of the research work was done on a customer basis for member countries. In the past few days there had been an expression of Soviet interest.

### **Motion tabled further to the Council meeting of 26 June.**

Mr Gerd Springorum (Ge, CD), chairman of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, moved a motion that the four-year research programme of the joint research centre should be completed by the end of next year as planned, and that the necessary funds be made available. The motion warned against irreparable damage to European research which would follow rejection or delay of the Commission's research proposals and particularly on research into energy supplies. It also warned that delay represented an irresponsible threat to the achievement of Community aims.

Mr Tom Normanton (Br, EC) said that he became distinctly nervous at Mr Brunner's reference to Soviet interest in joint research. He asked whether Euratom research was classified. 'I would feel anxiety at the motivation behind Soviet interest in Community research and I would ask to what extent Community research establishments are engaged in classified work of high security and strategic interest.'

If that was the case, he wanted to be assured that the confidentiality and security of classification would be maintained, where interest was being manifested from directions which had an interest in blowing it open. The greatest leap forward in aero technology – Concorde – had been copied in almost every little detail by the Russians. That stemmed from the fact that copies of blueprints and designs which were the product of research in the Community had been handed over in their totality to the USSR. ‘We cannot allow that sort of thing to continue and I hope that Mr Brunner will give a clear assurance that classified and secret work is not being made available to those who would wish to destroy us economically and politically.

In reply Mr Brunner said that in theory there was no secrecy about the Community’s research work; but it was not naive either, especially bearing in mind the industrial and business interests that had to be protected.

### **Statement on Council meeting of 26 June**

Mr Henri Simonet said the Council had tackled one or two minor points and two major ones. He took the minor ones first. There was no decision but a fair consensus on financing research into hydrocarbon exploitation. The ministers were in agreement but referred the matter back to the Committee of Permanent Representatives. On the International Energy Agency, he said, we wanted the Nine to take a common line on other sources and on how we could protect them against any sudden fall in price of oil, although there was some point to saying one should first determine what the energy sources were and see how they could be developed. The talks planned with the United States would be tough and the Eight would have to have something to say. He had hoped agreement could be reached on a minimum level of protection to help alternative sources and develop coal and nuclear energy in particular.

The most serious contingency facing the Commission was what would happen in the event of a further embargo on oil supplies. The Eight would have a sharing arrangement but it would be a violation of the treaty for the Eight not to trade their supplies with France. So the Commission could either do nothing or declare there had been an infringement of the Treaty. To get over this difficulty the Commission had proposed that in such an eventuality a Community mechanism should simply be super imposed on the present International Energy Agency arrangement. Mr Simonet said he regretted very much that the French Government had been unable to accept this. Its reasons seemed specious to him. They said it was because the proposal came from the International Agency.

## **Guidelines for coal**

As rapporteur for the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, Mr Friedrich Burgbacher (Ge, CD) reported to the House on the Commission's 'guidelines for coal' covering the years from 1975 to 1985. The EC now needs coal more but has problems mining it. Long-term investments is called for; mining is labour-intensive; and the coal industry is bad at responding to market fluctuations. Hence these guidelines. In its 'new energy policy strategy' the Commission looked to a supply pattern for the year 2000 comprising 50 o/o nuclear energy and about 33 o/o gas. The crucial period in this strategy is 1975-1985. At 500 m toe solid fuels met 60 o/o of the EC's energy needs in 1960. This fell to 325 m toe or 22.6 o/o in 1973 (estimate) but must rise to 357 m toe or 16 o/o by 1985. To achieve this, coal output in the EC must be kept at present level, coal imports increased and EC production of lignite increased.

Mr Burgbacher felt coal must make a greater contribution, especially as nuclear energy would not be able to meet expectations as to output by 1985. The guidelines should be under constant review. He suggested measures (such as stockpiling, subsidies and extra-EC worker recruitment) that could boost coal production. The motion was agreed to.

## **Community policy on hydrocarbons**

The House decided to defer consideration of a report on hydrocarbons policy drawn for the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology by Mr Silvio Leonardi (It, CA). It will be taken in September. Mr Tom Dalyell quoted this report as arguing that 'as large a proportion as possible of crude oil consumption in the foreseeable future should be met from Community deposits'. Mr Dalyell said: 'For some of us this is a gut issue ..... the depletion rate of oil in the North Sea is a very hot political potato'. He added: 'Many people in Britain would take a more relaxed attitude towards a common policy on North Sea oil if we were convinced that there was also a common policy to find alternative ways of creating the energy that we shall need from the 1990's onwards.' Replying on this point Mr Henri Simonet said he found the British attitude contradictory: 'You can not ask others to organise a system of protection to allow for the production of your oil and, at the same time, seize every opportunity you have to say you want to keep it to yourselves.' The aim the Commission was

proposing for the Community for 1985 was to save an amount of oil equivalent to the whole of the probable North Sea production for that year. Speaking more generally, Mr Simonet said that what was needed was a political commitment to develop alternative sources of energy. This meant the same degree of political commitment from each of the Nine governments and the same degree of political difficulty.

## **EXTERNAL RELATIONS**

### **EC-Turkey Joint Committee's recommendations**

As rapporteur for the Associations Committee, Mr Egon Klepsch (Ge, CD) asked the House to approve the recommendations of the EC-Turkey Joint Parliamentary Committee adopted in Copenhagen on 24 April 1975. There are four of these (1) calling for standing political consultations between the EC and Turkey particularly with Cyprus in mind (2) calling for an action programme to develop the Association between the Community and Turkey and regretting the Association Council has not met since 14 October 1974 (3) calling for a preferential system under the planned Agricultural Review giving Turkey the highest level of advantages enjoyed by third countries, at least for farm products and (4) calling for proper educational facilities for Turkish children in the Community. The motion was agreed to.

### **Terrorism**

Mr Ludwig Fellermaier, for the Socialist Group, and Mr Peter Kirk for the European Conservative Group, tabled a motion expressing alarm at the latest terrorist attack in Jerusalem for which the PLO has claimed responsibility. It condemned all use of force to solve political problems and warned against the danger which continued terrorist activities constitute for world peace and for Euro-Arab relations. To preserve the untroubled nature of these relations the motion called on the Council and Commission of the European Communities to convey this sentiment to their partners in the Euro-Arab dialogue.

The motion was agreed to.

## **CUSTOMS UNION**

### **Simplifying customs clearance**

As rapporteur for the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, Mr Karl Mitterdorfer (It, CD) moved a motion on the customs union and the achievement of the internal market. This motion was tabled on the Committee's own initiative to express concern at the way the failure to harmonise customs law is acting as an obstacle to the customs union. The motion stressed the significance of the customs union and expressed concern at the number of controls on the movement of people and goods in the Community. The motion argued that customs formalities need streamlining as a matter of urgency. The motion was agreed to.

## **BUSINESS**

### **Indexing savings**

Mr Norbert Hougardy (Fr, L) tabled a motion for the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs calling on the Commission to further examine the whole question of indexation and especially the protection of savings and to report to Parliament on its findings. The motion was agreed to without debate.

## **BUDGET**

### **ECSC Auditor's report**

As rapporteur for the Committee on Budgets, Mr Heinrich Aigner (Ge, CD) reported to the House on the ECSC Auditor's report for 1973. He noted that expenditure rose to 175,034,035 u.a. but expressed regret at the reduction in expenditure of a social nature. Mr Aigner made a number of comments on how the ECSC's accounting could be improved. A motion summing up his comments was agreed to.



## **EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT**

### **Motion on setting up a procedural committee**

The chairmen of Parliament's political groups tabled a motion to the effect that a committee of 18 members be set up to be responsible for the Rules of Procedure and petitions. The motion was agreed to

### **Motion on committees**

The chairmen of Parliament's political groups put down a motion to the effect that the Political Affairs Committee, the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, the Committee on Budgets, the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment and the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth shall consist of 30 members each and the Committee on Agriculture of 35 members. The motion was agreed to.

## **ENVIRONMENT**

### **Motion on relevant sections in 8th General Report**

As rapporteur for the Committee on Public Health and the Environment, Mr Hans Edgar Jahn (Ge, CD) reported to the House on the sections of the Commission's Eighth General Report coming within his committee's terms of reference. Mr Jahn welcomed the Commission's emphasis on consumer protection and called for progress towards uniform legislation on food. He noted with satisfaction the work done under the ECSC Treaty and that done by the Steel Industry Safety and Health Commission and the Mines Safety and Health Commission. He welcomed the first results of the meeting of the Council of Ministers responsible for environmental protection of 7 November 1974 and praised the Commission's work in submitting a score of proposals for regulations and directives, recommendations and resolutions and on extending its activities at international level. He supported the Commission's drive to purify the Rhine, to establish standards for nuclear safety, and to conduct environmental research. He regretted, however, that the Commission only made a non-binding recommendation on the protection of birds and their habitat, that it would not be until the end of 1975 that a report on the state of environmental protection will be forthcoming. A motion summing up these points was agreed to.

## **Birds**

In reply to a question from Mr Hans Edgar Jahn (Ge, CD), Mr Carlo Scarascia Mugnozza, Vice-President, said the Commission had undertaken to look into three ways of protecting Europe's flora and fauna: by protecting species, by protecting their habitat and by protecting their habitat against different forms of pollution. The Commission had also called for special studies and some of the resulting findings had already been forwarded to Parliament's Committee on Public Health and the Environment. The studies would be completed by the end of the month. Mr Jahn had also urged stronger legal safeguards, calling for a draft directive on this subject. The Commission felt a recommendation would be more appropriate. As regards migratory birds, the Commission had for years been receiving letters expressing concern about the fate they suffered in Italy. He had spoken at length with the Minister for Agriculture on this subject. He had personally undertaken to support the bill before the Italian Parliament. But, added Mr Scarascia Mugnozza, it might help for the President of the European Parliament to write to the Italian Government and Parliament urging support for this bill. Meanwhile the Commission would do everything it could to solve this problem as soon as possible.

## **AGRICULTURE**

### **Farm fund**

As rapporteur for the Committee on Agriculture, Mr Charles Durand (Fr, L) reported to the House on the third financial report from the Commission on the European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund. This covers 1973. Mr Durand was critical of the Commission and of the Council and argued that the Council alone bears responsibility for the new wave of frauds against Community finances because of its failure to introduce the necessary legal instruments. A motion summing up his criticisms was agreed to.

### **Wine**

#### **Introduction**

The wine year begins, by tradition, on 16 December and in a normal year the yield of the Community's vineyards will be some 135 million hectolitres. In the

year 1972 to 1973, total production was 127.720 m hectolitres and consumption was 143.701 m hectolitres. Leaving aside the question of stocks, the Community was self-sufficient in wine to the extent of 88.6 per cent. As of 16 December 1973, therefore, the wine market gave no cause for concern. In the year 1973-1974 however the production figure was 171.52 m hectolitres as against a consumption figure of 148.813 m. And estimated production for 1974-1975 is 155.289 m as against estimated consumption of 154.719 m. So the Community has a problem, not least because the EC is short of storage capacity.

### **The Commission's proposals**

On 4 July 1973 the Commission submitted proposals for regulations designed to bring wine production potential more in line with demand and to secure a better balance in the market for table wines.

The Commission proposes (a) to prohibit new planting until 1 January 1977 (b) to require authorisations for replanting vines (c) to map out 'wine-growing reorganisation areas (d) to subdivide vineyards in three categories (e) to call on Member States to supply details to serve as a base for future proposals.

### **Mr Libero della Briotta's motion**

As rapporteur for the Committee on Agriculture, Mr Libero Della Briotta (It, S) tabled a 46 point motion on the Commission's proposals to amend regulations governing the common market in wine. He agreed vine planting must be controlled but pointed out this introduces the principle of curbing production and limiting support, a principle which, apart from sugar quotas, the CAP has carefully avoided even areas of production responsible for the greatest surpluses. He also took issue with the Commission on how such planting controls should be made. He argued that there must be a balance between the control of planting, market guarantees and the improvement of quality. He did not feel the Commission was likely to secure this balance. He also considered the Commission had almost entirely overlooked the possibilities of boosting wine consumption both in the Community and in third countries. He regretted too that the Commission was not pressing for a phase-out of wine taxes 'which are very onerous in some countries and frequently act as a sharp brake on the natural increase in the consumption of this basic nutriment.'



*Mr Libero della Briotta: "Italy's farmer's have been the poor relations long enough".*

### **The debate**

Opening the debate Mr Della Briotta said the Commission's proposals went much further than the Council's decision of 21 April. This was intended to resolve the clash between France and Italy by placing a limit on table wine production. And he asked how the Commission was going to sanction any infringements of the regulations it proposed? The aim of his motion, he said, was to moderate the action envisaged.

On the financial side Mr Erwin Lange (Ge, S) was unimpressed by the Commission's costs hypothesis. It was hardly a base for assessing the financial implications of what the Commission proposed.

### **Opinions of the Groups**

Mr Frankie Hansen (Lu, S), for the Socialists, said his group would agree to the motion. Mr Giovanni Boano (It, CD), for the Christian Democrats, observed that the last person to ban vine planting had been Diocletian in the year 92. The vineyard, he said, was more than an aspect of agriculture. It was a symbol of civilisation. Mr Jean-Francois Pintat (Fr, L), for the Liberals, thought more

emphasis should be placed on increasing wine sales both in the Community and abroad. Mr James Scott-Hopkins (Br, EC), for the European Conservatives, said his group would agree to the motion. He feared, however, that the choice facing the Council might be between a surplus of wine or a surplus of agricultural ethanol, an excess supply of which could have serious consequences. Mr Albert Liogier (Fr, EPD), for the European Progressive Democrats, was unable to accept the motion. He agreed production must be limited but thought more attention should be paid to the effect of the proposed measures on small producers. Mr Marcel Lemoine (Fr, CA) for the Communists, pointed out that although production had gone up the vine growers were still in debt. So much, he said, for economic liberalism. Only big business came out with a profit.

Replying to the debate Commissioner Petrus Lardinois said he accepted the motion before the House and recommended it be agreed to. When Mr Cornelis Laban (Du, S) moved the deletion of any reference to harmonising consumer taxes on wines Mr Lardinois replied: 'It really escapes me why, when excise duties have to be levied to meet the cost of social services, these have to be levied on wine and not — just to take one example — on coca cola.' The motion was agreed to.

## QUESTION TIME

### Questions to the Council

1. Mr Francis Leenhardt (Fr, S) asked why the Council had taken no action on the Commission's communication on multinational companies. Mr Mariano Rumor, Italian Foreign Minister and President of the Council, replied 'The Commission's communication on multinational companies in the context of Community regulations has been duly studied by the Departments of the Council concerned. It does not in itself, as you know, contain any formal proposal within the meaning of the Treaty; its main purpose is to list a number of measures — under Community policies now being developed — which in the Commission's view should help to solve many of the problems raised. The measures which are being considered are not discriminatory and deal with problems which are not peculiar to multinational companies but which may also concern national companies or individuals. Some of these measures have been the subject of Commission proposals. Some have already led to Council decisions — as in the case, for example, of the proposal concerning collective redundancies. Others are still under examination, for

example those concerning the protection of workers when a company is taken over, internal company mergers, the structure of sociétés anonymes and the control of combines. Others again will be examined as soon as possible, as in the case of the Statute of the European Company as regards which the Commission has just submitted an amended proposal to the Council. The Commission has announced proposals for other measures which the Council will certainly examine as soon as they are submitted. I would like to add two brief comments. Firstly, to say that since these phenomena are multinational in character, solutions must also be found on a worldwide scale, and secondly, to stress the need for better information concerning large companies both multinational and national.'

2. Mr Gustave Ansart (Fr, CA) asked about the transfer of 'pluton' missiles to the Federal Republic of Germany. Mr Rumor replied: 'As the Honourable Member is aware, defence problems do not come within the European Community's responsibility'.
3. Mr Rudolf Adams (Ge, S) asked whether the conduct of the Member States at the CSCE talks had been in accordance with the joint will of all nine Member States and the interests of the Community. Mr Rumor replied: 'As regards those matters dealt with at the CSCE which come within the sphere of competence of the Community, I can confirm that the guidelines drawn up in the Community were respected by the Nine throughout the proceedings in Geneva.'
4. Mr Walter Behrendt (Ge, S) asked whether the Council thought that the chances of peaceful frontier changes in the context of European unification would be in any way restricted by the results of the CSCE talks. Mr Rumor replied: 'The problem of peaceful changes in frontier lines does not come within the purview of the Council.'
5. Mr Peter Corterier (Ge, S) asked what political and economic advantages for Europe the Council expected from the results of the CSCE. Mr Rumor replied: 'As you know, the CSCE has not yet finished and it would therefore be premature for me to comment on the results of the Conference or to evaluate the advantages it may bring to the Community.'

### **Questions to the Commission**

1. Mr Willi Müller (Ge, S) asked to what extent the Commission had been involved in the CSCE talks and consultations. Sir Christopher Soames,

Vice-President of the Commission, replied that the Commission had been involved in a number of ways. Commission representatives had participated in the work of Committee 2 which deals with economic matters and its various sub-groups. When this Committee began its work the representative of the Member State exercising the presidency indicated that the Commission would be expressing the Community's view on issues within the Community's competence. The Commission had also participated in all discussions and political cooperation machinery both at ministerial and official level while the positions to be taken by the Member States have been prepared.

2. Mr Gérard Bordu (Fr, CA) asked whether the Commission was able to present the initial results of its enquiry into the activities of oil companies. Commissioner Albert Borschette replied that the Commission had concluded its enquiries into the activities of 22 oil companies in the Common Market countries. 'These enquiries and our analysis of them have not yet reached the stage where we have an overall view of the activities of oil companies particularly at the level of international groups. The Commission has, therefore, taken upon itself to defer the presentation of its report on this subject to the House. We are at present engaged in further enquiries into 11 oil companies including large international oil companies operating both within and outside the Community with particular reference to the price of oil on transfer to the refineries of the Common Market and the prices quoted in trade between the various countries during the oil crisis.'
3. Mr Eric Blumenfeld (Ge, CD) asked to what extent the Commission's economic analyses and prognoses were based on reports and statements from the member governments and to what extent the Commission endeavoured to make its own assessments of the state of the economy at any given moment. Mr Wilhelm Haferkamp, Vice-President of the Commission office of the European Communities and that it gathered a lot of information from the enquiries into the attitudes of business leaders. It also drew on the statistical reports of the Member States and made use of statistics made available by other international organizations. Mr Haferkamp added that a good deal of statistical information coming into the Commission from the Member States consisted of unpublished data made available for the Commission's own purposes. He attached particular importance to the value of the enquiries conducted into the attitudes of business leaders.
4. Mr Norbert Hougardy (Be, L) asked the Commission if it did not consider that the regulations on the advertising of alcoholic drinks applicable in

France contained measures that were in fact equivalent to quantitative restrictions. Commissioner Petrus Lardinois replied that the measures in question could give the impression of having the same effect as quantitative import restrictions. For this reason the Commission had decided to conduct an enquiry. The first reply received from the French government indicated that this was not the case. On the other hand, the enquiry was not yet completed. The House would be informed of any conclusions the Commission reached.

Mr Hougardy then asked the Commission if it did not think it odd that such traditional French products as Cognac, Calvados, Rhum, Cointreau and Grand-marnier whose alcoholic content was between 40-45 degrees were completely free to advertise whereas whiskey, vodka and gin whose alcoholic content was only 43 degrees could not be advertised at all? Mr Lardinois said he was unable to reply although he added that this had been his first impression too. He pointed out, however, that the products covered by the advertising ban included pastis which accounted for some 60 per cent of the French alcohol market.

Mr John Corrie (Br, EC) said he welcomed the Commission's effort towards removing discrimination against imported spirits including scotch whiskey but could the Commission say what progress had been made on the harmonisation of excise duties on scotch whiskey and other spirits. Mr Lardinois said he was unable to answer this question but said that he would consult his colleague on this matter and send a written reply.

#### **Action taken on Parliament's advice**

Commissioner Finn Gundelach made the following statement: 'I cannot take the floor on behalf of the Commission without expressing the deep satisfaction of the Commission at seeing represented in this House the members of the British Labour Party. We are deeply convinced that their presence here will strengthen our debate and thereby strengthen the construction of Europe. We look forward to close and fruitful collaboration with the new Members. My report contains six points. First, in accordance with the opinion contained in Mr Muller's report on waste elimination and recycling, the Commission altered its draft directive. The alteration, which was submitted to the Council at the end of April, concerned the title of the directive and the amendments proposed by the Parliament to Articles 3, 4, 10 and 14. Secondly, the Commission has also sent the Council an



amended draft directive on the coordination of laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to joint insurance, on which Mr Brewis had reported. As indicated in its letter of 30 May 1975 to the President of the European Parliament, it decided to incorporate in its amended draft the most important of the House's comments. In that letter it also gave some details concerning its recent draft. Thirdly, in a debate on Mrs Orth's report on the directive on materials and objects which will come into contact with foodstuffs, the Commission stated that it accepted the amendments to Article 2, 5 and 10 of its draft. I can now say that these amendments, endorsed by the Commission, have been well received by the Council.

Fourthly, with regard to the report on a regulation concerning the minimum amount of levies to be collected on certain processed agricultural products, I am happy to announce to Parliament that the Council, on 24 June, adopted the regulation in accordance with the wishes of Parliament. Fifthly, the draft directive on pesticides, on which Mr Della Briotta presented his report to Parliament during the April sittings, has been amended to take into account the wishes expressed in this House, and accepted by the Commission. Sixthly, the revised version of the draft third directive on company law, which was dealt with in Mr De Keersmaecker's report, has been amended to take into account the wishes of Parliament, and it is hoped that the amended proposal will be forwarded to the Council before the summer recess.'

## References

Subject	European Parliament document number	Commission document number	date of debate
Simplifying customs clearance . . . . .	135/75	22/75	7/11
EC-Turkey Joint Committee's recommen- dations . . . . .	182/75	107/75	7/11
Medium-term guidelines for coal 1975-1985	147/75	—	8/11
Third financial report on EAGGF 1973 . . . .	175/75	—	8/11
European Union . . . . .	174/75		9/11
Wine . . . . .	187/75	363/74 177/75	10/11
Changes in EC Treaties . . . . .	166/75 167/75	501/74 501/74	11/11
ECSC Auditor's report . . . . .	140/75	266/74	11/11
Indexing savings . . . . .	165/75	—	11/11
8th General Report . . . . .	149/75	500/75	11/11
Birds . . . . .	152/75	—	11/11
Community policy on hydrocarbons . . . . .	122/75	—	—

## Abbreviations

The following abbreviations are used in this text to denote nationality and political allegiance: CD Christian Democrat, S Socialist, LA Liberal and Allies, EC European Conservative, EPD European Progressive Democrat, CA Communist and Allies, Ind Non-attached Independent Members, Be Belgian, Br British, Da Danish, Du Dutch, Fr French, Ge German, Ir Irish, It Italian, Lu Luxembourg, EC European Community.

## Notes

### **Tribute to Mr Furler**

Professor Hans Furler was a Member of the Common Assembly and the European Parliament from 1955 to 1973. He was Vice-President from 1958 to 1960 and from 1962 to 1973 and President from 1960 to 1962. Parliament, said President Georges Spénale, had more than one reason to honour the memory of this great European. It was he who won acceptance for the idea of a single parliament when the three communities were created. It was he who began Parliament's long struggle for greater powers and it was he who was one of the first to build up the Community's association with countries overseas. 'On behalf of the European Parliament I have sent a message to the family of our former colleague and to the Christian Democrat Group expressing our sincerest condolences and giving an assurance that we shall follow his example and go on with his work'.

The House observed a minute's silence.

### **Appointment of new members**

On 20 June the Danish Folketing had renewed its delegation to the European Parliament. The following were appointed: Mr Kristian Albertsen, Mr Ole Espersen, Mr Ove Guldberg, Mr Erhard Jakobsen, Mr Niels Anker Kofoed, Mrs Edele Kruchow, Mr Jens Maigaard, Mr Jorgen Brondlund Nielsen, Mr Knud Nielsen and Mr Kai Nyborg. On 1 July the House of Commons of the United Kingdom appointed the following representatives to the European Parliament: Mr Buy Barnett, Miss Betty Boothroyd, Mr Tam Dalyell, Sir Geoffrey De Freitas, Mrs Gwyneth Dunwoody, Mr Tom Ellis, Mr John Evans, Mr William Hamilton, Mr Mark Hughes, Mr R.C. Mitchell, Mr John Prescott and Mr Michael Stewart. On 7 July it appointed Mrs Winifred Ewing as member of the European Parliament. On 3 July the House of Lords of the United Kingdom renewed its delegation to the European Parliament and appointed the following: The Earl of Bessborough, Lord Ardwick, Lord Bethell, Lord Bruce of Donington, Lord Castle, Baroness Fisher of Rednal, Lord Gordon-Walker, Lord Reay, Lord Saint Oswald and Lord Walston and on 8 July it appointed Lord Gladwyn as member of the European Parliament. Finally, on 8 July 1975 the House of Commons announced that the appointment of Mr Russell Johnston had expired.



*Sir Geoffrey de Freitas, the new Vice-President, takes the chair*

### **Election of a Vice-President**

The President announced that he had received from the Socialist Group the nomination of Sir Geoffrey de Freitas as candidate for the vacant seat of Vice-President. As only one nomination had been received for this seat the President declared Sir Geoffrey de Freitas Vice of the European Parliament by acclamation and congratulated him on his election.

### **Membership of committees**

On a proposal from the Liberal and Allies Group, Parliament appointed Mrs Kruchow as member of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology and the Committee on Public Health and the Environment and Mr Kofoed as member of the Committee on Agriculture, to replace Mr Nielsen.

## **Presentation of a petition**

The President informed Parliament that he had received from Miss Caterina Chizzola and several thousand other signatories a petition on a draft constitution establishing a European government.

## **Strength of the Political Groups**

Socialists	67
Christian Democrats	51
Liberals and Allies	25
European Conservatives	17
European Progressive Democrats	17
Communists and Allies	15

## **Summing up**

At its sittings of 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 July Members put down 5 questions for debate with the Council and 5 questions for debate with the Commission. At Question Time 5 questions were addressed to the Council and 4 to the Commission. 12 reports were considered and the European Parliament delivered 13 Opinions.

## RESOLUTION

on European Union

*The European Parliament,*

- Recalling the hope repeatedly expressed since the Bonn Summit Conference in July 1961 and the concrete indications concerning the transformation of the Communities established by the Treaties of Paris and Rome into a single and real economic, social and political Community;
- Desirous of seeing practical effect given to all the undertakings solemnly entered into by the Heads of State or Government of the Member States on 1 and 2 December 1969 at The Hague, 19-21 October 1972 in Paris, 14-15 December 1973 in Copenhagen and 9-10 December 1974 in Paris;
- emphasizing its essential role and its responsibilities as an institution representing the peoples joined together in the Community in the efforts to transform all the relations of the Member States into a European Union;
- recalling in particular its resolutions of 5 July 1972, 14 November 1972 and 14 October 1974;
- firmly convinced that the progressive achievement of the Union must be based on the active and conscious participation of the peoples, whose interests it must reflect, and that the European Parliament will, therefore, have to take at all times, with the assistance of the national parliaments, all initiative likely to foster and ensure such participation;
- in answer to the desire expressed by the Heads of State or Government for the Community institutions to contribute to the work on European Union and, in particular, to the drawing up of a summary report by Mr Leo TINDEMANS,

## DECLARES THAT

1. The European Union must be conceived as a pluralist and democratic Community whose priority aims are as follows:
  - to ensure strict respect for liberty and human dignity;
  - to promote social justice and solidarity between the Member States and the citizens of the Community, through the establishment of an economic order ensuring full employment and the equitable distribution of incomes and wealth;
  - to oppose resolutely any cause of conflict or tension, in order to contribute towards the maintenance of peace and freedom;
  - to take part in efforts to reduce tension and settle disputes by peaceful means throughout the world and, in Europe, to develop cooperation and security between States;

The European Union must be brought about progressively by means of more rational and efficient forms of relations between Member States, taking existing Community achievements as its point of departure through the introduction of a *single* organization undertaking duties which the Member States can no longer effectively carry out alone, thus avoiding wastage of effort or actions contrary to the cohesion of the Union;

3. The Union must be based on an institutional structure which will ensure its coherence:
  - on a body, within which participation by the Member States in the decision-making process will be guaranteed,
  - on a Parliament having budgetary powers and powers of control, which would participate on at least an equal footing in the legislative process, as is its right as the representative of the peoples of the Union,
  - on a single decision-making centre which will be in the nature of a real European government, independent of the national governments and responsible to the Parliament of the Union,
  - on the European Court of Justice,
  - on an Economic and Social Council, as a consultative body,
  - on a European Court of Auditors.

4. The dynamic character of the present Community must be preserved in full, the powers and responsibilities of the Union must be progressively widened, respecting the essential interests of Member States, in particular:
  - (a) foreign policy, for which the existing coordination procedures must be further strengthened. New procedures must be developed to enable the Community to speak with a single voice in international politics;
  - (b) security policy;
  - (c) social and regional policy;
  - (d) educational policy;
  - (e) economic and monetary policy;
  - (f) a Community budgetary policy;
  - (g) policy on energy and supplies of raw materials;
  - (h) a scientific and technical research policy.

The Union, based on the collective exercise of common responsibilities, must remain open to new tasks.

5. The Union can only be achieved through a process of continuous political development, which must make full use of all the provisions and possibilities of the present treaties and the other procedures which link the Member States, in order to bring about quickly and effectively the degree of solidarity necessary to transform the present Community into an organization whose decisions are binding on all parties.
6. Achievement of the Union therefore necessitates immediate action to ensure real progress in the various Community policies and in the institutional structure, which must take place in parallel.

The European Parliament *therefore asks*

7. That an immediate start be made on the procedures necessary to allow the election of its Members by direct universal suffrage not later than in 1978, the date indicated by the Heads of Government of the Member States, thus giving proof of the political resolve to advance towards the construction of Europe with the active participation of the peoples;



8. That in the course of 1976 the Commission of the European Communities should submit an overall programme of priority action which will enable the main aims of the Community policies on which the future European Union is based to be achieved before the end of the present decade;
9. That this programme should be submitted to the urgent consideration of Parliament and the Council for such amendment or modification as may be jointly agreed between the two institutions and then for approval and implementation by the Council;
10. That the links which exist between Economic and Monetary Union and European Union, making desirable a parallel development in the two fields, should be recognized, without, however, allowing the lack of progress in one field to be used as a pretext for taking no action in the other;
11. That adjustments to the institutional structure necessary to adapt it to its task in the European Union, should now be made, in particular,
  - (a) that, in accordance with the treaties, the Council should abandon the principle of unanimity and meet in public in its legislative capacity;
  - (b) that the role of the Commission should be extended to include the primary responsibility for all multilateral relations between Member States; this decision would enable these relations to be simplified and coordinated, while putting an end to the distinction between Community procedures and inter-governmental procedures;
  - (c) that the Community decision-making process should be organized in accordance with the following procedure:
    - the Commission, where appropriate on a proposal from Parliament, draws up a draft proposal;
    - the Council proceeds to give consideration to the proposal only after having received the text amended by Parliament and in the light of that text;
    - until the Council has adopted its conclusions with regard to the proposal the Commission retains the right to amend it in accordance with the provisions of Article 149(2) of the EEC Treaty;
    - if the Council feels it has to make changes in the text of the proposal as approved or amended by Parliament, a conciliation procedure must be set up within time limits to be specified, before the Council takes its decision, and the procedure will continue until Council and Parliament have reached agreement;

- (d) that, above all, in the transfer of new powers to the Communities the European Parliament should be given corresponding powers of legislation and control, since this is the only way to ensure that decisions of the European Communities are democratically legitimate;
- (e) that Parliament, in accordance with the wish solemnly affirmed by the Heads of Government of the Member States, should participate fully in the work concerning political cooperation and in all the procedures for coordination and consultation between the Member States;
- (f) that Parliament should participate in the appointment of the Members of the Commission of the Communities to emphasize their democratic legitimacy.

The European Parliament,

- emphasizes that these adjustments – provided for in paragraph 8 et seq – do not involve formal modifications to the existing treaties but are necessary if there is a desire to make real progress towards European Union and give proof of the existence of a political resolve capable of affirming and strengthening the solidarity between the peoples of the Community and between their governments;
12. Hopes that, with a view to giving the peoples of the Community a sense of common destiny, a 'Charter of the rights of the peoples of the European Community' will be drawn up and that practical measures capable of contributing to the development of a European Community consciousness, which have been requested for some time, will be adopted;
  13. Appeals to the national parliaments to associate themselves with the efforts towards the progressive achievement of European Union capable of responding to the legitimate hopes of the peoples and in particular of youth;
  14. Expects the governments of the Member States, the national parliaments, the Council and the Commission of the European Communities to act on this resolution and undertake the necessary practical steps to achieve European Union within the time limits laid down;
  15. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to Mr Tindemans, to the national parliaments, to the governments of the Member States, the Council and Commission of the European Communities.



Copies of 'The Sittings' for the current year may be obtained free of charge by using the slip below.

Subscriptions may be renewed at the beginning of each year.

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

Please send The Sittings to:

NAME\* .....

ADDRESS .....

.....

.....

\* Please use block letters

