

Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea

Debate on the report by Mr. A. Gillot (Doc 1-725/79)

Official Journal of the European Communities, Annex No. 553, March 1980

Debates of the European Parliament, pages 206-219

19. *Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea*

President. — The next item is the report by Mr Gillot (Doc. 1-725/79) on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee on the need for and definition of a common position for adoption by the Member States of the Community at the Third UN Conference (9th session) on the Law of the Sea and on the participation by the Community in its own right in the agreements to be concluded at the end of the Conference.

I call Mr Gillot.

Mr Gillot, *rapporteur*. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the ninth session of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea opened on 3 March. Both the scope of its work — the establishment of the legal *régime* for more than 70 % of the surface of this planet — and the number of participants — about 150 states — make this conference definitely one of the most important of this half century. The official goal is for the states to adopt a single international convention covering all aspects of the use of the sea, for whatever purpose: economic, military or scientific. It was not possible to achieve this in the first eight sessions, but thanks to the work of the Conference, the international Law of the Sea has undergone a radical change after centuries of resistance to reform.

The traditional Law of the Sea was based on the concept of freedom; in the name of this freedom, almost all the world's oceans were placed under the *régime* of the high seas, areas of sea in which ships of any state were free to navigate, to fish or to undertake scientific research. The most important exception to this principle was the existence of territorial waters limited to three nautical miles, and another exception more recently introduced into international law related to the *régime* of the continental shelf, where the coastal state had sovereign rights over exploitation and exploration.

This traditional Law of the Sea proved unable to cope with the rapid development of fishing and mineral extraction techniques, which seemed likely to result in a decrease in numbers, or indeed in the disappearance, of certain species and posed the problem of the delimitation of the continental shelf.

Finally, uncontrolled freedom in the exploitation, which has now become possible, of polymetallic nodules in the ocean deeps seemed likely to result in a monopoly by some industrial countries.

The radical reform affecting the Law of the Sea originated in the objections raised by the Third World countries, which challenged the traditional concept of freedom and are demanding the introduction of new law based on the organizational principle concerning the appropriation and exploitation of sea areas. Lastly, a new and major concern entailed further change: the protection of the marine environment, which is particularly threatened by the development and conditions of hydrocarbon transport, too often the cause of unacceptable marine pollution.

In this context, the interests represented at the Conference gave rise to two sorts of division: the first between the great industrial maritime powers and the developing countries (group of 77); the second, between the coastal and land-locked countries.

While the wishes of the latter have scarcely been considered, there has, on the other hand, been a compromise between the Third World countries and the

industrialized countries on the extension of the rights of coastal states over the sea areas around their coasts: limits of territorial waters extended to twelve miles and establishment of a so called 'economic' zone 200 miles wide in which these states would have sovereign rights confined to the exploitation of resources. In exchange for these rights, freedom of navigation would be guaranteed in this economic zone and in the international straits.

On the other hand, the discussion on the exploitation of the deep sea bed has reached deadlock; the system designed to be operated in parallel by the Enterprise of the future International Authority on the one hand and the states and private enterprise on the other has in fact been challenged by the Group of 77, which wants a single system in which the International Authority, which they would control thanks to their automatic majority, would be given wide powers. This deadlock is now the major obstacle to the successful conclusion of the conference.

The Member States of the European Community and the Community itself are directly concerned by the work of the Conference, and on 13 May 1977 the European Parliament already adopted a position on Mr Bangemann's comprehensive report dealing with these problems, but the recent opening of a new and possibly decisive session of the Conference makes it necessary for this Parliament elected by universal suffrage to reexamine the situation and to take up a clear, definite position. It was at the instigation of the Christian-Democratic Group that the four competent committees got down to work so that this House could adopt its position and make it known before the opening of the ninth session. I deplore the fact that the crowded agenda for the last plenary part-session did not allow this.

The main aims of the motion for a resolution which has been submitted on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee, as the Committee responsible, are: — to point out the prime importance of problems relating to the Law of the Sea and to define what is at stake at the Conference not only for the industrialized countries and the Third World countries, particularly those with which the Community is associated through the Lomé II Convention, but also for the Community itself and for its Member States; to define the legal basis and procedures for Community action and to set out the prerogatives and areas which come under the jurisdiction of the Member States, on the one hand, and of the Community itself on the other.

It points out the need for the Community to participate in its own right in the agreements to be concluded in areas in which the Member States have transferred their sovereignty to the Community and the need for Member States to coordinate their action on other questions, even when these are not within the scope of the EEC Treaty.

President

Finally, the motion lists the problems facing both the Community and the Member States at the Conference. It states or restates the common positions of the Member States, omitting any reference to problems which are irrelevant to the work of the Conference or unnecessarily contentious.

It specially mentions:

- the need for a balance between the concepts of appropriation and of freedom of navigation, exploitation and research;
- the major problem of the International Sea Bed Authority. It is essential that the Community should participate effectively in this Authority. Its powers must be clearly defined and strictly limited and its enterprise must not be subject to a privileged regime;
- lastly, the adequate control of marine pollution, which current events are, unfortunately, constantly bringing to our attention. It is imperative that this urgent problem should be the subject of appropriate international provisions and very strict controls, particularly on oil tanker traffic.

These are the main considerations which guided me, as rapporteur, and the Committee responsible. Before I finish I would like to point out a purely formal error at the end of paragraph 10. In the last line the reference to the forwarding of the resolution to the chairman of the Third UN Conference should be deleted because this is not customary and might make the task of the Community representatives more difficult.

I therefore request that the vote be on the text before you, minus the words 'and to the chairman of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea', that is, the end of paragraph 10.

Finally, I feel it should be mentioned that the observations of the other committees referred to for an opinion were taken into consideration.

The Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs expressed its agreement with the principles set out in the report of the Legal Affairs Committee and intends to submit a specific report on the economic aspects of the exploitation of the sea bed to this House before the summer. The concerns of the Committee on Transport are incorporated in the motion for a resolution. Lastly, the opinion of the Committee on Agriculture is taken up in the motion as far as protection against pollution is concerned. With respect to the proposals on fisheries policy, the Legal Affairs Committee considered it appropriate to include these in an annex, which is also subject to the vote of Parliament and has of course the same authority as the resolution itself.

In concluding this statement, may I express my hope that, as in the Legal Affairs Committee, which approved it unanimously, there will be general agreement in this House on a motion for a resolution which

tries to take account of the legitimate concerns of the Community and its Member States in this crucial problem, which goes far beyond ideological or political differences.

President. — I call Mr Megahy, on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Megahy. — Mr President, on behalf of the Socialist Group I would like to congratulate Mr Gillot on the clear, comprehensive summary he has given of an extremely complicated and intricate matter, the Convention on the Law of the Sea. If due regard were given to the prime importance of this subject for the future development of this world it would not, perhaps, have been scheduled for this time of the evening. I appreciate that in terms of the competence of the Community, it may not be the most important subject; but certainly in terms of national cooperation, of trying to deal constructively with the many problems of the sea, then this must rank as one of the most important topics which we have considered.

It was, I think, rather jokingly said in the Socialist Group when I was asked to be spokesman on this subject, that the reason for it was that if you lived anywhere in the United Kingdom you must be an expert on the Law of the Sea. Well I live in West Yorkshire, about as far as one can from either coast! I can certainly speak as an international lawyer, however, and I think it is very interesting to note that as regards the development of the Law of the Sea, my one nation has been intimately concerned with both aspects of this — that which Mr Gillot referred to before, dealing mainly with freedom of navigation, and that which is preoccupying the Conference on the Law of the Sea which has been taking place for the last six years, which deals essentially with the way in which the natural resources of the sea may be exploited. I think that increasing attention is being given to the vast resources of the seabed which are capable of being exploited, and to the necessity to find international agreement on the ways in which this can be done.

I think we have seen a remarkable example of consensus politics during the last six years, when something like 150 nations have been meeting in the United Nations, attempting to hammer out, not by majority vote but by reaching a consensus, the very big differences that exist between them, between the industrialized and the non-industrialized world, between the coastal state and the non-coastal state, in a search for a common agreement.

Mr Gillot did say that he hoped this House would receive his report unanimously, as the Legal Affairs Committee did, and would send it to the Council. It is not the intention of the Socialist Group to move any amendments to this document. I myself would say that I find it highly acceptable, but I would add this caveat:

Megahy

there may well be differences of emphasis at various points in the report that we would like to make, without necessarily disagreeing with the formal text. And here I should like to mention one or two points which I think ought to be highlighted.

One of the points raised in this document concerns support for the EEC itself to be a signatory to the final Convention, something that is fully supported by this House. I am not always seen in this House to be an enthusiast for extending the competence of the EEC, but it most certainly does seem logical that if the various nation States of the Community have surrendered part of their sovereignty to the EEC, one cannot obtain a satisfactory Convention which does not involve the signature of the EEC itself in those aspects, and only in those aspects, of course, which concerns the Community as such, leaving other matters to be dealt with by the nation States.

There is just one question, not so much a categorical statement, that I would like to raise as it interested me on looking through the text. It concerns the kind of procedure that ought to be used with regard to disputes. Near the end of Mr Gillot's explanatory statement he refers to the fact that the EEC should choose only one of the four methods of settling disputes which were mentioned because, he asserts — and he well may be correct in this, I am not necessarily challenging it — for example, the International Court of Justice would not accept the EEC as being within its competence. I would be interested to hear whether or not it would be possible finally to get the 150 States to accept the EEC as a party to the Convention; and whether it would not also be possible, having obtained that much agreement between the nation States, to get a further agreement that all of the methods of arbitration open to the other nation States would also be open to the EEC. I realize that there may well be practical reasons why that could not be done.

Turning to the point that Mr Gillot mentioned, which I think is tremendously important, that this Law of the Sea Conference represents a dialogue between the developing and the industrially developed world, I think that one of the important by-products of this conference has been the contribution that it has made to getting the various nation States of the world in different degrees of development round the table to look at and to solve joint problems. I would hope that the way in which this has been carried out over the years will be an example to us in many of the other problems which we will be facing in future.

With one part of the comments of Mr Gillot I should like to take issue. That is his reference to the work of the International Seabed Authority, where he says that the work of this authority must be strictly limited. I would hope that its work is not so strictly limited, Mr President, as to make it impossible for it to carry out its functions effectively. I recognize, of course, that as in most of the matters that have been discussed so far, agreement is only possible by means of compromise,

and that in the beginning there were very considerable differences between the Third World and the industrialized countries about the nature and extent of this Authority and the powers that it should wield. Whilst I accept that the result of that compromise is that there should be freedom for the enterprise itself and freedom for other bodies to act, I think that it is important to recognize that no dual system of this kind could function if the seabed enterprise were not to possess the technological and financial capacity to function effectively as an organ of exploration and exploitation. We should see that this body does have sufficient powers not only for this purpose, but also to allay the fears of many of the developing countries that the western industrialized States may be trying to carve up, as it were, the exploration of the seabed to their own advantage. I feel it is important, therefore, that this body should have sufficient powers to operate properly on an international scale.

One of the significant features of the Conference has been the development of the exclusive economic zone, and I would welcome the attempt in Mr Gillot's report to strike a balance between the rights of the coastal States to prevent, reduce and control pollution and to regulate marine scientific research, and those of other States who are anxious to advocate free access to waters.

The Socialist Group in particular, and I believe that other of my colleagues will mention this, welcomes the emphasis on the protection of the marine environment and the need to ensure that there are effective powers, both in the coastal States and in the international authorities, to deal with questions of the marine environment. Although this is mentioned in the report, it could perhaps have been more strongly emphasized.

Those are the major points I wanted to make. Of course, as the Conference has been going on for six years, a last-minute intervention by this Parliament will not necessarily make a major contribution to the solving of difficulties. Nevertheless, I think that it is right that Parliament, which after all comments on practically every matter that concerns this planet, should make its contribution to this very important subject, because as a group of nations we are very much concerned with the kind of decisions that are taken here. They are going to be far reaching decisions: they are going to affect us industrially, politically and in many other ways. I hope that the representatives of the Commission who are at this moment in the United Nations looking at this matter, will take to heart the points that I have made and that within a year or two we will see the satisfactory conclusion of a United Nations Convention guaranteeing freedom of the seas and laying down an effective international regime to deal with the research, development and exploitation of the seabed resources.

President. — I call Mr Janssen van Raay to speak on

President

behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group).

Mr Janssen van Raay. — (NL) Mr President, I should like to congratulate Mr Gillot, as I already have in the Legal Affairs Committee, on the splendid work he has done and his excellent legal report on the Third Conference on the Law of the Sea in America.

Unfortunately, I must follow up these friendly words by making for the second time today, some rather acerbic comments on ourselves, the European Parliament. During the debate on the ASEAN cooperation agreement, I expressed, on behalf of the Christian-Democratic Group, my regret that, although the matter had been on the agenda, before the signature of the Kuala Lumpur agreement, we ourselves had — to my mind, wrongly — caused it to be postponed. We — that is, the Legal Affairs Committee and the three other committees — have all been in a hurry to get the Gillot Report ready by the beginning of this conference. Here again, we have — in our perhaps understandable parliamentary zeal — got involved with world problems which in fact lie outside our sphere of competence. As a result, we have neglected to keep up to date on things which are our concern.

At the end of his speech, Mr Megahy pointed out that, when a conference has been going for six years, a last-minute intervention may not have much effect on the final result. Strictly speaking, he was quite right, but the aim of those who tabled this motion for a resolution was first and foremost to put pressure on the nine Member States to formulate a common Community position. Viewed in this light, there is indeed some point in the motion for a resolution, as is particularly clear from the text of the motion itself.

Before I proceed any further, let me say that the Christian-Democratic Group will be voting for this motion for a resolution. So much for my first point.

There are, however, a number of differences between the text we adopted unanimously in committee and the original motion for a resolution, and my Group regards these differences as a step in the wrong direction. We shall refrain from tabling any amendments, and we shall be voting for the motion as it stands, but we regret that the final text of the resolution omits what the original text had to say about close cooperation with the United States.

I should like to point out to the Member of the Commission that we for our part would welcome this cooperation.

This is not so much a political consideration as recognition of the fact that the United States of America, just like the Member States of the European Community, has important shipping interests. The fact is simply that many of the other countries taking part in this

Conference on the Law of the Sea do not have such worldwide shipping interests. The point we wish to emphasize is that freedom of navigation through straits must be maintained. That is a vital interest which the Member States of the European Community share with the United States of America, among others.

We are particularly conscious of the fact that this Third Conference marks the end of the era of my famous 17th century compatriot Hugo Grotius. It is thanks to the principle he formulated in the standard work *Mare Liberum* that the seas — unlike airspace — have in fact always been free, and we have all profited enormously from this.

While I appreciate that the era of Hugo Grotius is now past, this does not mean to say that we should give up our determined efforts to safeguard what remains of the principles he set out. What I have in mind in particular — although I am sure that Mr Klinkerborg will be referring to this point a little later — is what the Committee on Transport says in its opinion about straits which are of vital importance to our economies and thus to our prosperity. In this respect, we must be unanimous in our determination to see that freedom of navigation is maintained and that we do not become dependent on sovereign States adjacent to these straits.

A second point that was deleted from the original text of the motion for a resolution was the reference to the International Labour Organization. We regret this omission too. We believe that some attention should be devoted to the working conditions of the organization concerned. Here again, the fact that this paragraph has been omitted does not mean to say that nothing should be done on this point.

Looking through the rest of the motion for a resolution, I do not think I am going too far in saying that what is at stake here is the very future of mankind and the preservation of shipping as we know it.

What we are concerned with here is of the utmost importance, not only for Europe and the United States but also for all those countries which are in a position to exploit the natural resources in the seabed. That is why we wanted to bring this matter once again to the attention of this House via Mr Hoffmann's motion for a resolution. That is why we wholeheartedly support this motion, and that is why — as I said — we shall be voting unanimously tomorrow in favour of it.

President. — I call Mr Moreland to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Mr Moreland. — Mr President, speaking on behalf of the European Democratic Group — or I suppose, looking at the benches around me, I could almost say,

Moreland

speaking as the European Democratic Group, having taken over the Liberal Party as well — I should like to congratulate the rapporteur. We intend to support this report wholeheartedly, and if I have a few words of criticism they are really of minor importance when compared to the overall praise we should like to give.

I share with Mr Megahy one unique thing this evening, and that is that both his and my group happen to have chosen as spokesman a Member of this Parliament who represents an area as far away from the sea as is possible in the United Kingdom. Perhaps this is the best credential for speaking this evening.

I want to speak primarily about the proposals relating to shipping. I understand from this report — and I quote from page 32 of the English edition — that its main object is to emphasize the need for a common position at the Law of the Sea Conference. This is a point that I would like the Commission to develop when it, as I hope it will do, responds this evening, because it is my understanding that the competence within the Commission on the subject of shipping is very limited when compared with the competence in the Member States. I must therefore emphasize that when it comes to the subject of shipping, I hope that the negotiating will primarily be done by the Council rather than by the Commission. That is not, of course, to say that the Commission should not build up its own expertise on shipping, but perhaps this is a little premature at this time. The whole constitutional position of the Commission in these negotiations and indeed in its relations to the future authorities that might be devised is, in fact, an area of great uncertainty.

I noticed with interest that in paragraph 34 the rapporteur emphasizes that the main problem for the Community in relation to the proposed International Authority is exactly how it would participate in the institutions of the proposed Authority and its operational organ, the 'Enterprise'. Perhaps this is a matter which the Commission could enlighten us on.

Naturally, my own country has a dominant interest in shipping as the leading shipping country of the Community, and there is perhaps a temptation to say that we might on occasion be a little worried about the common position, in that we might be working on the basis of the lowest common denominator and downgrade the expertise that we obviously have in the United Kingdom. If I may put it this way, I wonder what negotiating on the Law of the Sea might be like under, shall we say, a Luxembourg presidency; that might well seem a questionable procedure to us. This is, I think, an area that does need to be tidied up, not just in relation to the present negotiations but also to future representation on the constitutional bodies that may be devised.

I strongly support this report in its emphasis on the right of navigation. This is a very important principle, which is going to be under pressure from those in the

Member States and elsewhere who are obviously going to want to lay down environmental limitations. Once the Law of the Sea Conference has come to some conclusion, I hope our negotiating position will be that any change due to environmental pressure cannot be decided on by an individual coastal state, but must be agreed by the appropriate authority: in this case I presume it would be the International Maritime Government Organization.

There are two other matters I want to touch on this evening. The first, in connection with shipping, concerns the approaching membership of Greece. Obviously, one of the subjects we are going to be concerned about at this conference is the whole question of safety at sea, and I think we have to face the fact that the reputation of Greek shipping is not exactly of the best as regards safety at sea. We must therefore not let down the rest of the world by allowing a country within the Community to have bad regulations concerning safety at sea which might endanger other independent States. Having said that, I want to make it quite clear that in this connection we very much welcome the entry of Greece into the Community because, if I may say so as a representative of the largest shipping nation of the Community, it does give us and the whole subject of shipping a little more weight within the Community. This brings me to my final point.

I was very pleased to see that the opinion of the Transport Committee touches upon the question of access to Community shipping waters for the fleets of the Comecon countries. The way in which the Comecon countries have undermined our shipping is an unqualified disgrace, and it is time the Community fought back at the Comecon countries, who are very deliberately undermining not just our shipping but our road haulage and our whole transport network through deliberate undercutting and other undesirable practices. When we talk of rights of navigation within the Community, I wonder how many rights of navigation there are around, shall we say, the coasts of the Comecon countries. So this is a matter where we have to be on the alert.

I understand — and perhaps again the Commission can clarify the situation — that on this whole question of the balance between rights of navigation and the natural concern of countries to have some coastal environmental protection, there is now substantial agreement at the Law of the Sea Conference and it is unlikely that this subject will be considered in depth again. The section of our report relating to transport is therefore perhaps to some extent outdated. I say that with pleasure, because if there is agreement this is a very welcome step indeed.

We support this report. I must say that I disagree with Mr Megahy in that I would like to see the EEC as a signatory to the Law of the Sea Conference, because I

Moreland

think this is yet another case where the countries of Europe working together can achieve more for the individual countries of Europe than if they work separately. It is a clear case where the existence of the Community can be of benefit. We are, in other words, working for the Law of the Sea and not for the law of the jungle.

President. — I call Mr Chambeiron.

Mr Chambeiron. — (*F*) Mr President, the Communist and Allies group attaches great importance to the objective of a comprehensive convention being pursued by the Third Conference on the Law of the Sea which opened on 3 March in New York.

This involves the possibilities opened up by technological progress with regard to prospecting and exploiting the sea bed, which is not, however, accessible to all countries; it involves defining governments' authority over the various zones, in particular the respective roles of territorial waters, the high seas and the exclusive economic zone; there is also the question of joint management of the high seas, regarded as the common heritage of all mankind, and lastly a multitude of questions relating to transport and security problems, such as the possibility of creating demilitarized peace zones — which we advocate for the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean — or again the problems of pollution. You are aware, Mr President, of the importance we attach to this political problem, since it was the timely initiative taken by my colleague Mrs Leroux which led this House to agree to hold a debate tomorrow morning on the latest onslaught of pollution to afflict the coast of Brittany. For all these reasons, reforming the law of the sea is clearly a very important stage in developing new international relations and in particular a new international economic order.

In this field of the law of the sea, as in the field of energy, or raw materials, we are convinced of the need for changes to grant the developing countries their rightful place and gradually move towards the extension of national jurisdiction on the part of coastal States to the zones adjacent to their coasts, at the expense of the old rule of the freedom of the seas, which is no more than the freedom of the strong to impose their law on the weak.

In view of the working methods that have been tried, involving the grouping together of States with varying interests, and in view of its objective of a comprehensive convention, this Conference confers on each State full responsibility for formulating demands which fit in exactly with its individual characteristics. Obviously France, because of the form of its coastline, with its 5 500 km of coast, because of the structure of its industry, 30 % of which is involved with the sea, particularly ship-building and ship-repairing — which it seems unlikely the Community can defend the deve-

lopment of at a conference in New York while organizing the running down of this industry in Brussels — and lastly because of the pattern of its external trade, three quarters of which is carried by sea, has major interests to defend in the context of this Third Conference.

We know how decisive our contact with the sea is in ensuring our economic independence, and we shall not slacken in our efforts to defend the existence and development of shipping under the French flag, which is threatened by the Community's restructuring policies and by the policy of enlargement. We regard it as most important that the specific nature of each country's own demands should be put forward clearly, without being restricted by the fragmentation of authority or of responsibilities which would result if the Community were to be represented at the Third Conference on the Law of the Sea and to speak on behalf of the nine Member States. Moreover, the marked lack of enthusiasm shown by a large number of countries with regard to participation by the Community alongside the national governments demonstrates the danger of debasing the commitments entered into by our respective national governments in the eyes of the international community.

Experience has shown that it is unrealistic and dangerous to deny national realities. Indeed, national realities are objectively of great importance. In the course of the Caracas conference in 1974, common-interest groups were formed on the basis of the objective interests of particular States. We thus saw the United Kingdom joining the group of 25 coastal States including Canada, Australia and Chile. The adoption by the countries of the Community of a common position at each stage of the negotiations, as proposed in Mr Gillot's report, can only mean restricting the scope for negotiation offered by the comprehensive nature of the future convention and accepting the lowest common denominator.

Finally, I should like to stress that I suspect this proposal conflicts with the provisions of Article 116 of the Treaty of Rome, which does not seem to me to authorize the Community to take joint action in connection with such international conferences. For this reason we are unable to support the conclusions of the Gillot report.

Personally, I must say that if I had at any time been tempted to vote in favour or to abstain, certain speeches with their NATO-oriented overtones or certain remarks which reminded me of the Cold War would have persuaded me otherwise. This is why we shall not be voting for Mr Gillot's motion, as it gives the Community new powers which we are not prepared to grant.

President. — I call Mr Klinkenborg to present the opinion of the Committee on Transport.

Mr Klinkenborg, draftsman of an opinion. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to begin by saying how much the Committee on Transport regrets the fact that we should now be discussing this subject on 13 March, when it has been known for a long time that the 9th session of the Conference on the Law of the Sea would be reopening in New York on 3 March. This too may be an indication of how the European Parliament sees its role, and I should like to associate myself with the criticism voiced by Mr Seeler, who came to the same conclusion in another report. A lot of things that are treated as a matter of urgency here seem to me to be no more than pseudo-urgent, and because of all the 'urgent' business, a lot of the things we should be talking about are in fact neglected. By so doing, we are effectively missing an opportunity to take a stand on the important questions which it is up to the Community to deal with in the interests of the people of the Community.

I should therefore like to express once again the Committee on Transport's regret that, despite a procedural motion, it was not possible to get this subject discussed during the February part-session. That would have been the last chance before the 9th session of the Third Conference on the Law of the Sea got under way to reiterate the views of the European Parliament on the questions down for discussion at the conference. Given the situation in Europe, the European Parliament's views inevitably differ on some points from those of the Member States.

The opinion I am here to present today is concerned exclusively with the transport aspects of the current Conference, and it is against that background that I should also like to comment on what has been said so far in this debate.

Firstly, let me point out most emphatically that the opinion of the Committee on Transport was arrived at unanimously.

Secondly, Mr Moreland knows very well, as a member of the Committee on Transport, that the committee has long been deeply concerned with the question of shipping safety, and that we have repeatedly pressed the Commission to give us answers to the questions which have emerged from our discussions in Committee.

Thirdly, the most important question the Community will have to tackle and resolve in the next few years is that of its relations with the State-trading countries. I take your point, Mr Moreland, but we must be extremely cautious in our approach to this problem, and we must tackle each point on its merits. This is not something we can deal with at one fell swoop.

It will take a great deal of hard work from the specialist committees before we can arrive at a policy which will do justice to the magnitude of this problem. I say this just by way of an aside since, as I said earlier, my

job is simply to present the opinion which is concerned with the transport aspect of the Conference on the Law of the Sea. I shall be brief, Mr President, because I am not convinced that what I have to say will be improved by constant repetition of this or that point.

We realize that shipping is the most difficult aspect of all in the search for a common European transport policy. The Committee on Transport's demands, set out as conclusions to the committee's opinion, for freedom of navigation and minimum restrictions on navigation in territorial waters and contiguous zones are, in the committee's opinion, indispensable conditions which the governments of all the Member States could, and indeed in their own interests must adopt. Consequently it is only logical for us to take the view that the Council of Ministers should authorize the European Community to take part in the Conference on the Law of the Sea. It is of prime importance to the merchant shipping fleets of the European Community that the Community as such should have a joint negotiating position to defend its interests in the formulation of documents with due regard for the freedom and security of shipping, energy conservation and the protection of the environment. Because of its economic strength and its dependence on trade, the European Community is highly vulnerable to a restrictive policy on shipping. The Community's shipping fleet accounts for almost 20 % of world merchant shipping — in terms of tonnage — and this share will be increased considerably by the accession of Greece. The Community therefore has a duty to protect its own interests, not only for reasons of transport policy, but also in view of the volume of its external trade. The need is all the more pressing because the maritime interests of the European Community have never before been so seriously threatened by the practices indulged in by certain maritime nations. Shipowners are having to contend with dumping, flag-of-convenience fleets and merchant fleets from the State-trading countries. The European Parliament has always, I think, been aware of this problem, and the Council would have been well advised to pay more attention to the many reports which have been produced on the subject.

In view of the terms of reference of this opinion, there is no need for me to go into the details of this complex subject yet again, especially as the members of the Committee on Transport gave high priority to the whole problem of shipping in their plan of work drawn up on 30 October 1979. We would simply reiterate that the Community's shipping interests must be safeguarded within the framework of the Third Conference on the Law of the Sea, and the first step must be for the Member States of the Community to show more solidarity. In specific terms, so long as the Commission is not responsible for conducting the negotiations, that means there must be regular consultations between the Member States and that a common position must be worked out on every single point, so that the Community can speak with one voice at the Conference. In the opinion of the Committee on

Klinkenborg

Transport, our aim must be to make the Community as such — as well as the individual Member States — a party to any future international conference on the law of the sea. The committee endorses Mr Gillot's report. As I said earlier, its opinion was reached unanimously, and we would beg the House's approval for it.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Ferri.

Mr Ferri, chairman of the Legal Affairs Committee. — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I am aware that at this late stage in the debate I cannot presume too much on the patience and the attention of those present in this House. But as I believe that everyone present here now, or at least the majority, are keenly interested in the problem which we are dealing with, I shall ask for a few more minutes of their attention.

I had intended to speak very briefly in order to give credit first of all to our rapporteur, Mr Gillot, for the excellent work he has done in committee and which he set out before us so brilliantly a short while ago in this House. Similarly, I wished to give thanks to everyone who has spoken, in the hope, which I too shared, that the conclusive vote on this report might be unanimous. But the speech which we listened to a short while ago on behalf of the French members of the Communist and Allies Group which was made by our friend Mr Chambeiron, obliges me — I think — precisely because of my capacity and my responsibility as chairman of the Legal Affairs Committee, to provide some clarification.

Mr Chambeiron is raising very sensitive issues when he says that he only wants to give us some idea of the contents of the report and one or two parts of the resolution which is justified by the report, but that in fact there is a definite tendency to give the Community responsibilities and tasks which go beyond the text of the treaties and which in a certain sense would undermine the independence and the autonomy of the individual Member States and the individual nations in the extremely difficult and sensitive negotiations which have been going on for some years at the Conference on the Law of the Sea.

Ladies and gentlemen, I want to make it quite clear — what is more this is stated very clearly in the report — that the rapporteur and, with him, the Committee, have taken no account of the differences between the various political positions, because it is well known that even within the political groups themselves — I think this is particularly true of the group to which I have the honour of belonging and we must not indulge in the weakness of attempting to hide the fact — there exist, with regard to the outlook for future development in the Community, significantly different atti-

tudes. There are some people whose concern is to adopt a rigorously restrictive interpretation of things, according to which we should not take the smallest step that goes beyond the letter of the treaty; there are others who believe in taking further steps towards European integration, not just as regards future amendments to the treaties but also as regards interpretation and application of the treaties themselves.

Subject to these differences, I wish to say that in this case we all reacted to the rapporteur's proposal from a point of view of rigorous respect for the letter and the spirit of the treaties. There is nothing in this resolution which is designed to provoke or to call for an increase in Community responsibilities to the detriment of the responsibilities of the Member States. What is more, I hope I may be allowed to point out that the fact that Mr Gillot belongs to the group of European Progressive Democrats ought, from this point of view, to put even the most sensitive and fastidious consciences at rest: a French representative of the group of European Progressive Democrats is hardly likely to suggest or recommend, let alone draw up, increases in Community responsibility to the detriment of the national states. In other words, there is absolutely no truth in any of this. I say this with complete frankness and cordiality, for the benefit of Mr Chambeiron.

What lies at the bottom of this request, which is repeated in our resolution, that the Community, as such, should be allowed to take part in the Conference on the Law of the Sea and subscribe to its conclusions? There is the simple fact that in the context of the treaties at present in force the Member States have abandoned various aspects of their sovereignty and have handed over various responsibilities to Community bodies. Consequently, as a result of a juridical principle which cannot be called into question, their responsibility in certain respects has been transferred to another body, namely to the Community. That is all there is to it.

Far be it from us — because it would be pure madness — to ask that the Conference on the Law of the Sea should be signed by the Community only. This is quite clear: the Member States remain responsible for those matters, which moreover still make up the majority, that are reserved for the sovereignty of the nation states; the Community on the other hand is responsible for those matters which have been assigned to it. And I am not trying to mislead you, because all this is clearly spelt out in the report. When we come to the problems of fisheries, transport, the fight against pollution and those problems which in a commercial context would derive from the hypothesis of the exploitation of the mineral resources of the sea-bed, we are entering a sphere, which, according to the treaties, according to the interpretation of them that has been made by the European Court of Justice, and by this Parliament itself, is the preserve of the Community.

This, therefore, is the purport of our resolution; we

Ferri

have no intention of straying from it; here is the juridical and political basis of these proposals.

Ladies and gentlemen, I should also like to say that I have heard many people express the regret that this discussion is taking place at a time when the conference has already begun. Obviously, it would have been preferable to be able to discuss the topic and vote on it during the February part-session. However it is not a tragedy if we can only get down to it today. If only the conference were about to come to an end! That would mean that the serious problems, which are still open, were about to be solved, but we know that more time will be needed. So our attitude, though it is not aiming at any unattainable goals, which in any case would be illusory, is justifiable and appropriate. It is in line with the attitude that Parliament adopted — and this is not something dating from yesterday as the rapporteur reminded us — when it voted a resolution dated 23 May 1977 relating to a detailed report by Mr Bangemann, in which we find substantially the same ideas and the same motives that have been expounded here today in the Gillot report, which — permit me to remind you, ladies and gentlemen — constitutes an extremely balanced view of things compared with the clash of national interests and present problems.

It has been said — and allow me to repeat this as a conclusion to my few brief comments — that significant progress has already been achieved. An agreement has already been reached in terms of customary law on some problems, even though they have not been the subject of particular conventions and such an agreement is binding in international law: for example, the 12 mile limit for territorial waters and the 200 mile limit for exclusive economic space. The problem that really remains open is the problem of the sea-bed because, along with the conclusions which have already been achieved, we have safeguarded — and our resolution provides an express record of this — the principle of freedom of navigation even in straits, a subject of long standing polemics and disputes in the international law of the sea.

What is the core of the problem of the sea-bed? The question is to reconcile the demands and the expectations of the developing countries. The poor countries, the countries of the Third World, with the exigencies and the interests of the industrialized countries. What is the role that the Community ought to play in this conflict of interests? It must be a balancing role, a role inspired by wisdom, which will make these legitimate demands its own as far as that may be possible. This conference started out from a great idea, it was inspired by great expectations — which were perhaps, like all great expectations, more generous and more ample than may be consistent with reality — in other words, that these new resources, which could only be considered susceptible of being mined relatively recently, these sea-bed resources, should be organized as the common birthright of humanity in such a way as to channel the income from them to the developing

countries, to those countries that need to improve their living conditions and their living standards.

This will not be an easy thing to do, but I believe — and this is the purport of our resolution and this is the line that the Community has followed — that here we must combine the realization of a supranational authority, which would follow these guidelines with the indispensable support needed to achieve concrete results, with the technology and the resources of the industrialized countries, which are already capable of beginning the exploitation of these resources.

We know that though the conference is, unfortunately, still dragging on, there are already some countries which are thinking about devising national laws to protect and control the exploitation of the sea-bed by nationalized companies. This is also the background to the hopes that we may be able to find a common position for all Member States as regards the topics that come within their jurisdiction. This is also legitimate; we are not talking about setting up binding rules; we are only saying: within the limits of what is right and reasonable, within the limits of what is possible and even in cases where the authority to discuss and stipulate has remained within the preserve of the national states, let us attempt to devise common attitudes. Here I see nothing that infringes the Treaty. On the contrary, here once again we are acting in accordance with the letter and the spirit of the Treaty.

This, then, ladies and gentlemen, is why I believe that even against the background of the different points of view, all legitimate and useful which have been expressed in this House by those who have introduced the votes in favour of the motion by the various Groups, we can still vote for this resolution with absolute peace of mind and with clear consciences, in the conviction that Parliament is remaining within the limits of its own powers and is not setting itself aims which exceed its authority but, on the contrary, intends to make a contribution which will help to show the way for the other Community institutions that are directly involved in this conference, just as it hopes to promote the achievement of an agreement which will certainly mark a significant stage in the development of international law and cooperation amongst nations.

President. — I call Mr Josselin.

Mr Josselin. — (*F*) A little over three centuries ago the system of enclosures was established which was to revolutionize agriculture, first in Britain and then in Europe. I believe that we are today witnessing a transformation on the same scale in the realm of the Law of the Sea.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, this is a vast subject which unfortunately we have only been able to touch on this evening. I hope we shall have the chance

Josselin

to come back to this subject with a little more time for discussion, in the light of a report at least as comprehensive as the one submitted by Mr Gillot.

It is a subject whose very title reveals all its complexity: 'the law of the sea' is in itself a contradiction, since up to now the rule has always been thought to be the freedom of the seas.

Everything about this subject also indicates that it is a splendid one for us in the European Parliament to discuss. This is certainly true as regards the geographical area it involves. Need I remind you that, if we calculate the size of the economic zone, the seas surrounding the European Community — and even more so in future with enlargement to include Spain and Portugal — make it the largest maritime region in the world: 22 million square kilometres!

It is also true as regards the multiplicity of subjects and of sectors involved. There is the fisheries question, and Mr Battersby was right to remind us how important this is and how much the huge problem of the extinction of certain species deserves our attention. Then there is the problem of transport by sea, and as one of the Members for Brittany I am unfortunately in a position to know how much caution must be exercised when it comes to transport. I will not go further into this question this evening, since, in addition to the motion for a resolution tabled by Mrs Le Roux, two motions which I have tabled will be discussed tomorrow morning. The major transport problem is of course that of safety. Then there is also the problem of research — and here too the rapporteur did well to emphasize the need for a pooling of our resources. And then again there is the huge issue of how to exploit the wealth of the sea bed.

When faced with all these questions we are forced to admit — I say this in all friendliness to the representative of the Communists and their allies — that they can only be tackled on a Community basis. I was among those who supported the proposal for the Community in its own right to be a signatory to the Convention, but I would have liked to make Community participation even clearer by choosing a number of representatives from our midst to go and represent, exactly as their national counterparts are doing, the European Parliament at this conference in New York.

Perhaps it is still not too late, as long as there are no budgetary problems. Since all the national parliaments have designated representatives to attend, why should the European Parliament not follow suit?!

In fact, over and above the fisheries question — and if we wish to have a Community policy on fisheries, then it is obvious that we must act as a Community in discussing the problems of fisheries on an international scale — there is the need for Europe to set an example in giving institutional form to the notion of the region

in matters relating to the sea. I mean that we must replace the conflict now opposing the 77 (the developing countries) and the industrialized countries, and that between coastal states and landlocked states, or coastal states and maritime powers, by the notion of the maritime region.

I would hope that within these regions multilateral cooperation might develop, enabling us to go beyond our present conflicts which, as we well know, are capable of preventing any progress towards accepting the rule of law in this matter.

What I would like is for the Community to be on the side of the coastal states. The notion of maritime powers, was, we must admit, based on the idea of force. I would like the Community to lead the way in defending the rule of law. And when I refer to the law, I use the term in its strictest sense. I must warn those amongst you who want to rely simply on common law against the example to be found in so many westerners: common law meant freedom, the right to the rancher to let his cattle run the farmer's corn and that sort of thing.

I would like us to give a proper legal dimension to this conflict. Common law can never give rise to an international authority founded on the principles of democracy; however, we cannot do without such an authority to ensure that the rules of the game are obeyed.

We would also warn the Community against the danger of seeing the sea bed taken over by the multinational companies (which is why we must have this international authority), as well as against the danger of transferring technology on the basis of our own needs rather than those of the developing countries, which is a major problem. For example, it should in fact be possible to process the nodules of various metals in countries near to where they are to be found — if not, what is the point of all our speeches on hunger in the world?

These are the few brief points I wished to make after the many which have already been made to encourage this House to adopt the Gillot report.

I too would like to say in conclusion that I hope — or more than that, I am certain — that this is a great task which can be guaranteed for the defence of the common heritage of mankind, for peace and — why not? — also more simply for the building of Europe.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Lyngé.

Mr Lyngé. — *(DK)* Mr President, as the representative of a country which is almost totally dependent on the sea, I must agree with the many speakers here this

Lynge

afternoon who have said that this question of the law of the sea is very important. I will not speak at great length, I will merely very briefly draw your attention to a problem which I see was not covered by Mr Gillot's excellent report, and, as far as I know, has not received any official attention whatsoever in certain quarters, including the United Nations.

I am referring to the problem of the icecaps. Around the South Pole and the North Pole, the sea is covered with ice for the larger part of the year. The fact is that two thirds of the country I represent lies north of the Arctic Circle and a large part of the Community sea around Greenland is covered with ice for most of the year. This raises the following question. Is sea which is covered by ice for most of the year and is frequented by hunters, i.e. people who live from what they find on or under the ice, is this ice sea or is it an extension of the land which temporarily recedes? This is an extremely pressing problem for us. I should like to remind this House that the most northerly people in the world, the Polar Eskimos in Thule, are citizens of the Community and that their problems should be discussed here too.

The Canadian Government has, over the course of a few years, planned an enormous gas extraction project in North Canada and has started work on planning a project known as the 'Arctic Pilot Project' involving the extraction of natural gas off Bylot Island north of Melville Island and transporting it in tankers via the North-West Passage which is continually covered with ice. The largest tankers in the world will be used and, according to the current plans, they will be travelling along the west coast of Greenland through Community waters with a cargo of refrigerated, liquid natural gas with an explosive power which, according to experts, would correspond to that of the bomb used at Hiroshima. This is a very large undertaking which Canada has taken on.

Regardless of the fact that there will probably be no accidents of this kind, the implementation of a plan of this kind would mean that the Polar Eskimos' ice-covered areas would continually be ploughed up. Several people here today have mentioned the free right of navigation and said that this must be upheld. However, in view of the importance attributed to agriculture in this House, I think I might reasonably ask those here who understand agricultural matters whether farmers would accept a right of navigation which would mean that a tanker could come and plough through their fields, and the icecap in the most northerly part of the Community is to the Eskimos what a field is to a farmer. This is a problem which, as far as I know, has not been discussed at all.

I should like to request the Commission to set up an expert committee to look into this aspect of the matter and report to this House, the responsibility of which extends to the Polar Eskimos, the most northerly inhabitants of the world and Community citizens.

This is of vital significance to my country, and I shall say no more concerning the further consequences which could result from a negative outcome. We will leave this to a future occasion.

President. — I call Mr Giolitti.

Mr Giolitti, member of the Commission. — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, as we were reminded by Mr Gillot, whom I should also like to congratulate on the excellent contribution he has made to the problem which we are concerned with today, and as was also emphasized by the various speakers who have preceded me, this third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea is the occasion of wide-ranging negotiations, the aim of which is to re-define the rights of various categories of countries with regard to sea areas.

The evident and undeniable sluggishness with which these negotiations, which began in 1973, are progressing, can be explained in terms of the difficulty of drawing up general rules in an area where the interests of the various countries involved all clash with one another. The aim of the negotiations is to conclude the job of creating a new legal framework, valid for the whole world, to act as the basis for a new economic order in this vast and complex area. On the one hand, various marine interests must be safeguarded and at the same time the jurisdiction of seaboard states over the economic zone situated beyond their territorial waters, which are likely to extend to a distance of 200 miles, must be acknowledged; on the other hand, technological progress, by multiplying the possible uses of the marine environment, will make it possible for the states in question to take part in the exploitation of the sea-bed resources contained in the international zone. The negotiations are going ahead with the aim of concluding a consolidated text, whereas in 1958 and 1960 individual conventions were agreed upon, separated into the various areas connected with the law of the sea. The aim of arriving at one single convention cannot be separated from the need to achieve a consensus on the final text. A consensus has already been found in respect of one or two areas of the convention — I am thinking in particular of fisheries and marine pollution — but, as has already been pointed out here, the balance of interests is very precarious and any modification of this complex edifice could lead to a collapse. Nevertheless, the prospects facing us are in general positive. The international Community shows itself well aware of the need to succeed in devising a genuinely new law of the sea.

Since June 1976, the European Community and the Member States have made this great effort to participate in achieving this ambitious objective on the basis of the guidelines drawn up by the Council of Ministers. The steps taken by the Community are at present intended on the one hand to obtain acceptance of its rights to take part in the future conference in those

Giolitti

areas which come within its own remit as a community and, on the other hand, they are aimed at attaining common positions on the part of the Member States with regard to many of the topics dealt with by the conference. On various occasions the Parliament has made its own contribution to provide a favourable background for consultation amongst the institutions and the report that we are discussing today, which I hope will be approved tomorrow, confirms this reality, that is to say, this commitment and this contribution by the Parliament.

So much for the very general aspects of the matter. I should now like to give some detailed answers to the questions which were put to the Commission concerning one or two specific points. Concerning points 1 and 2 of the Motion for a Resolution, I should like to point out that a satisfactory coordination of the Community and the Member States in the application of the directives transmitted by the Council to the Commission on July 1976 resulted from the previous sessions of the conference. On the basis of these guidelines, the Community and the Member States have made an effort to arrive at a common position regarding each stage of the work, in particular in the following sectors: acceptance of the principle of the creation of an economic zone of 200 miles, extension of the continental shelf beyond the 200 miles, efficacy of the international sea-bed authority, representation of the Community in the executive bodies of the international sea-bed authority and in the operational bodies created by it, measures designed to prevent the creation of monopolies or dominant positions in the exploitation of the sea-bed; finally, a system of compulsory arbitration of disagreements and controversies.

With regard to point 5 of the resolution, let me remind you that the Commission and the Member States adopt a common position with regard to the safeguarding and the guaranteeing of freedom of navigation. The freedom is guaranteed on the high seas by Article 87 of the informal text of the Convention. With regard to territorial waters and the exclusive economic zone, the Community and the Member States have adopted a common attitude in order to see that the powers of control and sanction conferred upon the sea-board states are in harmony with the principle of freedom of navigation. In order to protect this principle, the Community and the Member States intend in due course to ratify the maintenance and the observation of the principle, by asking for it to be inserted into the preamble to the future Convention.

With reference to point 7, on the basis of the Council's guidelines of July 1976, the Council will ask to be allowed to participate, along side the Member States, in the management of the international sea-bed authority. The management of the common inheritance of mankind will be based on the principle of the so-called parallel system. This system is conceived with the aim of establishing non-discriminatory access to

the exploitation of the international zone, which may also be managed at the same time by the administrative body of the Authority, as also by private bodies or state-owned bodies based in the various countries which have signed the Convention.

As regards the sensitive and sometimes serious problem of pollution — point 8 of the draft resolution — let me remind you that the negotiations on this topic concluded with a consensus agreement at the conference and re-opening of negotiations in respect of this matter is not expected. The present text of the Convention sets out the ways and means of cooperation on a worldwide and regional scale, accompanied by the necessary guarantees for the Community and for its Member States.

Finally, a reference has been made to the problem of access to the international Court of Justice at the Hague. Apropos of this, let me point out that access to this court is limited to states, in accordance with Article 34 of the Statute of the court.

These, Mr President, are points which obviously do not go to the bottom of all the matters dealt with in this debate, but with regard to which it seemed to me that it was my duty and my responsibility to provide some further elucidation on behalf of the Commission.

(Applause)

President — I call Mr Gillot.

Mr Gillot, *rapporteur*. — (F) Mr President, I shall not talk for long, at this late hour, but I think I should reply to some of the observations which the different speakers have made. I welcome the broad consensus which has emerged from the different speeches and I thank the speakers who were so good as to praise the report before you.

I deplore all the more the attitude Mr Chambeiron has seen fit to take on behalf of the French Communists and Allies. In my second and very short statement, I shall give him pride of place, although I am not certain that he will like that. He mentioned the need to create demilitarized zones and quoted the example of the Mediterranean. I am not sure whether he is not, by this very means, creating areas which would be unprotected, and I am not sure whether he is not thereby creating divisions which might very well be regretted later. He was very supercilious on the question of national prerogatives. Mr Ferri anticipated me by pointing out that I could provide a certain guarantee in this respect as I belong to the Gaullist Group. Finally, I note with pleasure that the attitude taken by Mr Chambeiron, while inconsistent with those he takes on behalf of his Party in other areas, is such as to fully confirm my own idea of patriotism, which is not sectarian, but pragmatic, and which recognizes the needs of the Community when necessary.

Gillot

I shall now come, very briefly, to the remarks made by the other speakers, who were all so good as to say they approved of this report.

I note that, in the main, they put the stress on the differences in emphasis in the report. It is in fact a question — and this is the important thing — of striking a balance between the essential concepts of freedom of navigation, research and fishing, which should not be the freedom of the fittest, and the new concepts of appropriation, of pooling world resources and of recognizing and guaranteeing the legitimate rights of the developing countries. This balance is difficult to reach, but we must try to reach it. As the representative of the Commission said, this is an ambitious goal.

One of our colleagues feared that our contribution, coming perhaps at the eleventh hour, would have no effect. I believe that once determination is shown, as we shall show ours, it is never useless. Ultimately, it will have a noticeable effect. In conclusion, I would like to remind you of this saying, which seems very appropriate to me: it is not because things are difficult that we do not dare, it is because we do not dare, that they seem difficult. I hope that we shall demonstrate that we are capable of attaining ambitious goals for the good of mankind.

(Applause)

President. — The debate is closed.

The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote during the next voting time.

20. *Agenda for next sitting*

President. — The next sitting will be held tomorrow, on Friday, 14 March 1980 with the following agenda:

9 a.m.:

- procedure without report
- vote on several requests for urgent procedure
- vote on two requests for early votes
- 10.30 a.m.: Voting time
- motion for a resolution by the Committee on Budgets on the budgetary timetable
- motion for a resolution by Mr Spinelli on air links with Strasbourg
- motion for a resolution by Mrs Maij-Weggen on discrimination against women
- motion for a resolution by Mr Penders on Zimbabwe
- two motions for resolutions on the oil slick in Brittany
- Seal report on trade with Cyprus (without debate)
- Seal report on negotiations between the EEC and Cyprus
- Joint debate on the Helms, Quin, Nielsen, Enright, Woltjer, Provan and Kirk reports on fisheries
- *End of sitting*: Voting time

The sitting is closed.

(The sitting was closed at 10.55 p.m.)