

Annex

Official Journal

of the

European Communities

No 1-268

English edition

Debates of the European Parliament

1981-1982 Session

Report of Proceedings

from 10 to 13 March 1981

Europe House, Strasbourg

Contents

Tuesday, 10 March 1981	1
Opening of session, p. 1 — Minutes, p. 1 — Revision of Rules of Procedure, p. 2 — Welcome, p. 30 — Committees, p. 30 — Agenda of part-session of 23-26 March 1981, p. 32 — Disabled persons, p. 32 — Next sitting, p. 67	
Wednesday, 11 March 1981	68
Minutes, p. 69 — Urgent procedure, p. 70 — Welcome, p. 76 — Urgent procedure (contd), p. 77 — Disabled persons (contd), p. 79 — Sugar, p. 89 — EEC financial and budgetary policy, p. 106 — Question Time, p. 120 — Next sitting, p. 133 — Annex, p. 134	
Thursday, 12 March 1981	161
Minutes, p. 162 — Urgent procedure, p. 163 — Western Sahara (contd), p. 167 — Lomé Convention and Zimbabwe, p. 178 — Stabex, p. 182 — EEC financial and budgetary policy (contd), p. 190 — Youth activities, p. 196 — Welcome, p. 197 — Youth activities (contd), p. 197 — Linking work and training, p. 209 — Date and place of part-sessions, p. 213 — Votes, p. 215 — Linking work and training (contd), p. 227 — EEC-Romania relations, p. 236 — Compensation for victims of violence, p. 241 — UK immigration controls, p. 244 — Community apple-market, p. 247 — Wine-growers in the Community, p. 250 — Urgent procedure, p. 253 — Next sitting, p. 253	
Friday, 13 March 1981	254
Minutes, p. 255 — Agenda, p. 256 — Date and place of part-sessions (contd), p. 257 — Urgent procedure, p. 265 — Votes, p. 270 — Council decisions on transport, p. 277 — Attempted <i>coup d'état</i> in Spain, p. 284 — Next sittings, p. 295 — Minutes, p. 295 — Adjournment, p. 295	

NOTE TO READER

Appearing at the same time as the English edition are editions in the six other official languages of the Communities: Danish, German, Greek, French, Italian and Dutch. The English edition contains the original texts of the interventions in English and an English translation of those made in other languages. In these cases there are, after the name of the speaker, the following letters, in brackets, to indicate the language spoken: *(DK)* for Danish, *(D)* for German, *(EL)* for Greek, *(F)* for French, *(I)* for Italian and *(NL)* for Dutch.

The original texts of these interventions appear in the edition published in the language spoken.

SITTING OF TUESDAY, 10 MARCH 1981

1. Opening of annual session	1	7. Economic, social and vocational integration of disabled people — Report by Ms Clwyd (Committee on Social Affairs and Employment) — (Doc. 1-868/80):	
2. Approval of the minutes	1	Ms Clwyd, rapporteur	32
3. General revision of the Rules of Procedure — Report by Mr Luster (Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions) — (Doc. 1-926/80):		Mr De Graaf (Council); Mr Oehler (S); Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti (EPP); Mr Spencer (ED); Mrs De March (COM); Mrs Nielsen (L); Mr Vié (EPD); Mr Pesmazoglou (Non-attached); Mr Pannella (Technical Coordination Group); Mr Moreland, draftsman of an opinion; Mr Dalziel, draftsman of an opinion; Mr Peters; Mr Henckens; Mr Prag; Mr Kappos; Mrs Pruvot; Miss De Valera; Mr Vandemeulebroucke; Mr Frangos; Mr Patterson; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mr Patterson, draftsman of an opinion; Mr Richard (Commission); Mrs Viehoff; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Miss Brookes; Mrs Hammerich; Mrs Dekker	35
Mr Luster, rapporteur	2	Point of order: Mr von der Vring	63
Mrs Vayssade (S); Mr Fischbach (EPP)	5	Mr Boyes; Mr Bourmias; Mr Ghergo; Mr Ceravolo; Mr Coutsocheras; Mr Gondicas	63
Point of order: Mr Pannella	9	8. Agenda for next sitting	67
Mr Patterson (ED); Mr D'Angelosante (COM); Mr Galland (L); Mr Vié (EPD); Mr Capanna (Technical Coordination Group); Mrs Dekker; Mr Andriessen (Commission); Mr Sieglerschmidt; Mr Herman; Mr Price; Mr Chambeiron; Mr Vandemeulebroucke; Mr Romualdi; Mr Rogers; Mrs Boot; Mr Prout; Mr Pannella; Mr Gondicas; Mr Adam; Mr Tyrrell; Mr Luster	9		
4. Welcome	30		
5. Membership of committees:			
Mr Pannella; Mr De Goede	31		
6. Preliminary draft agenda for the part-session from 23 to 26 March 1981:			
Mr Pannella; Mr Linde; Mr Enright	32		

IN THE CHAIR: MR MØLLER

Vice-President

(The sitting opened at 9 a.m.)

President. — The sitting is open.

1. *Opening of annual session*

President. — Pursuant to Rule 1 of the Rules of Procedure, I declare the 1981/82 session of the European Parliament open.

2. *Approval of the minutes*

President. — The minutes of proceedings of yesterday's sitting have been distributed.

Are there any comments?

The minutes are approved.

I would point out that the vote on the motion for a resolution tabled by six political groups concerning the renewal of the appointments of committee members (Doc. 1-976/80) was postponed yesterday until 3 p.m. today so that the Bureau might consider the candidatures.

3. *General revision of the Rules of Procedure*

President. — The next item is the report drawn up by Mr Luster on a general revision of the Rules of Procedure of the European Parliament (Doc. 1-926/80).

I call Mr Luster.

Mr Luster, rapporteur — (G) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I will present, on behalf of the Committee on the rules of Procedure and Petitions, the report on the general revision of the Rules of Procedure of the European Parliament. As you will remember, the Committee was first charged by the Enlarged Bureau with drawing up such a document in 1979. It has taken a year and a half for the work, whose results are now before you, to be accomplished. The Committee defined its final position on the matter on 12 February of this year.

During this year and a half we all became acquainted with the reasons which make such a revision of our Rules of Procedure necessary. We are all aware that the number of delegates in the directly-elected Parliament is more than double that of the previous Parliament, having increased from 198 to 434. We know too that the work load of Parliament has increased, not only because of the increase in membership but also because most of us today do not have the double mandate which was formerly obligatory. Direct elections have thus fired us all with new energy as far as European policy is concerned, and we feel ourselves especially committed to progress in the eyes of our electors. This has not merely doubled the amount of Parliament's work; it has created a snowballing effect which has been apparent in both oral and written activities, in plenary session and in committee.

The consequences, taken all together, have produced an untenable situation. The plenary session can no longer deal with the agenda which it establishes for itself; items on the agenda are put off from sitting to sitting; many questions were dealt with in committee in November of last year and are only coming before the House now, for there was no time for them earlier. We were held up by many requests for urgent procedure, whose justification should not be disputed but which took up time not only in the discussion itself but also beforehand, when the urgency of the issues was being decided upon. Because of the overflow of material we often experience irritation over the many time-consuming procedural debates. The strong, and in themselves, praiseworthy political commitments of Members often lead to explanations of vote. All these factors render the time schedule of the parliamentary agenda incalculable. Questions which interest and concern the public or the voters most closely are frequently dealt with at awkward times. Someone who comes to hear about a certain item on Wednesday's agenda can wait until Friday and the debate which he came to attend will still not have taken place. Journalists complain that they cannot follow our work

properly. Everything is in disorder, overwork is the rule, and discontent and frustration are widespread.

How can this situation be resolved? Parliamentarians cannot put in additional working time. Already all of us, when we take our work seriously, are heavily overburdened. We have the group week, then the plenary session week, then the two weeks in committee, not including time for delegations and study. When can we turn our attention to matters in our constituencies and answer the letters and inquiries from our electors? When can the electors be attended to? And — if I may — when can the family receive its due? When can we enjoy our leisure time, which is devoted not only to amusement but also to calm reflection? We have no alternative but to reduce the burden of the plenary session. There is no sense in leaving ideas hanging in midair without finding the time to discuss them fully. Perhaps the Armenian proverb can help us here: 'What does the extent of the universe matter to me if my shoes are too tight?' I believe we have all recognized the nature of these 'tight shoes', and from this springs our decision to effect a general revision of the Rules of Procedure.

What, specifically, do we suggest? Firstly, to abandon the 'do-it-yourself' Rules of the old Parliament and restructure the Rules of Procedure according to the so-called Patterson Plan. The old rules had their merits, which should not be underestimated, but looking back we can see that they are not carved out of one block, and it can do no harm for them to be better organized through restructuring. We have furnished an index for the draft which makes it easier to locate specific rules in their former context. This does not make the index which has been in use up to now superfluous, but rather serves as an additional help. We decided that we didn't want to revise merely for the sake of revising, so we retained the parts that had proved effective. We also made no changes where the consent of the majority of the committee members was in doubt: for example, proposals concerning Parliament's place of work, determination of the competences of the President, the Bureau, and the Enlarged Bureau, methods of choosing vice-presidents, etc.

What are our specific suggestions? In order to ease the burden of the plenary session and its agenda, we have changed the procedure without report and the simplified procedure as they are in the current Rules so that they can be resorted to more frequently.

Our committee further suggests the introduction of a new procedure on the Italian model, whereby the plenary session's decision-making powers can in specific cases be delegated to the competent committee when there are technical points without general relevance to be decided upon. It was important here to guarantee the rights of the minorities, and this has been done. There were some doubts in committee as to whether this procedure was in accordance with the Treaties. We looked into the matter and the majority is

Luster

of the opinion that it is, and that the suggestion can safely be made here.

In addition, we have adopted from the British parliamentary experience the written procedure for motions for resolutions, and we have also suggested a procedure whereby a Member can move that his motion for a resolution be entered in a register where it can be undersigned by all the other members. If at least half of the members do undersign it, the resolution is forwarded to the institutions named by the author. There was opposition to the adoption of such a procedure, since it is foreign to most of us, except for our British colleagues, but the committee has taken courage and decided that it should be given a trial. The Rules of Procedure are not, after all, written for eternity. If further experience shows that we need to make other changes, we can always do so, though not in an arbitrary way. We feel, however, that we ought to experiment with this registration procedure.

A problem with which we have repeatedly concerned ourselves is that of urgency. We have tried to find a new approach to this issue. We propose that debates be held on topical and urgent questions in order to deal with issues which are not matters for consultation. The committee proposes replacing the existing urgent procedure with provisions for the allocation during each part-session of one or two periods of time totalling a maximum of three hours for debates on urgent and topical matters. A group of at least 21 members may move that a certain subject be discussed during this debate. Such a request must be accompanied by a motion for a resolution. The subjects to be dealt with in these debates would be chosen by the President and the group leaders. A group of at least 21 members may, however, object to the discussion of an issue or to the fact that an issue has not been chosen for discussion. The majority of the committee believes that this procedure would ensure that Parliament would set aside time for urgent debates when drawing up the agenda, and that discussions on urgent procedure as such would not take up the Parliament's time. In this way we would no longer waste time in trying to decide whether or not to discuss something, and the agenda would not be subject to continual amendment. The urgent procedure for consultations should remain the same. Once the above-mentioned procedure for debates on topical and urgent matters is introduced, the committee believes that the existing urgent procedure should apply.

In the context of the conduct of sittings, the committee proposes that the President and the group chairmen be given the task of preparing the draft agenda, as it is only by constant consultation between the political groups that repeated objections to the agenda can be avoided. The committee has learned with satisfaction that the President has recently resumed the practice of regularly inviting committee chairmen to a meeting to discuss problems relating to the agenda.

As far as the explanations of vote are concerned, the committee proposes that requests for explanations of vote must be submitted to the President before the commencement of final voting. (See Article 80 of the report.) The committee also proposes that no further requests should be accepted once the first explanation of vote has begun. This is intended to avoid any snowballing of explanations of vote. The committee has also made provision for members who do not choose to make an oral explanation of vote to submit a short written explanation instead. It is further proposed that speaking time for explanations of vote be limited to no more than one and a half minutes, with each political group allowed to make an explanation of vote of no more than three minutes.

We have also dealt with procedural motions, called 'points of order'. It has often been shown that this is an imprecise definition of what the author really wants. It may mean what in English is called a 'point of order' or what in English is called a 'procedural motion'. The member may want to make an observation on the agenda, on which there can be no debate — it is a matter which concerns merely the observation itself, which the member brings to the attention of the President, who then decides whether it is justified or not — or he can make a procedural motion. We have dealt with such procedural motions in Articles 82 through 88 inclusive, which should clarify this point.

The committee has dealt at length with the rules concerning the consultation procedure. The Treaties give Parliament limited but specific powers in the area of legislation. This was recently underlined in the judgment of the European Court of Justice on the isoglucose case. In cases where Parliament has a right to be consulted the Council cannot make a decision on a Commission proposal without first hearing Parliament's opinion. Parliament's opinion is not of course binding on either the Commission or the Council. However, Parliament must assume that neither of the other institutions wishes to make decisions which are not supported by the majority of the directly-elected representatives of the people of the Community. It is against this background that the committee has proposed a number of innovations in the consultation procedure as operated by Parliament itself. These are intended to ensure that Parliament will at least know the Commission's views on its proposed amendments before it adopts its opinion, and that the Council will explain why it has chosen to depart from this opinion. Because of time limitations I must ask you to examine more closely the written remarks relative to Articles 32 and 35-39.

The committee then considered the question of the quorum. Although many arguments were presented in favour of setting a lower figure for the quorum, the committee has proposed that the current provisions be retained, that is, a quorum should be considered present when one third of the members of the Assembly are in the Chamber. It was pointed out that in the

Luster

British Parliament, which has a real legislative function, the presence of forty members is sufficient to constitute a quorum. The committee has however decided to leave things unchanged in this regard. It has, on the other hand, been proposed that we delete the provision whereby at least thirty members present may move that the vote shall be valid only if a majority of the members of Parliament has taken part in it. Furthermore the committee stresses in a new paragraph that those members who ask for the quorum to be ascertained are required to take part in the vote and not to leave the Chamber; this puts an end to the deplorable practices we have all witnessed in the past. We would like, too, to introduce the secret ballot on matters other than elections or appointments, and we propose this to you. Voting by secret ballot must be requested by at least one fifth of the members of Parliament and where appropriate takes priority over a request for a vote by roll call.

We have proposed to committees and delegations that members of committees and committee chairmen hold office for two and a half years, as do the President, Vice-President, and Quaestors of the European Parliament. As regards substitute members, we have proposed in Article 93 an arrangement which by and large reflects current practice, though it corresponds to no provisions in the Rules of Procedure. In other provisions — Rules 95, 86, and 96 — we propose for the first time the setting-up of ‘committees of inquiry’ and of a committee for the verification of credentials and the grounding of the already existing interparliamentary delegations in the Rules of Procedure.

The committee has proposed only one change in the budgetary provisions, namely that we dispense with the vote on the draft budget as a whole in Annex 1. This vote is not provided for in the Treaties, and it has often led to difficulties during voting. We know, however, that the budget committee wishes for budgetary issues to be dealt with in the future in a particular way according to other provisions contained in the Treaties and in the Rules of Procedure. We have been informed of this wish too late to be able to examine it and to make appropriate proposals.

The committee has proposed a series of new provisions for dealing with petitions. These would allow the committee responsible for the Rules of Procedure and Petitions to organize hearings with the participation of the author of the petition and other interested parties. Provision is made for a report every six months to Parliament and particularly a report on actions taken by the Council or the Commission in connection with petitions forwarded by Parliament.

In Rule 8, the committee, despite reservations on the part of a number of its members, has proposed guidelines for the introduction of special rules of conduct for members, on the basis of those already present in

the parliaments of some Member States and of what had been recommended by a previous parliament.

The committee has not proposed any changes in the competences of the various parliamentary bodies. It is waiting until the discussions between the Bureau and the Committee on Budgets on the procedure for Parliament’s budget have been concluded. However, in accordance with the wishes of some of its members, the committee does suggest that members should be able to put questions concerning the work of the Bureau, the Enlarged Bureau, and the Quaestors. (See Rule 25 for this proposal.)

Similarly the committee is not proposing any changes in the procedure for electing the Bureau, although a number of members advocated a provision whereby all Member States are guaranteed representation in the offices of President, Vice-President, and Quaestor. This has been proposed, but in the form of a recommendation — as has been the case in the past — rather than through an explicit provision. We trust, however, that a wise Parliament will ensure that each Member State is adequately represented in these positions.

Finally, the committee has included in its proposal considerations regarding the amendments which were made available to it. I refer you here to the written remarks.

Mr President, let me conclude by saying that the work of the committee has not been easy. It has required much patience and a willingness to compromise, but the patience shown by all sides has finally been rewarded. The committee presents to you a text which, I am glad to say, has received the unanimous approval of the committee. And that, in matters as politically controversial as these, is a rare occurrence indeed.

Here I would like to offer my sincere thanks to all the members of the committee, especially the Chairman, who had no easy task, the vice-chairmen, the group members, and their leaders, whose persistent objections obliged us to formulate our opinions as clearly as possible. I thank the interpreters and the translators, who were obliged to work especially hard. I thank the secretariat of the committee, without whose help we would have had many difficulties. Above all I thank the Danish committee secretary, Mr Rømer, who made an extraordinary commitment to the job and was of great service to us. Finally, I thank you, Mr President, and you all, ladies and gentlemen, for hearing my report so patiently. Our committee, after a hard struggle, did arrive at a unanimous vote, and I hope that the House will follow our example and come to an agreement, on the acceptance of the proposal now before you, acting not from emotion or uncalculated enthusiasm but according to an intelligent analysis.

(Applause)

President. — I should like to associate the Bureau with your thanks. The Socialist Group has the floor.

Mrs Vayssade. — (F) Mr President, I do not believe that in September, when we decided to resume the general review of the Rules of Procedure after the failure of the first Luster report in July, even the most optimistic among us thought that we would reach this stage so quickly, and I welcome the fact that this first report on a general revision is before us today.

The July setback has been helpful to us, regardless of the basic problems it has caused, since I believe that it gave rise to the working method we adopted in the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions and to the spirit in which this general revision has been tackled. What was agreed at that time has been, I feel, respected throughout these months of work. It has been a spirit of compromise. We considered a relationship based exclusively on majority and minority forces conflicted with what the Assembly's Rules of Procedure must be. We therefore aimed at the widest possible measure of agreement throughout our work. And whenever we felt such agreement would not be possible, we refrained from revising the disputed rule. This was the spirit demonstrated by the Socialist Group in the committee, and I hope that a spirit of compromise will also govern our analysis of the amendments tabled and that we will arrive at solutions acceptable to the vast majority of this Parliament, because a set of Rules of Procedure is meant for the vast majority of a Parliament and for all its members.

We have thus reached the end of a first general review of these Rules of Procedure. I repeat: a first review, because we do not claim to have completed the work. Every group has given way on something it considered necessary or desirable. We thought the compromise was relatively satisfactory. I will mention in a moment the few points on which we are tabling amendments. And if you consider the small number of amendments that have been tabled — except by the Group for the Technical Coordination of Independent Groups and Members — it would seem that this compromise also satisfies the other groups in the Assembly. I feel that we have all done our work in the political groups. Some points caused considerable difficulty. Some of the problems on which conciliation had to be sought were quite complicated. For example, how to reconcile the defence of the right to speak and each parliamentarian's individual rights, the rights of groups, because we are in a Parliament and we therefore make policy here, we have formed groups in accordance with major political views — and I for my part set great store by the defence of the political groups — the problem of gaining time to complete the numerous tasks which this Parliament has to perform and to ensure that these tasks are performed effectively. These are problems which are not always compatible, and it is a question of knowing, at a given moment,

how to strike the least unsatisfactory balance. It may not always be the best balance possible.

Account also had to be taken in committee of the different concepts some of us have of the very role of this European Parliament. I believe we have to contend with a very wide range of ideas on the role a Parliament elected by universal suffrage has to play. Some of us take a greater interest in its consultative task and so in collaborating with the Commission and Council, in keeping a very close watch and in very profound discussions of European questions. Others are more sensitive to the reaction of the public and are therefore interested in problems which sometimes do not fall directly within our terms of reference, but which are of great public interest and which we must deal with because we know that what these people say will be heard. So it is necessary to strike a balance between these two tasks of Parliament. We have tried to do so. I will not say that we have been absolutely successful, but I will say that the efforts that have been made by the groups in general and the Socialist Group in particular lead us to believe that we have not given the matter too little thought.

This is not to say that we have created a perfect set of Rules of Procedure or that the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions will now be out of a job. We have not completed the revision. There are still problems. There are some which we have deliberately left aside because we knew that they would involve us in debates so long and so difficult to bring to a conclusion that we preferred to leave them until later. There are problems which Members will be raising, because even through the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions tried throughout its work to maintain the closest possible contact with all the members of the groups, it has undoubtedly overlooked certain problems which non-members of the committee will uncover and point out to us. And then there are the problems which may perhaps emerge from the application of the new provisions we are proposing, on which we are ready to vote, and this may mean our revising certain procedures in a few months' time. Every parliamentary assembly is a living body, one which is evolving and I believe that a revision of the Rules is almost always a topical issue. What we have tried to do in committee — and this, I believe, has the approval of the Socialist Group today — is to initiate a first stage in which the most important problems facing this Parliament are dealt with. Within the Socialist Group our feeling has been that a subsequent report should take up various problems which have not been raised today, and we shall undoubtedly very soon be tabling a number of amendments that we did not want to include in this Luster report, regarding in particular the parts of the present Rules of Procedure which the committee has not touched. We felt it better to leave this until later, but we can say straight away that various rules raise problems that have not been settled.

Vayssade

Subject to one or two minor modifications, we are prepared to endorse the Luster report. To begin with, we approve the new list of contents, in other words the new nomenclature that has been proposed. I feel it is more logical than the order of the present Rules, the accuracy of which had been improved little by little without the whole ever being reconstructed. I also believe and hope that it will be more convenient for all Members to consult, because they will be able to find the rules they are looking for more quickly.

Then there is a whole series of rules to which we have no objection. I do not intend to list the 70 of the 116 new rules proposed that contain changes or innovations. I have not counted the ones we accept, but they are in the majority. I feel they answer the call for situations to be clarified. In many cases they cover practices that have become customary in this Parliament or customary as a result of instructions from the Bureau without ever having been put to Parliament for its approval. Reference has sometimes also been made to the provisions of the Treaty, enabling us to have at hand, in the Rules of Procedure, a whole series of essential points: questions to do with the status of parliamentarians, their immunities and so on.

There are also rules where the compromise reached seems satisfactory to us. I am thinking specifically of the debates that have been devoted to the question of petitions, to the procedures without debate and so on, where agreement was reached very quickly.

In the case of some rules we shall be approving we refrained from referring to the problems involved. I am convinced that we would have come off second best, that we would have formed a minority and that it was therefore pointless to raise these problems again. I am thinking of a point which was discussed in committee, this being the public nature of committee meetings, to which the Socialist Group attached some importance and which we would have liked to see accepted. We realize that the majority of the Assembly is opposed to this idea. I feel that the compromise reached regarding the possible power of committees to vote will partly solve the problem. In this context, I should like to say that we decided in the *ad hoc* Committee on Women's Rights that all its meetings would be open to the public and that this decision did not in any way detract from the quality of our work. Quite the contrary: I feel it was a great help to us to know that we were being listened to.

There are also parts of these Rules of Procedure where not all the problems have been solved. Mr Luster mentioned some of them just now. But we decided to leave the text as it was for the time being and to raise the problems later in a different form. I am referring in particular to the roles played by the Presidency, the Bureau and the enlarged Bureau. This is a very complicated issue, which we discussed at length in the Committee on the Rules of Procedure

and Petitions, and it seems to us in the Socialist Group — and we shall undoubtedly be tabling a motion for a resolution along these lines — that the bodies concerned should give some thought to the part they play and report to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions fairly soon on what they think of their respective functions. In this way those directly concerned can state their views on this question.

Then there are the rules on which we are tabling amendments. There are four of these. We have tried to phrase them in such a way that they are acceptable to everyone, and I hope that they will not cause anyone any problems.

The first rule on which we are tabling an amendment is Rule 34 (1), which concerns the inclusion in the agenda of reports without debate. As the Luster report now stands, such reports 'shall be included in the agenda of the last sitting of the part-session'. We do not think that reports without debate should automatically be put off, because they are without debate, until Friday morning, when, as everyone knows, benches are often empty. I therefore feel that in this case there should be more flexibility, so that such reports can be debated at other times and so adopted by Parliament.

Our second amendment concerns Rule 35, which deals with the consultation procedure, voting and consultation with the Commission. In the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions we expressed some reservations about the wording that has been adopted by the majority of the committee's members. It seemed to us that to give Parliament an absolute right of veto if the Commission refused to withdraw a proposal was going too far and was perhaps contrary to the spirit of the Treaty. We therefore propose that, when Parliament rejects a proposal and the Commission refuses to withdraw the text that has just been rejected, Parliament should be able to refer it to the appropriate committee and that this referral should not be automatic, but rather the outcome of a decision taken by Parliament on a specific matter, and that the committee should, within a given period, draw up a report after hearing the Commission's views again. It seems to us to come closer to the spirit of conciliation with the other organs if this procedure is made more flexible. That is the purpose of our amendment.

Our other two amendments are of a more delicate nature.

First, there are our amendments to Rule 48, which concerns the urgency procedure, so contentious an issue in this Parliament and one to which we have already devoted many hours of deliberation. Having discussed the matter at very great length and very honestly and very sincerely sought the broadest possible compromise, what we propose is that two modifications be made to the procedure for which the Luster report provides. The first would ensure that, when the

Vayssade

agenda for the three hours of topical debates was being drawn up at the meeting of the President and group chairmen, some kind of balance was struck as regards the items included in the agenda, because, while debates in this Assembly represent a trial of strength between those present, there is only one chairman for each group, and we felt there is sometimes a danger of a political blockade being imposed on one minority or another. We are therefore concerned that there should be guarantees with regard to the establishment of this agenda. The amendment consequently aims at a balance during part-sessions between motions for resolutions tabled by the various groups and those tabled by at least 21 parliamentarians. That is our first amendment. The second calls for a less draconian approach towards anyone speaking in opposition to the agenda proposed and for such speakers to be allowed one and a half minutes. We are not asking for a debate, but simply that anyone contesting the agenda for the three hours of topical debates should have one and a half minutes to explain why he wants a motion for a resolution withdrawn or reintroduced. So much for the amendments to Rule 48. I hope that we can agree on this procedure.

Our last amendment concerns Rule 55 and the establishment of the agenda. After discussing this subject in the Socialist Group, it seemed to us that to deny the enlarged Bureau any say on the agenda might be harmful and, in particular, it might result in the vice-presidents called upon to chair a sitting having little knowledge of the agenda, because they were not present when it was drawn up. We therefore propose that before each part-session the draft agenda should be adopted by the enlarged Bureau and that Parliament's President and the group chairmen should put the final touches to it before the opening of each part-session. I believe this amendment complies precisely with what is done at present, with the enlarged Bureau proposing an agenda several weeks in advance and the President putting the final agenda to the House.

Here again, I hope that this amendment will find your approval.

I should also like to say that we have tabled these amendments with the idea of improving the text and making it an instrument that is more manageable for everyone and respects everyone's rights wherever possible. We shall not make our approval of the report as a whole dependent on the approval of these amendments. In other words, if one of our amendments is rejected, we shall not reject the whole Luster report. I therefore believe we have an interest at present in reaching a compromise as quickly as possible.

To conclude, Mr President, I should like to say that, however perfect a set of rules may be, everything depends to a great extent on the way it is used, and once this Luster report and these new procedures have been adopted, the smooth functioning of this Parliament will also depend on the political will and the

authority of this Parliament and each of its Members. That will be at least as important as perfect parliamentary provisions.

President. — The European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Party) has the floor.

Mr Fischbach. — (G) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, my group joins with the majority in welcoming the general revision of our Rules of Procedure as suggested in the Luster report, a revision made necessary by the numerical expansion of Parliament and the increase in its work load. We hope that this reform will result in clear and efficient working procedures for the Parliament, together with a full recognition of the rights of the minorities of this House, to whom increased veto powers have been granted.

Of the 116 new provisions and the approximately 70 completely or partially modified articles of the Rules of Procedure, as they are proposed by the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions, I would like to limit myself to those which in the opinion of my group are most essential.

I refer to those which, in favour of greater efficiency and functional capacity for this House, tend to significantly relieve the burden on the agenda of the plenary session and thereby lighten the work load. The most important is the new Rule 48, which provides for one or two debates per week of plenary session for a total of three hours, when urgent procedure has been invoked. The committee thought it necessary for representatives from the Bureau, the group chairmen, and the non-affiliated members to combine in choosing the most urgent matters for attention; each group will have the right to present a written objection to the choices made by this body if it is supported by at least 21 members. In the last instance it is the task of the majority of the plenary session to decide upon the definitive list of proposals for urgent debate.

My group joins with the majority of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions, whose view was that the objection with corresponding written grounds should no longer be bound to an additional debate. My group is convinced that Parliament will better be able to perform its stipulated tasks and especially its advisory function in regard to the Commission if urgent debates are kept within a definite time-limit.

This hope is all the more justified in that the changes I have mentioned are to be complemented by an additional written procedure, that is, by the so-called registration procedure. The rapporteur has mentioned that, according to a practice in use in the British parliament, each delegate can enter his own motion for a resolution in a special register. The proposal is considered adopted when at least half of the delegates have signed

Fischbach

it. Such a procedure has the unmistakable advantage that it takes place outside of the agenda and thus does not take up much time.

Another praiseworthy modification concerning the relief of the burden on the agenda is the delegation to the competent committee, with the consent of the House, of questions of a technical nature which have no general application. The various possibilities for objection which were included on this point are aimed at preventing any misuse of Rule 33. My group believes that the new formulas in Rules 35, 36 and 37, which deal with the strict protection of the EEC Treaty-established parliamentary powers and the full exploitation of Parliament's rights as an advisory body to the Commission, are no less essential. According to the present Rules of Procedure, Parliament expresses its will and its opinion in the form of a resolution. This means that the consultation procedure concerning a particular proposal of the Commission is only decided upon once the plenary session has adopted the corresponding motion for a resolution. Supported by a decision of the Court of Justice in Luxembourg, the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions agrees upon three hypotheses in this context, whereby the consultation procedure is not to be considered as completed.

First hypothesis: the Commission is not prepared to withdraw a proposal which has been rejected by a parliamentary majority. In this case Parliament will try to put the corresponding motion for a resolution to the vote.

The matter will be once again referred to the competent committee. We have heard that the Socialist Group would prefer that this referral not take place automatically, but rather that Parliament should decide whether the motion for a resolution should nevertheless be voted on immediately or whether it should not be voted upon for reasons explained by the Commission. My group feels that this is a well thought out proposal whose eventual inclusion in the Rules of Procedure should be considered.

Second hypothesis: the Commission rejects corresponding amendments suggested by Parliament. In this case the plenary session, on the suggestion of the chairman of the competent committee or the rapporteur, can disregard the rejection of the motion in question. Then the matter will be sent back to the competent committee, whose duty it will be to present a new report within a maximum period of four weeks.

Third hypothesis: if a proposal on which Parliament has already given its opinion is replaced in a new text or so much modified that it has basically become a new text, then Parliament, on the motion of the President, must be consulted again.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, by means of these three new items in its Rules of Procedure Parliament

will make it clear that, without abusing its powers, it is now in a position to exercise them to the full in its dealings with the Commission. In any case, there will be no need for the application of this rule — or for any such conflict between Parliament and the Commission — if the latter is willing to propose an inter-institutional agreement to Parliament. Such an agreement was called for by this House in the programme discussion last month and it was also suggested by the Commission for October of this year as a 'new form of dialogue with the Parliament'. It is unquestionable that at least in important matters a consensus of opinion on the part of Parliament and the Commission can influence the decisions of the Council of Ministers in the direction of common progressive development.

Finally I would like to discuss the amendments which my group has proposed for the Luster report. One amendment has to do with the motion for a resolution itself. In order to prevent any eventual gaps in the Rules of Procedure, my group suggests a paragraph 2, to be used when an article of the draft text does not have enough support. In this case a provision that was not contained in the present Rules of Procedure is automatically invalidated. If the problem at hand was dealt with elsewhere in the present Rules, then the corresponding item remains valid, after written adaptations in accordance with paragraph 3.

Another amendment concerns Article 71, paragraph 4, according to which the members who asked for a quorum to be ascertained are required to take part in the vote to establish the number of members actually present in the Chamber. My group moves that this moral duty be made also a legally binding one, so that the members who have asked for a quorum are also counted when the number of members present is being ascertained if they have already left the Chamber.

A third motion concerns Article 81. My group wishes there to be complete clarity about the power of the President to establish the validity of a vote.

Another amendment, introduced by individual members of my group and other groups of this House, aims at the proper representation of all Member States and political leanings in the Bureau.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, allow me to say to those of you who cannot agree with one or several of the new items in our Rules of Procedure and who may have reservations about the suitability of the Rules as a whole: for a Parliament which, like ours, is still developing, from the organizational as well as from the institutional standpoint, no Rules of Procedure can be considered definitive. These internal rules will constantly need to be adjusted and improved. This being so, each of us may justifiably hope that the Rules of Procedure of this House will some day correspond to what he himself had in mind. With this reservation, few members will deny that the proposed revision as it stands now constitutes a not insignificant step in the right direction.

Fischbach

I do not want to conclude without referring to the special contributions made by Mr Rudolf Luster as rapporteur. Without his great experience, combined with amazing patience and a constant willingness to compromise, it would not have been possible to cope with the general revision of our Rules of Procedure in so short a time. My group is convinced that its work and the work of the whole Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions will be appreciated as it deserves to be by the House in plenary session.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Pannella on a point of order.

Mr Pannella. — *(F)* I merely wish to refer briefly to Rules 13 and 37 of the Rules of Procedure.

Mr President, we have just been handed a motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-976/80), which we are to debate at 3 p.m. It bears the date 9 March 1981. Rule 13 of our Rules of Procedure states that motions for resolutions may not be debated or voted on unless they are tabled 12 days before the beginning of the part-session, except in cases of urgency. This does not apply to this motion for a resolution, and there has been neither a request nor an announcement of urgency. Therefore, Mr President, the motion for a resolution tabled by the six group chairmen is, as is often the case, the outcome of the arbitrary and necessary. They frequently contravene the Rules of Procedure because they do not know them, even when they are changing them.

Furthermore, Mr President, there is something in the motion that is not true: it refers to a decision taken by the Bureau having regard to Rule 37(2) of the Rules of Procedure. That is not correct. The Bureau did not meet to discuss this subject until this morning, on the initiative of my group. So this is not true, and this resolution may not be tabled. I hope, Mr President, that when the groups have adopted their new Rules of Procedure, they will study and respect them, because it is disgusting that we should constantly be forced to refer to the Rules of Procedure and that we should never be allowed to discuss the basic problems. It will not therefore be possible to do what has been announced for 3 o'clock this afternoon.

President. — I would draw attention to Rule 37(2) under which committee members are elected at the beginning of the session which opens each year on the second Tuesday in March. Today is the second Tuesday in March and it has therefore already been known for a long time that the election would take place today, and at the opening of today's sitting it was announced that the Bureau would deliberate on the candidatures and that the vote would not be taken before 3 p.m.

I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — *(F)* Mr President, I am extremely obliged to you for agreeing that I am right in both form and essence. So today we must vote and elect, as our Rules of Procedure specify. For our part, to permit this election to go ahead, we have put forward nominations. The Bureau did not meet until we requested it to do so pursuant to the Rules of Procedure. But what I must insist on, Mr President, is that the motion for a resolution tabled by the six group chairmen is dated 9 March and that we cannot vote on or take into consideration motions for resolutions which have been tabled fewer than 12 days before the beginning of a part-session, except in cases of urgency, which is decided by reference to the criteria which we all know, and there is no urgency in this case. Nevertheless, Mr President, I am extremely grateful to you for telling us what you intend to do. I believe this is a problem for the Bureau and not for the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions.

President. — The enlarged Bureau is meeting at the moment. The meeting began at 10 a.m. and all political groups are represented.

The European Democratic Group has the floor.

Mr Patterson. — Mr President, most Members of this House will no doubt have heard of the Scottish king Robert the Bruce, and if they have not I expect Mrs Ewing will tell them about it when she arrives. He was subjected to a series of defeats by the English and found himself a refugee in a cave in Scotland where he saw a spider building a web. The spider failed on a number of occasions but at last succeeded: Robert the Bruce took the message, went out and subjected the English to the hiding of their lives.

Over the last year and a half at least, the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions has found itself rather in the position of Robert the Bruce, and I hope that this occasion will be the one where we defeat the English and get our report through. A lot of man- and woman-hours have gone into this report of Mr Luster's, and I start by congratulating him and, indeed, all my colleagues on the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions, who have put in an enormous amount of time and effort.

This committee is coloured by its experience of two facts of life, and the first is that we need 217 votes at the end of the day to get this report through. It is no good getting a simple majority on each particular rule or each particular amendment if at the end of the day we have offended so many people that it is impossible to get the whole report through. That is why this report is a very carefully constructed package which we are assured, and we know from the various groups,

Patterson

will command a majority. I hope that everybody noticed the pledge which Mrs Vayssade gave that the Socialist Group was going to support this report at the end of the day irrespective of what happened to their amendments. That is the most important statement we could have had today, because it was the Socialist Group and its difficulties which resulted in the defeat of the last Luster report, and I think that the pledge Mrs Vayssade has given almost assures us of success when we come to vote. So this is a compromise, and I assume from the emptiness of this Chamber that the compromise is acceptable to most people — at least that is how I interpret the fact that nobody is here to listen to this debate.

Very few amendments have been tabled by the groups — my own group has tabled just four technical amendments — except, of course, for one group, and that brings me to the second fact of life: that any minority, no matter how small, can hold a report up. We have tried — and, Mr Pannella, we have tried very hard — in the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions to avoid offending any minorities. Mrs Bonino and Mr Coppieters played a very constructive part in our deliberations, and we have indeed adopted a number of the amendments they proposed. That is why I find it curious that the activities of Mr Pannella's group have resulted in our now having a system under which we speak now and vote later. I do not believe that anybody has taken into account the effect of postponing the vote. Had this report gone through on Thursday, we should have been voting on the agricultural price package in two weeks time on an entirely different basis. We should have been able to vote under these rules directly on the Commission proposal. As a result of the postponement of the vote, we shall be voting entirely differently. I know, Mr Pannella, it is not your fault, but you yourself said yesterday that only 30 of your amendments were of any significance whatsoever, and I may say that if that is the case I cannot see why you put them down. I also find it curious that other groups, apart from my own, decided that your amendments were so important that they wanted to read them first. It would have seemed to me that if only 30 of them were significant the groups could have read those 30 and then we could have voted on Thursday. I find the whole way in which this is being handled, as I say, curious, to say the least. It has had a significant effect on the way we vote on the price package.

Now what does my group find important in this particular report? What are our objectives?

The first objective must be to improve the effectiveness and power of this Parliament within the Community, and it is quite clear that Parliament does not deserve this power unless it can organize itself more effectively. That is why we in the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions are proposing a number of important changes to make the rules of the Parliament clearer. We can also make use of the powers we have

got under the Treaties much more adroitly — for example, on the legislative processes: this is the significance of Rules 32 to 37, about which a colleague of mine will shortly be speaking.

Secondly, and I want Mr Pannella to listen carefully here, we in my group wish to see the rights of individual Members preserved — and, Mr Pannella, your group does not have a monopoly of these rights. My group has proposed in the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions — and this proposal is now incorporated in the Luster report — a number of new opportunities that individual Members will have. For example, the early-day motion procedure — the register procedure — under Rule 49 is one that will give new rights to individual Members. Rule 25, on the right to ask questions of the Bureau, the enlarged Bureau and the Quaestors, is, curiously, a joint proposal from myself and Mrs Bonino that is giving new rights to individual Members. So we wish to preserve a balance between the effectiveness of the Parliament as a whole and the rights of the individual Members within it, and I think that that is precisely what Mr Luster's report does.

Let us turn briefly to the form. Mr Luster was kind enough to draw attention to the fact that I was draftsman of an opinion from a working party on which the form of these rules is based. I believe this will be worth doing even if none of the substance of the rules is changed, because the new rules, when they are printed, will, I hope Members will find, be very easy to refer to and will lead to far less confusion, because neither Members nor anybody else can find their place in the Rules of Procedure as they are.

The new form will, however, solve two other major problems which my group finds particularly important. The first is — and it would be interesting to know how many Members here have read them from cover to cover — the problem of the so-called 'pink pages'; but nobody — I suspect not even the Bureau — has any idea what precise force these 'pink pages' have. And what is more, I say I suspect that very few Members in this Parliament have read them. Now we are proposing that these 'pink pages' be abolished and that rulings on interpretations of the rules be annexed to the handbook of the Rules of Procedure itself so that everybody can know what interpretations the rules have been subjected to over a period of time.

This second matter of rulings my group finds particularly important. In our national parliament, we are used to working on a system of precedent. When a ruling has been given on the interpretation of some provision of the rules, that is incorporated in a reference work so that everybody knows precisely how that rule has been interpreted in the past. Hence we believe that Rule 111, on the application of the rules and the way in which these precedents can be built up, will be of great value in removing confusion on the texts. In particular, we believe that the new rule on points of

Patterson

order — Rule 83 — under which the President will have the option of ruling immediately, giving a reserved ruling or referring the matter to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions, will give us a flexible mechanism for interpreting the rules. Because Rules of Procedure are not merely the texts as written down: they are also the way they are applied.

Now for a few remarks on particular rules. With regard to Rule 10, on the seat of Parliament, my group finds it a pity that the amendment put down in the name of Mr Tyrrell and Mr Kirk on using our rules to fix ourselves a seat has not been accepted by the committee, but we understand the reasons for this. However, it is quite clear, and Mr Luster makes it clear, that until this Parliament does have a fixed seat a lot of the problems which the Rules really are not responsible for cannot be removed.

Secondly, I have also referred to Rule 25, on the accountability of the Bureau, the enlarged Bureau and the Quaestors. We believe that this is extremely important, because without impugning the activities of the Bureau and the enlarged Bureau it is important that what they do be seen to be done in public, and a great deal of confusion will, I hope, be eliminated by Rule 25.

With regard to Rules 32 to 36, on the legislative procedure, the two key things are, first, that we shall vote on the Commission proposal direct and, secondly, that we shall have the opportunity to find out what the Commission thinks of our amendments before the final vote on the motion for a resolution. Here I have to disagree with Mrs Vayssade on one tiny matter. If we have rejected a Commission proposal, if the whole proposal has been voted down, it would be absurd if Parliament then said, all right, we will go ahead regardless. We think that in such cases there should be an automatic reference to committee. On the other hand, I accept Mrs Vayssade's contention that there should be a time-limit; so that half of the Socialists' amendment we can accept, half of it we cannot.

When we come to the matter of urgent and topical debates, well, we have spent so much time on this, on Rule 48, that I think my group will support almost any amendment which commands reasonable support, and we support the amendments as outlined by Mrs Vayssade.

I should like very quickly to talk about the written procedure, the early-day motions, because there is a lot of misunderstanding about this. This procedure — Rule 49 — will give individual Members an entirely new opportunity which they do not at present possess under our Rules of Procedure to make themselves and their opinions known. At the moment, under Rule 25 you can put down a motion for a resolution, it goes off to committee and that is probably the last you see

of it; or you can use the urgent procedure under Rule 14, which is often abused. Now most Members, when they wish to table a motion for a resolution, are doing so for declaratory purposes as much as anything else; and the idea of a register, which works very well in the House of Commons, gives Members the opportunity to make their political opinions known and to find out whether they are supported by a majority of their colleagues. I note that Mr Luster says we should try and see if it works. I hope very much that it will work.

In conclusion, I do not disguise the fact that these new Rules of Procedure will be to some extent an act of faith. There are problems. One problem, which my colleague Mr Galland will probably talk about, concerns Rules 28 and 65, on the speaking time of the non-attached. We have yet to tackle the budgetary procedure. And I too, like Mrs Vayssade, am sorry that committee meetings are not open as a matter of course. But they are better than the old rules. They are clearer, they will make this Parliament more effective, and that is the touchstone. We in this Parliament must get away from arguing about our Rules of Procedure; we must get on with the business of playing our proper part in running the Community; and that is the importance of Mr Luster's report.

(Applause)

President. — The Communist and Allies Group has the floor.

Mr D'Angelosante. — *(I)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, as has already been mentioned, these new Rules of Procedure are the result of a compromise. In committee while the text was being worked out, each of us yielded on some points and insisted on others. Our experience leads us to believe that Parliament can reach an agreement on this matter, although no one can say that the Rules are exactly as he wanted them, or that they all have our enthusiastic support.

Mr President, I wish to add that the majority in this Parliament did not adopt this spirit of compromise because of any natural bent towards democratic negotiation. It was rather obliged to act in this way by the vote held last summer, which resulted in the rejection of all proposals of an authoritarian nature designed to 'militarize' our Rules. In this manner it was made apparent that the authoritarians in this House are in reality possessed of relatively little authority.

At the root of our compromise is the need to prevent this Assembly from moving slowly but surely towards a definitive paralysis of its own activities, as now appears inevitable if measures are not taken to reverse this trend. The matters which we as a Parliament must examine are so numerous, the time at our disposal so limited, and obstructionist manoeuvres so frequent that if no thorough modifications are carried out — while of course respecting the principles of freedom

D'Angelosante

and democracy — in a short time Parliament will no longer be able to function. We pointed out that in the Rules of Procedure there are references to the Anglo-Saxon tradition and to the continental tradition. We pointed out that the system of urgent procedure has gotten out of control, for now not only a great political debate is considered urgent, but so, for example, is a debate on licenses for lorry drivers on an island in the far north of Scotland. This is obvious to everyone, Mr President, and we must all recognize the need for change. The person who presents 550 amendments is making a mistake. We could have presented many amendments ourselves. We have only presented one, however, in agreement with some other groups, asking that all groups be represented in the Bureau and the College of Quaestors, and this, naturally, in accordance with the Hondt system.

These Rules of Procedure, in my opinion, are not only the fruit of necessity. They also include improvements, which I would now like to point out. For example, counter-checking was introduced, allowing each member of Parliament to request the verification of a vote; the secret ballot was introduced, which did not exist before and which would now be adopted under certain circumstances, as an alternative to the individual electronic vote in the event of a malfunction of this system: a roll-call vote was introduced, a procedure impossible under the present Rules without the approval of the House. We carefully listed all the appeals to the Rules of Procedure in detail along with the procedural motions granted. If these new Rules are approved, it will no longer be possible for any member to interrupt the debate simply by raising a point of order.

As I see it, these modifications are positive in nature, as are those which concern the mechanism of parliamentary consultation. I don't know whether the Vaysade amendment will be accepted. Nevertheless, I approve of the introduction of a voting system which, in cases when the Commission obstinately refuses Parliament's opinion, would allow Parliament to delay its final decision until an agreement has been reached with the Commission. Such action is, I think, admissible for there is no regulation in the Treaty which lays down a deadline to be met by Parliament when giving its response, except in budgetary matters. The decision made by the Court of Justice in the isoglucose case has taught us that if the Council does not request either urgent procedure or extra sittings, it must wait while Parliament arrives at an opinion.

Finally, Mr President, the most important point concerns urgent procedure. I think that there were no objections raised to the rule which provides for a short-end procedure through the delegation of decision-making power to the committees. Here I only wish to point out the legitimacy of this provision. Parliament, by virtue of Article 142 of the EEC Treaty, is responsible for its own internal procedure. Moreover, Article 173 of the same Treaty makes Parliament, in contrast

to the Council and the Commission, the only institution whose decisions are not submitted to the Court of Justice to determine their legitimacy, with the result that our actions cannot be taken before the Court.

As far as urgent procedure is concerned, Mr President, it is a question of determining whether the majority — and I am sorry that Mr Pannella is not here — is better served by a system of Assembly power plays or by a fair agreement among group leaders.

Many times we have been obliged to witness the scandal of the majority approving its own urgent procedure while rejecting a minority request for urgency on the same subject. We aimed at eliminating the blockage in Parliament caused by the multiplicity of urgent procedure on all levels and concerning matters of widely varying importance, while at the same time making it possible to hold discussions in an atmosphere where fair agreement can be reached among all the groups. For this reason, I agree with Mrs Vaysade's proposal, except for the concluding portion where it says that with this system we will be depriving individual members of some unspecified powers. This is untrue, Mr President: individual members could and still can present resolutions, but even at the present time only a group or 21 members together can request urgent procedure. The problem, after these 21 members or this group has requested urgent procedure, is to determine who has the power of decision. Do we want the decision to be made in the Assembly or do we want it to be made by a group of delegates from the Assembly? We are in favour of the latter solution. It could perhaps be objected that, in this way, a power belonging to the individual members — a power which, in the final analysis, consists merely in standing up to say yes or no — would be reduced.

The written procedure of Article 49 permits an individual member to present a motion for a resolution to which anyone may append his signature. When a certain number of signatures have been gathered, the resolution will be considered as approved and will be forwarded to the Council and to the other institutions concerned.

This seems to me to be absolutely logical, Mr President. We have not done this in order to leave things as they are, however; we have done it in order that this Parliament might finally be able to discuss the matters brought to its attention, and discuss them more thoroughly. If we can save time by turning many texts over to the committees and by limiting the discussion on urgent procedure to three hours, the time saved in this way can be put to productive use. In consequence the current Rule 28, which has become, without agreement on our part, Rule 65, cannot retain its present form. All groups, even small ones, must be able to speak for the necessary length of time in the debates. Scandals like the one which today obliges us to modify the Rules of Procedure which will determine the future of this Assembly in a little over three

D'Angelosante

hours, must be eliminated. This is absolutely not 'parliamentary'; it is justifiable only in the current situation which I would characterize as a 'state of siege'. The new Rules will raise this siege in the interest of the debate and of universal free participation in it.

Until last July, this Assembly, opposed to modifications, found itself obliged to choose between the old Rules and a new text which was even worse. Now, we believe, the Assembly can choose between the old Rules and a new text which is objectively better. We will vote in favour of the new text and we hope that it will be approved by the whole Assembly.

(Applause from various quarters)

President. — The Liberal and Democratic Group has the floor.

Mr Galland. — *(F)* Mr President, in this debate on the revision of the Rules of Procedure, on which a very wide measure of agreement has obviously been reached in this Assembly, my task is made easy by the fact that I am following the spokesmen of the other political groups, because everything they have said, I could have said in their place. I shall therefore confine myself to making a few comments.

Firstly, as Mrs Vayssade has said, I feel the unfortunate experience we had last July has benefited the organization of our work. I note with great pleasure that her own group has drawn the logical conclusions, and nothing could make us happier.

The same goes for my own group, and we can but welcome the desire for unanimity and compromise which has been a feature of the extremely difficult discussions in committee in the last six or seven months and which meant that, to achieve unanimity, we always worked until we found a solution. I would refer in this context to the activities of my colleague Hans Nord — not with us today, unfortunately, because he is unwell — who, I feel, made an extremely valuable contribution to our committee's work thanks to his experience and competence.

The urgent need for these new Rules of Procedure — urgent in relative terms, since we took our time — is obvious. Our Rules suffered with the change in our Assembly, the fact that there are now 434 of us instead of 198 and that, unfortunately, some of us have taken liberties and constantly used the opportunities offered by the old Rules to abuse procedures. I feel that under the new Rules this type of abuse should disappear.

What is curious is that the method we have chosen is that called for by Mr Pannella. I vividly recall meetings of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and

Petitions at which Mr Pannella said: 'Do not reform the urgency procedure, do not make a partial revision, take four or five or six months if necessary, but make an overall revision, revise the whole thing.' That is precisely the method we adopted. So it comes as something of a surprise to hear the criticisms Mr Pannella has levelled at us today. I feel all he is interested in is making a constant fuss and he forgets what he said six months before. It seems to me all he thinks of is defending his own interests, and what interests him is publicity for himself. We can only deplore this, and I am afraid — to be very frank — that Rule 8 on the Code of Conduct may be insufficient, considering what we hear from one quarter or another, and particularly from Mr Pannella's group.

We also feel that the new Rules have been inspired by a desire for realism and effectiveness: it protects the individual and collective rights of parliamentarians. If this were not the case, there would never have been the consensus we now have on the adoption of these Rules.

In this respect, I should like to thank Mr Patterson, who provided us with a very clear plan which will enable each of us to refer to the Rules or to see whether some point or other in our debates accords with the Rules and to find it far more easily than in the present list of contents. We shall vote in favour of the amendment tabled by the Christian-Democratic Group, which provides that, if one of the rules of the new Rules of Procedure is not adopted, or if one of the amendments is rejected, and if the old rule is then to be reinstated, it must be included in the new nomenclature in the natural way.

I should now like to make a few more specific observations. Firstly, as regards Rule 1, we have tabled a purely formal amendment, to which I would draw the rapporteur's attention. It concerns the designation given in each language to persons elected to this Parliament. This designation should be respected in the other 116 rules. Thus, since such persons are known as 'deputés' in French, the word 'membre' or 'représentant' should not be used in the remainder of the Rules of Procedure. That would obviously be ludicrous.

Then, with regard to the composition of the Bureau — Rule 12 (3) — I can say that we shall not be voting for the amendment tabled by various of our colleagues which would require each Member State to have at least one representative in the Bureau. Mr Fischbach, we fully appreciate why you have tabled this amendment, and I can tell you that in the Liberal and Democratic Group we are very sensitive to the reasons that led you to table this amendment. The proof of this is that we of the Liberal and Democratic Group have demonstrated the spirit that must prevail rather than the rule that must be imposed. Consequently, as you know, if your country is represented in the Bureau of this Parliament, it is because our group wanted it that

Galland

way and made the necessary efforts, which no other group made. So we agree on the spirit. We do not think, Mr Fischbach, that this should figure in the Rules of Procedure.

I should also like to say that my group will be abstaining in the vote on the rule that concerns the allocation of seats in the Chamber. We have not tabled any amendments and the rule we adopted was that we should not table the same amendments in plenary, although my group is extremely annoyed at being seated on the extreme right of this Chamber. This in no way corresponds to our political convictions. Of course, the new Rule 27 will again mean, I suppose, the Bureau's deciding to seat us on the extreme right. What we wanted to achieve with the amendment we tabled was that our Assembly should decide on the allocation of seats in the Chamber by voting. We shall therefore all be abstaining in the vote on this rule to show our disapproval of the seats allocated to us.

As regards Rule 33, we should like to say that the fact that committees now have power of decision on technical matters should not disturb those Members who feel this might rob the Assembly of some of its powers. We did not feel there was any disadvantage in this, considering, on the one hand, the matters concerned, which are all technical in nature, and, on the other, the composition of the committees, which ensures that everyone and every political view is represented when such decisions are taken.

Then, we shall be voting in favour of the Socialist Group's amendment to Rule 34 (1), since we agree to the deletion of the words: 'of the last sitting'. We are happy to point out that in the new Rules of Procedure we have improved the consultation procedure and that things are now much clearer.

We now come to a delicate issue, Rule 48, which concerns topical and urgent debates. Once again, my group was unable to gain the support of the majority of the committee for its views on Rule 48. We had put forward a draft amendment on topical and urgent debates which differed substantially from the text proposed in the Luster report. We also know that each political group had its own, not very different but private, views on what should constitute urgency. But I feel a very precise consensus emerged in the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions. This was that the arrangement provided for in the new Rules of Procedure would make any debate impossible. Consequently, Mrs Vayssade, my group will not be voting for the amendment you have tabled. I know you have made a great deal of effort: having wanted three minutes for one speaker in favour and three for one speaker against, you are asking for no more than one and a half minutes. We shall not vote for the amendment because you see, Mrs Vayssade, if all the Members of this Assembly were responsible, we would probably vote in favour. But if I put myself in the place of certain Members, what would I do? I would table a

motion for a resolution and request an urgent debate, knowing full well that the request would not be granted for a debate during the time set aside for that purpose. I would realize that. I would be one of those Members who want an extremely thorny issue discussed which will not be debated in plenary. So, when the President announced what subjects had been selected, I would hear that mine had not been chosen. Why would I nevertheless table it, Mrs Vayssade? I would table it because I would then have a further one and a half minutes to speak to the subject, because I would know that it would not be adopted by the Assembly. The reason is that I would have one and a half minutes to speak to the subject. We do not want that, Mrs Vayssade, as you very well know, and I would ask you to explain to your group that we did not vote against your amendment without first thinking about it and that we are happy to know that, if this amendment is not adopted, you will nevertheless be voting for the Luster report.

As for the other change you want, some kind of balance in the motions selected by the Bureau, all I can say is that we agree and that we shall be voting in favour of your amendment. But I must say this: as things now stand, Mrs Vayssade, it is the law of the majority versus the minority, as you very well know. And under the law of the majority versus the minority you have regularly been exposed to the risk of being defeated. You are therefore asking for an assurance not provided by the old system, which exposed you to the maximum risk. We consider that quite normal, and we shall therefore be voting in favour.

As regards Rule 49, I should like to say to the British Members that we were opposed, very much opposed, to the idea of a register. However, we battered away like the proverbial goat until the small hours of the morning trying to prevent this register from seeing the light of day, and we were defeated. We shall therefore be approving the register system, again in the spirit of compromise that has inspired us throughout our work. I hope it will work, but we are very sceptical.

Mrs Vayssade said just now that her group reserved the right to table amendments later to improve the Rules of Procedure. We too shall be tabling one later. When Rule 53 (4) states: 'An amendment may be moved during the debate by its author or by any other Member appointed by the author to replace him', it means, ladies and gentlemen, that we can move any amendment. That is what it says here in black and white. It means that, if a group tables 600 amendments to a text, it can justly say, under the new Rule 53 (4): 'But we must. It says in the Rules of Procedure that we must move our amendments.' We think this is a mistake. Of course, there are Members who are responsible and Members who are not. We shall see if this paragraph 4 of Rule 53 stands the test of time or not. That is why, for the time being, we have not proposed that this paragraph should be deleted but, if

Galland

it gives rise to excesses, I can tell the House now that we shall be tabling an amendment seeking its deletion.

I shall keep my comments on the remaining rules brief. I now come to Rule 57. We are opposed to the possibility of at least 21 Members requesting an urgent debate on a proposal on which Parliament has been consulted. We feel that such urgency — of a technical nature — must be requested either by the Commission or by its President. We do not think that 21 Members should be able to request it. We therefore call for the deletion of the words: 'at least 21 Members'.

I would now ask Mr De Goede, Mrs Dekker and the Greek Members for their attention, because what I have to say is of particular interest to them. I am referring to Rule 65 and the allocation of speaking time. I do not think it will come as a great surprise to the non-attached Members when I tell them that this allocation of speaking time does not at present satisfy anyone in this Assembly, except them.

I think I am right in saying that there are at the moment 25 non-attached Members. They have more speaking time than a group of 63 Members in this Assembly, by which I mean the European Democratic Group. This is a completely abnormal phenomenon and one for which I feel partly responsible, because it was due to me that, in the Nord report, the speaking time of the non-attached Members was doubled. But today, for reasons for which they are not responsible, this doubling of speaking time gives rise to an unforeseen situation. Among the non-attached Members there are some who should not in fact be considered as such. They include 14 Members all of the same nationality, all with the same political leanings. They should not be non-attached Members, but, for perfectly creditable reasons, they have chosen to remain non-attached. But they should not enjoy the same advantages as non-attached Members where speaking time is concerned. We have therefore sought to table an amendment which maintains the doubling of speaking time for non-attached Members, in the spirit of the text, but which does not provide for the doubling of the speaking time of those who are not, in our view, non-attached. That is why we specify in this amendment that, if five Members belong to the same political grouping of a Member State and decide to be non-attached Members, they cannot benefit by the doubling of speaking time for which provision has been made. Their speaking time would thus be calculated separately, in accordance with the procedure laid down in Rule 65 (2) (b). This means that, where the non-attached Members consist of fewer than five Members from one Member State and with the same political leanings, the rules remain unchanged.

I should point out to the Greek Members that this must not be interpreted as some kind of attack on them. Their decision has resulted in a corruption of the Rules of Procedure, as it were, and if we do not

take decisions today, I am sure that it will be all the non-attached Members who will suffer very soon, because the situation will be unacceptable to everyone.

On the other hand, we completely endorse the amendment tabled by the EPP to Rule 71, which in its present form makes for an abnormal situation. At the moment, it is possible to ask the President to ascertain whether a quorum is present and then leave: those who ask for the quorum to be ascertained are not included in the count of those present. You are asking that this should be an automatic procedure, that there should be a mathematical rule that those who have made the request should automatically be counted. This is how it should be, and we shall support the amendment.

I should also like to say that we did hear say that one of your amendments to Rule 80, concerning explanations of vote, called for such explanations to be given after the voting. We are very grateful to you for abandoning this amendment. For us this is a question of principle which will make the Socialist Group's position on Rule 48 easier, because I am sure it will make an equivalent gesture.

Mr President, to conclude, I should like to say to those Members present who have severely criticized the procedure that they would do well to read Rule 112. Rule 112 will enable any parliamentarian at any time to take up any provision which does not prove effective in practice. I therefore feel that once again there is no need for any fuss about this matter. The sooner we approve the revision proposed by Mr Luster, the better our proceedings will be. Finally, I should like to take this opportunity to thank the rapporteur for the excellent work he has performed in very difficult conditions. My group is very grateful to him for this.

(Applause from various quarters)

President. — The European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group) has the floor.

Mr Vié. — *(F)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like first to join with Members from other political groups in congratulating the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions and its rapporteur on the remarkable work that has been done. It is all too obvious to everyone that the present size of our Parliament, since its election by universal suffrage, necessitates the revision of its Rules of Procedure, whose inadequacies have been glaringly obvious on many occasions. But it is also quite obvious that a parliamentary assembly derives its strength from the strength of the working rules it has given itself. Inadequate rules which leave room for procedural tricks likely to detract from the proper consideration of

Vié

problems results in the institution losing any credibility it may have, and we are very well aware of the malevolent criticisms that have already been levelled at us from various quarters on many occasions.

We therefore agree with the general philosophy underlying this report where it endeavours to facilitate and provide for the better organization of the proceedings of plenary sittings. We also agree with anything that tends to make Parliament's opinions more effective and its relationship with the Commission more constructive, without wishing, of course, to fetter it to the life of Parliament, but with the intention of initiating a more thorough dialogue with it as a means of giving a clearer explanation of votes taken in our Assembly.

I should like to confine what I have to say to one general remark and three specific comments. I will begin with the general remark. I have just emphasized the need for strong Rules of Procedure to enable our Parliament to work effectively like any other assembly of this type. One question which arises, or may arise, is: who will decide whether the Rules of Procedure comply with the Treaties? Unlike the national parliaments, which can settle this very easily by referring to their national constitutions, this Parliament cannot obtain a clear answer to this question. It is a point which, in our opinion, will merit serious thought in the future.

I now come to my three specific comments. The first concerns the budget. My group has tabled an amendment seeking to restore the vote on the budget as a whole, which has been removed by the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and its rapporteur. We are well aware that the interpretation of Article 203 is difficult, and we in no way hold it against the rapporteur for the position he has adopted. But it does seem to us unreasonable not to express an overall political opinion on the budget, which is, as everyone knows, the act on which a political activity is based, since we rightly insist on playing our part as the second branch of the budgetary authority. Amendments, as you all very well know, may be adopted successively by different majorities. Only a vote on the budget as a whole can have real political significance, and I consider it essential for our electors to know our overall political position on the budget as a whole. Only then can they exercise the normal control over their representatives which is their due but which would be completely illusory, completely uncertain if all that was considered was the successive votes on a series of amendments, all of which undoubtedly have a political colour, but which cannot, taken individually, constitute a policy.

My second comment concerns the Hondt system. This system, which was introduced to ensure the mathematical equality of groups according to their respective size, would be appropriate if applied only to votes all of equal importance. But to consider the Hondt system only in terms of the differences of

value of posts to be filled would mean, for example, if the size of a group five times larger than another were applied to posts with value thresholds from 1 to 5, in an extreme case that group would in fact be not five times larger than the other one, but 25 times larger. We feel this could easily lead to the crushing of the minorities, whereas we are absolutely convinced the system sought to give them equality. In our view, particular attention should be paid to this point if we want to avoid a worsening of the tension between large and small groups in the long term.

My third and last specific comment concerns speaking time. My colleague Mr Galland referred to this just now, and the comment I wish to make follows on from what I have just said. Here again, the aim was justice, on a strictly proportional basis, but I feel that what has not been properly understood is that the blind application of this rule would have the effect of completely sterilizing the activities of small groups. It is quite normal for a group that is far larger than others to have more opportunities to express its views and, in line with the sharing of the tasks it has to perform, it is clear that it will have more speakers than a smaller group and that it must use them more efficiently in debates. But where we have major debates, debates on basic issues, the speaking time of the smaller groups is so restricted that they are unable to develop their ideas properly. This ultimately results in an attack on democracy and the freedom to express ideas, which are our *raison d'être*. A group that is three times larger than another is not necessarily three times more right. Nor does it mean that it must have three times the opportunity to put forward its arguments and so convince its audience. I appreciate that it is difficult, perhaps impossible to strike the correct balance, but we should like to see agreement reached to allow every group ample time to express its views in debates, it being one of our assets to allow time for different ideas to be expressed, because the importance of an idea cannot be measured simply in terms of the numerical strength of the group putting it forward, even though it is obvious that this numerical strength is ultimately what counts at voting time.

As I said just now, the intention underlying the allocation of speaking time was acceptable as a means of establishing this proportional justice. The injustice stems from the fact that the intrinsic value of the subjects raised in various debates often differs basically from one case to another, which distorts the rules of the game.

Those, then, were the few remarks I wanted to make on behalf of my group in the hope that they may increase the effectiveness of our work, to which the Luster report itself will make a great contribution. My group will therefore be voting in favour of the report, and once again we should like to congratulate the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions and its rapporteur for their work.

President. — The Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members has the floor.

Mr Capanna. — (*I*) Mr President, you can see for yourself that there are fewer than 50 members present. This means that nearly 400 of us are not participating in an issue decisive for the life of this Parliament, that of the laws which are to govern us. You will permit me to say that this is simply scandalous. I urge my colleagues to read the Luster report and the proposed amendments with care, especially the former. If we go over this text attentively, we will find that if the Luster proposals were accepted, Parliament would become a mere 'office' where records are kept of the power relationships existing between the various blocs which dominate this Assembly.

I do not believe that Mr Luster's work constitutes a general revision of the Rules. On the contrary, it is simply a small and specific revision which puts the European Parliament on a level with the most backward national parliaments. My time limit allows me to give but one example: Rule 49, according to which motions for resolutions can be entered in a register and approved if signed by the majority of the members. Firstly, in this way the motions for resolutions would no longer be subject to debate, and debate is the primary task of a parliament worthy of the name. Secondly, an even more incongruous result is that, in this way, each majority can approve whatever it wishes outside of Parliament — and I stress 'each majority': that of the center-right which today dominates the Assembly, but also a different majority which could arise from future elections. I am frankly astonished by the argument of Mr D'Angelosante, whom I believed to be an expert jurist as well as an experienced politician, and who nevertheless favours this procedure. I am sorry that he is no longer present. Moreover, Mr D'Angelosante should ask himself why his short speech was applauded by the groups on the right in this Assembly.

Mr Luster's work has in reality one objective: to suppress dissent, not only and not principally from the Group for Technical Coordination but also from the non-affiliated members, as well as differences arising from democratic disagreement within each parliamentary group. Above all, it is aimed at preventing a real confrontation of opinions on the decisive questions which concern the European peoples of the ten countries of the Community.

In the last analysis, a close look convinces us not of the strength but of the weakness of the center-right majority which dominates the Parliament today. This weakness is a dangerous one, however, for it threatens freedom. I appeal to the progressive members of the Assembly, to the Communist and Socialist members, to the Liberal members who are not inconsistent, as is Mr Gallard. I say to them: think well before you vote

in favour of Rules of Procedure which put a noose around the neck of democracy and free expression, the essential prerogatives of any parliament. I will say something, addressing Mr Luster directly this time: I leave to you the entire responsibility for this little bible of trivia which you have so zealously compiled.

IN THE CHAIR: MR GONELLA

Vice-President

Mrs Dekker. — (*NL*) Mr President, in the speaking time available to me I shall concentrate on points and proposed amendments which ignore the presence of non-attached Members in this Parliament. I wish to speak on this subject because, as far as I can discover, non-attached Members were not involved in the preparation of this report.

But first I have a general remark to make on the proposed amendments. We approve most of them. There are some which I positively welcome, such as requiring the Bureau to inform the ordinary Members of Parliament and the proposed written procedure involving a register for resolutions.

Where the non-attached Members are concerned, the statements made yesterday in this Chamber show that there are still, almost two years after this directly elected Parliament came into being, a number of Members who are not aware that there are Members of this Parliament who do not belong to a political group. Lady Elles is unfortunately not here, but I would draw her attention to the fact that there are now more than 20 Members of this Parliament representing over 10 million electors who — I repeat — do not belong to any one of the European groups recognized by the Rules of Procedure.

I should like to make another general remark, Mr President. Yesterday's debate also showed that, however perfectly they may be worded, Rules of Procedure which are not applied properly remain a dead letter. It is above all the spirit and attitude with which the Rules are used which determine whether they function justly. Our President, Mrs Veil, once said in inspired words — I mean during the discussion of an amendment to the Rules of Procedure — that she would act as the President of all Members and not therefore simply of a certain majority, and we approved of what she said. And I hope Mr President, that this attitude will also apply to this revision of the Rules of Procedure. Then, I think, we shall come out of this quite well.

Dekker

There are really only two amendments which, unintentionally perhaps, ignore the existence of the non-attached Members. Firstly, there is Rule 93, which governs substitutes for committee members. As the proposal now stands, only members of political groups could have substitutes, and this opportunity would not be open to non-attached Members. I cannot imagine that this is what Parliament intends.

This can be put right by a simple adjustment, namely the inclusion of an additional paragraph governing substitution by other than permanent substitutes from the groups. I have drawn up a text to this effect, with which I will not trouble the Assembly now, but I should like to table this amendment. My colleagues and I did not in fact receive the report until yesterday afternoon. We made it clear during the debate yesterday afternoon that it was impossible for us to take note of this report before the deadline for the tabling of amendments had expired. I will now merely indicate the three minor amendments I wish propose, and I could thus table these amendments orally now. I can, of course, confirm them in writing as well. They are supported by a number of other non-attached Members. As we shall not be voting on the report until the next part-session, I hope it will be acceptable for the text to be corrected, but I will consult the group representatives on this.

Reference has already been made to the opportunity every Member has, under Rule 112, I believe, of proposing further amendments to the Rules of Procedure, but it would be far more practical if this amendment could be made now.

The first point, then, is the appointment of substitutes for members who do not have permanent substitutes. The second point concerns the composition of inter-parliamentary delegations. Under Rule 106(2) as proposed, the members of delegations would first be nominated by the groups and the delegations would then be set up in accordance with the numerical strength of the groups. This text does not therefore in any way refer to the existence of non-attached Members. I feel we can solve this problem by replacing the words 'having regard to the numerical strength of the political groups' with 'having regard to the distribution of Members among the various political lines'.

The third point concerns Rule 106(3), which states that the political groups appoint the members of the delegations. I would propose that the Bureau should be responsible for these appointments.

The fourth point concerns the present procedure under which two representatives of the non-attached Members have seats in the enlarged Bureau because of the wide range of views in that body. For the reasons which led to the introduction of this procedure, I should also like to see it applied to the representation of non-attached Members in the Bureau. At the moment, Rule 55 proposes a procedure under which

the President and the group chairman meet to fix the agenda. I propose that two representatives of the non-attached Members rather than one should be invited to this meeting. I do not think we have a shortage of chairs in this Parliament. In addition, the number of non-attached Members has grown considerably.

To conclude, Mr President, I can only endorse what others have said: the organization of our work leaves a great deal to be desired. Amendment to the Rules of Procedure may help here and there, but they can never eliminate the real difficulty. Nor does the problem stem from the mass of subjects to be dealt with, as Mr Luster said this morning, but from the anomaly that consists in our having to do our work in at least four European cities, hundreds of kilometers apart and from our having plenary sittings for only a few months each year. Until we have one central, fixed place of work, I am convinced we cannot pretend that we can ever do our work properly.

President. — I call Mr Andriessen.

Mr Andriessen, Member of the Commission. — (NL) Mr President, I am somewhat loath to speak during this debate, which after all principally concerns an internal parliamentary matter, but that does not alter the fact, Mr President, that your internal arrangements may well affect and, I think it is safe to say, will affect relations with the other institutions. And it is from this angle, relations with the other institutions, that I should like to make a few remarks. I shall confine myself to commenting on Rules 33 and 37, which concern the consultation of Parliament. These rules have also, Mr President, attracted considerable attention during this morning's debate.

The Commission welcomes the fact that Parliament wishes to define the consultation procedure rather more accurately. It is after all under this procedure that Parliament's role in the legislative process is given definite shape. And it is in the interests of the Community that you should establish these procedures in such a way that proper justice is done to Parliament's views. I can say, Mr President, that the Commission will cooperate in this. But the Commission does, of course, assume that it cannot and must not be Parliament's intention that the Commission's own position and responsibility in the legislative process should be prejudiced.

Mr Thorn has once again made it clear in his programme of work what the Commission's position is, and you will appreciate, Mr President, that I consider it important to recall that statement once again.

Andriessen

Finally, the Commission also considers it has a duty to ensure that the necessary decisions, relating, for example, to the Community's policies, are taken promptly. This idea of promptness has also been referred to during the debate. And I assume that this is also what Parliament wants and that it will view its responsibility in the legislative process in this spirit. That is what I gathered from a number of statements this morning, for example those by Mrs Vayssade, Mr Fischbach and also Mr Patterson, and I therefore feel justified in concluding that, acting in this spirit, Parliament will take proper account both of its own function in this important process and of the need for correct and prompt decisions, which under the Community's procedures have to be taken by the other institutions as well.

President. — I call Mr Sieglerschmidt.

Mr Sieglerschmidt. — *(D)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to begin by thanking the rapporteur. Mr President, in this House it has always been a polite European custom to thank the rapporteur. But this time I thank him not simply as a matter of courtesy, because the work he has performed has really been quite extraordinary. He has been the model of a rapporteur. I recall what Sir Derek Walker Smith, the British Conservative and for many years the chairman of the Legal Affairs Committee, always used to say: 'I am the obedient servant of the Legal Affairs Committee', and I believe this is also true of Mr Luster, he has truly been the obedient servant of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions and he has performed his task very well.

But now I must take away a little of this praise. Mr Luster was, of course, able to do such excellent work because he was not subject to the pressure from which every rapporteur otherwise suffers when dealing with various official matters and having to reconcile his position as rapporteur with his personal views. There was no need for this because the Rules of Procedure are common to the whole House and it is simply a question of how we as democratic parliamentarians should best arrange these things. To this extent, he was not subject to the same conflicts to which a rapporteur may otherwise be exposed.

Mr President, I have referred to possible pressures. But, I feel, it must be realized that the use of the Rules of Procedure is subject to pressures of different kinds. There is first of all the tension referred to briefly by a number of speakers between the ability of Parliament to function on the one hand and the rights of minorities and even of individual Members on the other. Tension is also caused — and this has also become clear in the debate so far — by different national parliamentary traditions, and these two aspects are related. This becomes quite clear if you look at the various parliaments. I come from a parliament — the

German Bundestag, of which I have been a Member for many years — which can be described as a parliament that places the emphasis on efficiency — in my view, too much so on occasion — rather than spontaneity, the depiction of political matters for the man in the street.

There are other parliaments which I would not say are completely lacking in efficiency, but which very clearly illustrate the function of a parliament as a public forum. The tension I have just described thus exists between these parliamentary traditions, or in the case of the Rules of Procedure between efficiency and ability to function on the one hand and the latter aspects on the other.

The Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions was also exposed to a particular temptation, which must be mentioned here. Allusions have already been made to this to some extent, but I should like to state the matter clearly. We are not a national parliament whose basic position in the national structure is largely predetermined by the constitution. The Treaties, as we all know, say very little about this, and what they say is very general. There was, of course, a considerable temptation perhaps to use the Rules of Procedure to add a little to and possibly even amend the Treaties to suit the majority of Parliament. I believe we successfully resisted this temptation in the end. But we did seize every opportunity to anchor in the Rules of Procedure the agreements that have already been reached with the other institutions — to which Mr Andriessen has just referred — for example, by getting these institutions to enter into commitments.

Let me make it quite clear — and I refer now to Mr Patterson's remark — it was not for Parliament to try, for instance, to take decisions on its seat through the backdoor of the Rules of Procedure. I have very clear views on this, but I would have considered it cowardly to do this.

I should now like to comment on the amendments that have been moved or announced. I will not speak to our own amendments, because Mrs Vayssade has already done so. All I should like to say is that all the amendments announced by speakers, where their substance is already recognizable, appear to be at least capable of discussion, and with some I can agree straight away. But we have not had an opportunity to discuss them as a group. Others will need some thinking about. I should like to take up one point that has been raised by Mrs Dekker on behalf of the non-attached Members. She has made a number of proposals, and we should perhaps, Mr President, and Mr Luster, consider the admissibility of one or other of these proposals, where they seem acceptable, possibly by means of an amendment tabled by the Committee on the Rules of Procedures and Petitions, which will be meeting once again.

I am thinking in particular of what she said about Rule 93. It is indeed unfortunate that a non-attached

Sieglerschmidt

Member, who cannot, of course, be in two places at once, is unable to be represented by another Member when important decisions are being taken in two committees at the same time. But I feel this should be confined to the non-attached Members, so that we can put an end to the old nonsense of everyone being able to substitute for everyone else.

I should now like to make a few comments on the relationship between the protection of minorities, the rights of individual Members and the ability of Parliament to function properly. Without wishing to indulge in too much self-adulation, it seems to me that, notwithstanding what Mr Capanna has just said, the proposal made by the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions represents a fair compromise between the two points of view. But here again, there are, of course, problems, and I quite appreciate what Mr Vié said. We not only have non-attached Members and individual Members but also numerically small groups, whose interests might possibly be considered more carefully during a second round of amendments. We must at least look at this very closely. But one thing seems quite clear to me. The establishment of minority rights very largely depends on how these rights are used or, in plainer terms, how they are abused. If it was possible to prevent Members of this House from abusing rights conceded to them under the Rules of Procedure on a more or less permanent basis, it would undoubtedly be far easier for the House to be even more generous to the minorities.

As regards the problem of differing national traditions in the Rules of Procedure, I feel that we have all — including the rapporteur — learned a great deal in the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions. After all, we are all inclined to claim, quite objectively and without national prejudice, that the traditions of the national parliament from which we come are, of course, the best. Consequently, the rapporteur's initial draft contained a great deal from the Rules of Procedure of the German Bundestag. I am not criticizing him for this, because it happens to everyone. Then we went through a phase in which a very dominating Italian member of the committee occasionally gave the impression that from now on only Italian rules could be adopted. We also had passionate discussions on the point of order and what it really meant. And again, British parliamentary traditions were very much in evidence.

I should just like to mention three examples, beginning with the explanation of vote. From my own German parliamentary experience, I am inclined to say that this is a statement made after the vote to explain why the speaker has acted as he has. But I discovered that for many others this is something of an ideological question. The majority of Parliament must therefore take account of this. I have already mentioned the point of order, and the rapporteur has also spoken on the subject. As my last example, I would refer to the question of how Parliament can speed up proceedings.

There was the Italian model, which was ultimately adopted, but there was also the idea that we should opt for the 'committee of the whole House', this being the British model, or possibly for a third alternative.

I do not think it can be claimed that our committee did not take enough trouble. At all events, it did attempt to do as the Bible says: Try everything and take the best. The result is not, I feel, a work of art. I at least do not feel like an artist, but we did all try to be reliable craftsmen. I believe the House should realize that, in so difficult an undertaking as this revision of the Rules of Procedure, there is no disgrace in perhaps subsequently improving something that proves not to be as acceptable as we at first assumed.

Mr President, in a declaration by the Socialist International adopted 30 years ago this sentence is to be found: Democratic Socialism is a permanent task. I have now learned that Democratic Socialism and the European Parliament's Rules of Procedure have something in common and that — I assume, but I will not say, I fear — the European Parliament's Rules of Procedure are a permanent task.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Herman.

Mr Herman. — *(F)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, this is the third time the attempt has been made to revise the Rules of Procedure and, as Mr Sieglerschmidt has just said, I am afraid it will not be the last time. The difficulty arises from our not all having the same concept of the role this Parliament must play. For some, Parliament is the forum where everyone may speak on anything at any time. This results in anarchy and disrepute. I had hoped that a very large majority of Members, aware that this Parliament does not have the same powers as the national parliaments, would try to obtain these rights by being worthy of them. This would mean Parliament being able to play its role, in other words to deal with everything on its agenda and also to include in the agenda everything it must discuss by virtue of its institutional obligations and, above all, by virtue of the role it wants to play on the European political scene. This is not the case at present: we have a disturbing backlog of opinions to deliver. But what particularly worries me is that, owing to a lack of time and organization, we are unable to adopt a position, after careful consideration, on questions which form the subject of deliberations in the Council, which deprives us of the possibility of having any influence.

What causes this powerlessness? We do not have to look very far. As everyone knows, there are four or five principal causes, and they have been mentioned here. The first is the procedure for voting on urgent matters, on which a great deal of time is wasted and

Herman

which weigh down our agendas. The second is the explanation of vote, which most of the time simply leads to a repetition of the debate. The third is the possibility of calling on the President to ascertain whether a quorum is present, which results in obvious abuses by those who do not like the way the vote is going on some decision or other. The fourth is the need for technical reports to be discussed in plenary when they could be dealt with in committee, and the fifth is the abuse of procedures. There are others, but I will refer only to the most important.

The Luster report — and, like everyone else, I pay tribute to the rapporteur and to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions — endeavours to solve these various problems. It is partly successful, but it remains to be seen how things work out in practice. I am personally somewhat sceptical about some of the proposals. I am speaking now on my own behalf. My group will be voting in favour of the Luster report and of various amendments, but I feel obliged to express some regret. It would have been so much simpler to stipulate that votes on requests for urgent debates should be taken without delay, as is done in various parliaments. That would have avoided all the trouble we have now, and it would have obviated the need to set the cumbersome machinery of Rule 48 in motion. As regards explanations of votes, it would have been quite easy to decide that they should be given very briefly after the voting either in writing or orally. This would also have eliminated most of the problems we have in this respect. With regard to the quorum, it seems to me that, considering the attendance figures for this Assembly, one-third of the Members is too high. The quorum in the British Parliament, which is often cited as a model of democracy, is 10%. I have never heard anyone say that it is not a democratic parliament. As ten countries, soon to be twelve, are represented here, we should not be too ambitious where the quorum is concerned. You will find, ladies and gentlemen, that asking whether a quorum is present will be the favourite procedural weapon of groups wanting to delay votes on matters they do not like.

I shall be voting in favour of the improvements proposed by the Luster report because they are improvements, but I must express the dissatisfaction felt by those who have at heart the smooth functioning of this Parliament and its reputation with the other institutions and the public. There are ways of doing better, and I hope we will do better next time.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Price.

Mr Price. — Mr President, I move the amendment to Rule 4 which I have tabled jointly with my colleagues,

Mr Simpson, one of our Quaestors, and Mr Tyrrell. This is not a matter where there is any real policy difference but a question of getting our legal drafting correct. Today this is a minor change but if we fail to get it right I believe that there could be major problems later. Now the existing text in the Luster report says quite simply that the financial situation of Members, including remuneration, will be dealt with in a special statute. The amendment would replace that text by 'the Bureau shall adopt rules governing the payment of expenses and allowances to Members'. If we look at the existing practice it is quite simply that the Bureau makes rules governing the payment of expenses and allowances to Members. The authority for these Bureau rules seems to be the power of Parliament to make its own rules. But since the Treaty power refers to Parliament it certainly would be far better if Parliament as a whole explicitly delegated to the Bureau the power to make those rules. The amended text would do this; it would do no more and no less. So the amendment would simply confirm and regularize the existing practice without making any change.

The text which is in the original could give rise to certain problems.

The first is that its effect is unclear. It says that the financial situation will be dealt with in a special statute. Is this simply a declaration of political intent, or is it intended to be a governing clause, specifying how the financial situation of Members will be dealt with, and where the relevant text will be found? If it is a declaration simply of political intent, it has no place in our Rules. They are not a manifesto but rules which are capable of regulating our procedure. The concept of a statute for Members, as I understand it, includes ideas for far wider change, not simply dealing with financial provision but including the extension of the rights of Members *vis-à-vis* third parties. Now that can only be done by Community legislation, either made by the Council or by treaty, so if we are making a declaration of political intent it depends on decisions entirely outside our control and in my view is worthless.

But on the other hand this rather ambiguous wording could be taken to be a governing clause laying down the manner in which the whole financial situation of Members is to be dealt with, and if that is what it is, then the mechanism is defective. It implies Community legislation made by the Council and if it is interpreted in that form, then, instead of our Bureau making those rules, we would have passed this function to the Council, surrendering certain powers that we already have. It would be cumbersome for the changes in allowances and it would leave a gap in time, perhaps a very long one, before such a statute was passed.

Now this amendment avoids these problems: it simply states the existing position and puts it on a firm legal base. It does nothing to prevent or restrict a statute of

Price

Members — and I emphasize that — because legislation can be passed in its own right. It needs no reference in the rules for its validity. For those reasons, Mr President, I hope that this House will support this amendment on what is really a matter of detail, but recent events have shown that the financial situation of Members could become a contentious matter where some parties might seek to exploit any ambiguity in our rules. I do not believe that we should take that risk and I therefore urge the House to support the amendment proposed by Mr Simpson, Mr Tyrrell and myself.

President. — I call Mr Chambeiron.

Mr Chambeiron. — (*F*) Mr President, I do not know whether the quality of a document should be judged by its size, but if so, everyone will agree that the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions and its rapporteur undoubtedly deserve the praise of our Assembly. The 54 rules of our original Rules of Procedure have now grown into the 116 rules proposed by Mr Luster's report. I do not say this to detract from the efforts that have unquestionably been made in various quarters in the search for a valid and as wide-ranging an agreement as possible so that we may overcome the deplorable situation we have faced in the past year. There is at least one point on which we all agreed: the need to revise our Rules of Procedure. But what I ask myself is whether there is not a danger of this abundance of material proving to be, when confronted with practical requirements, more of a headache than an instrument likely to help us to conduct our proceedings with greater efficiency. Have we succeeded, as the rapporteur writes in his explanatory statement, in increasing the clarity and transparency of our Rules of Procedure so as to facilitate their application? To some extent I believe we have, but I stress to some extent only. What I personally find strange is Rule 83 (3), under which the President has 24 hours to announce his ruling on a point of order. It sounds as if doubt is being cast on the very clarity of the Rules and it is suggested that the President should consult the leading lights of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions. It seems to me that the first quality a clear set of Rules should have is the ability to be easily and immediately interpreted. Has the best it was intended to achieve become the enemy of the good it was intended to serve? I do not want to prolong my statement, and I shall therefore confine myself to three comments. The first concerns various provisions which seemed contradictory to me and which run the risk of complicating the interpretation and application of the new Rules of Procedure. The new Rule 3 provides for the names of Members whose presence is recorded in the register of attendance to be entered in the minutes of each sitting. But the new Rule 89 (1), which is a revised form of the existing Rule 17, lays down that the minutes of proceedings of each sitting should contain the decisions of Parlia-

ment, the names of speakers and nothing else. I stress, nothing else. How can we reconcile these two contradictory requirements? Are we going to have to give preference to one rule over the other as the case may be? Secondly, the new Rule 53 (2) states that an amendment may seek to change the whole — I repeat, the whole — or part of a text, which means in fact that an amendment may propose a different text, which is tantamount to rejecting the original text. But Rule 54 (1) states that an amendment is not admissible if it is tantamount to a motion for rejection of the text to which it relates. I might have understood if it had said 'if it constitutes a motion for rejection', but it says 'if it is tantamount to'. For me, ladies and gentlemen, there is an obvious contradiction between these two phrases. How are we going to solve this problem? Thirdly and finally, Rule 53 (6) allows a vote on amendments which have not been printed and distributed in all the official languages as long as fewer than one tenth of the Members do not object. But Rule 61, which contains the provisions of the present Rule 15, states that all documents of Parliament shall be drawn up in the official languages. That is another contradiction which I find deplorable. What will the President decide if one of us refers to Rule 53 (6) even though another Member is perfectly entitled to require the strict application of Rule 61?

By emphasizing what seemed to me to be obvious contradictions, I am not in any way trying to make the adoption of the text before us more difficult. But the points I have raised pose a question of principle: if no amendments are tabled — and I do not at the moment know if any have been tabled, because I have not seen them — to ensure absolute concordance between the rules I have referred to, what situation are we going to find ourselves in? The deadline for the tabling of amendments has passed. The text cannot therefore be changed now. There are two alternatives: either we vote on the two contradictory rules simultaneously, which would not be a responsible approach, or we refer the provisions concerned back to committee. There are no other alternatives.

My second observation concerns paragraph 6 of Rule 9, which is an amended version of the present Rule 1 and which permits the President, by way of exception and with the approval of the enlarged Bureau, to convene Parliament at the request of one third of its Members. I should simply like to point out to the Assembly that this is not provided for in Article 139 of the Treaty of Rome, which states that the Assembly may meet in extraordinary session only at the request of a majority of its members. Despite what the rapporteur has written, we are in fact proposing a modification of the Treaty, or perhaps these words do not mean the same thing to everyone. We intend to abide by the provisions of the Treaties establishing the Communities. We have therefore tabled an amendment to this effect, which constitutes a preamble to Rule 1.

Chambeiron

My third and last remark is less an observation than a question. What use does the majority of this Assembly intend to make of various provisions of these Rules of Procedure? I am thinking in particular of Rules 12 and 48. The committee discussed at some considerable length the need to take account of the various political leanings in this institution in elections to the various organs of the Assembly. Some of us would like to have seen things expressed clearly in this respect, with every ambiguity eliminated from the new text. I recall hearing Mr Luster tell us that it was obvious, it was a question of political honesty. May I remind him, as one who likes to quote French writers from time to time, that Talleyrand said, 'If it is obvious, it improves with the saying.' The present wording, which is not very satisfactory, calls for account to be taken of the need to ensure an overall fair representation of the Member States and political views. I will not propose anything likely to delay the proceedings in which we are involved. I should simply like to ask the rapporteur to tell us that it is his intention, and above all the intention of the friends of his who appointed him rapporteur, to abide strictly by this criterion of political honesty when it comes to electing the organs of our institution.

My question also applies to Rule 48, which changes the procedure for urgent debates. I will not repeat everything that has been said about the abuse of the present procedure, except to say, of course, that these abuses were in no way of our doing. If you want to be sure, you need only draw up a list of the motions for resolutions accompanied by requests for an urgent debate that have been tabled in the last year. What is worrying in this specific case is less the letter but the spirit of the rule. Here again, I should therefore like to ask the rapporteur to tell us that, when the list of questions accompanied by requests for urgent debates has been drawn up by the competent authority, he and his friends will take account both of what the majority requests and what should at present be called the minority of this Parliament.

My friends and I have tabled a number of amendments, but I will say straight away that it is in no way our intention to use procedural tricks to hold up the debate. I will very briefly explain these amendments. The first seems important to me: we propose the deletion from Rule 22 (3) of the words 'after consulting the appropriate committee'. We do not consider it suitable, when it comes to determining the organization and workings of the services of this Assembly, for the Bureau, which represents all the political views in this institution, to be subject to the supervision of one or other of Parliament's standing committees. As regards the organization and functioning of the services, the Bureau must have sovereign power. Rules 113 and 114 should, of course, be changed to allow for this. We also propose that Rule 65 (4) should be simply deleted. For us it goes without saying that, when speaking time is allocated for several items on the agenda, how this speaking time is used should be

left to the groups, which must discipline themselves accordingly. This amendment seems logical to me, and I therefore hope that it will be approved by all Members. As regards Rule 55, we propose that we should stick to our present bad habits, which seem to us more in keeping with parliamentary tradition.

Finally, we propose that the third indent should be reinstated in Article 3 (6) of Annex I. The vote on the draft budget as a whole is a political act for which everyone must accept complete responsibility. To shirk this obligation would be, it seems to us, so contrary to parliamentary custom that I do not doubt that this amendment will be adopted without difficulty.

Allow me to say in conclusion that, while the object of the Rules of Procedure is to enable our deliberations to be better organized, it must never become an instrument used by a majority to constrain a minority. Rules of Procedure must not be a weapon in the battle of ideas but a collection of provisions which ensure both the satisfactory organization of proceedings and the pluralism that must be the mark of a democratic assembly. If we want this Assembly to have credibility, we must seek it less in the Rules of Procedure than in the organization of our proceedings and in particular in the discussion of the major problems closest to the hearts of the public that has sent us to this place.

President. — I call Mr Vandemeulebroucke.

Mr Vandemeulebroucke. — (NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in many respects we regard the Luster report as a remarkable improvement. And we also note that practically all the groups regard the Rules of Procedure as being in a permanent state of evolution. I listened with particular interest to the excellent statement made by Mr Patterson. He was concerned about the protection of the rights of individual Members. And it is indeed an improvement to find that questions can now be asked about the Bureau's activities. He also focussed on the greater efficiency needed in Parliament as an institution, and with reference to these two considerations, I should like to move three amendments which I have tabled with Mr Blaney and Mrs Castellina.

The first amendment concerns Rule 53 (4), which says that an amendment may be moved by its author. I propose that this should be changed to read that every amendment not only may but must be moved. I realize that this is in complete contradiction to what Mr Galland said earlier on in the debate. But it is abundantly clear, ladies and gentlemen, from various debates in which we have been confronted with hundreds of amendments that not every Member realized what was precisely at stake in each case. If we go on like this, we shall be reducing Parliament to the status of a machine and then it might perhaps be

Vandemeulebroucke

enough for a number of group chairmen to vote, while the rest of us go home. What we have here is a basic choice: do we opt for the power of the groups or for a strengthening of the rights of the individual Members?

The second amendment concerns Rule 80, which says that explanations of vote may not exceed one and a half minutes in length. I should like to see us reverting to the original proposal of three minutes. I will give just one example to illustrate this. Last month, when the Maij-Weggen report on women's rights was being debated, it became clear that a number of explanations of vote had suddenly given rise to a fresh debate and to changes of emphasis. I also support what Mrs Dekker said, that we must not systematically go about saving time, because then we shall in fact be concerning ourselves with curing the symptoms. We will then be getting round the parliamentary rules and above all the parliamentary problems, to which solutions will not be found until we have a single seat and more sittings can be held spread over more working days.

The third and last amendment concerns Rule 93 (2), which states that, in the absence of an ordinary committee member, he may be replaced by another member of his political group. I should like to see the words 'of his political group' deleted out of consideration for the non-attached Members in particular. There are Members who do not belong to any political group.

Circumstances beyond their control, sickness, for example, can then prevent them from making important statements, and I consider that to be flagrant discrimination. I would therefore ask you, ladies and gentlemen, to give careful consideration to the rights of the minorities. These amendments in no way conflict with the greater efficiency of the proceedings of Parliament. In fact, they present a purposeful option in favour of the rights of the individual Member and perhaps also of the rights of those members of the large groups whose right of initiative and right to speak are often trampled underfoot by the leading lights of those groups.

President. — I call Mr Romualdi.

Mr Romualdi. — (*I*) Mr President, it is indeed difficult to make a judgment on these new Rules after a hurried reading and without having participated in their elaboration, for they are very lengthy. They were drawn up in committee with much labour, and the individual sections — 116 articles, I believe — have been approved there, mostly by a majority. For those who, like the non-affiliated members, are not represented in the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions, such a judgment becomes even more difficult.

It is clear that these Rules, like all rules, are the product of a compromise. It is not this which we deplore.

We do deplore the fact that, in general, the compromise was made to the advantage of the strongest groups, to the advantage of the majority, that is to say, without regard for the rights of the smaller groups and of the minorities, which are particularly represented in this Assembly by the non-affiliates. These non-affiliates are not independent by choice, as one ill-informed person has stated. Rather they are independent because of the material impossibility, for political and not practical reasons — indeed, contrary to practical reasons — of forming a political group in accordance with what is laid down in the rules concerning the composition of such groups.

I am perfectly aware that it is necessary to streamline our work load, but I do not believe we can allow this to be done at the expense of the rights of the weakest, as I think would be the case under Rule 48, where in paragraph 2 — as in Rule 55 as well, where the procedure for fixing the agenda is described — it is laid down that a representative of the independents is invited to participate in the meeting, but without the right to vote.

To me it is clear that, regarding non-affiliated members, the same should apply here as for the Enlarged Bureau: that is, the representatives of the non-affiliates should be at least two in number and should have the right to vote. The reasons for this are obvious. Only in this way will the non-affiliates participate on an equal basis with the representatives of the political groups, sharing the responsibility and accepting in a correct and disciplined manner the decisions of the majority, whatever they may be. Without the right to vote, they will be unable to do this. For the same reasons, that is, in defence of the independents, I declare that it is unacceptable to reduce the time limit for explanations of vote to a minute and a half. This is certainly not the way to expedite our work, which, for the most part, is drawn out, complicated, and at times blocked altogether by requests for urgent procedure — a question which almost never concerns the minorities and never, absolutely never, the non-affiliates.

I think therefore that the reduction of speaking time for explanation of vote is absolutely unacceptable.

On the subject of explanations of vote I will say that especially in a Parliament such as ours, where speeches, even the longest, are limited to a few minutes, such speeches are absolutely necessary to illustrate the positions of the groups and of the members who are not organized in groups. In this respect I think that three more observations should be made.

In the Italian Parliament, from which other procedures have been borrowed for these new Rules, in order to avoid taking up too much time in explanations of vote, the right to make such declarations is accorded, in an equitable way, only to group representatives and to those members — in practice very few

Romualdi

— who dissent from the decisions of their political group and feel obliged to vote otherwise. In our case, therefore, the right to the explanation of vote for at least three minutes should be granted to the leaders of the political groups, to the two representatives of the non-affiliates present in the Enlarged Bureau or to a member delegated by them, as well as to eventual dissidents from within the various political groups. This would greatly reduce the time necessary for the explanations of vote, but it would at the same time allow those who have a right to speak to do so in the shortest possible time; concise explanations, yes, but clear enough so that they may be understood.

There are many other points I could raise here — good, less good, and even very bad. This however would presuppose a closer reading of the text than was possible in the time available. I will therefore save my other remarks until the articles and amendments are examined — a difficult task which will require the best efforts of all of us.

In conclusion, I wish to associate myself with the expressions of thanks and esteem offered for the work which has been done — certainly with good intentions even where we consider errors to have been made — by the committee and by Mr Luster the rapporteur.

President. — I call Mr Rogers.

Mr Rogers. — Mr President, because of the meeting of the enlarged Bureau this morning, I come with the disadvantage of not having listened to the debate which took place earlier. I am down to speak as being one of those unfortunate people who worked hard in the committee that dealt with this report.

I would like to congratulate Mr Luster for his efforts. It must have been a very trying experience for him preparing this report, especially because of the obstructionism practised by certain Members of this House. It is that very obstructionism that requires these new sets of rules. As a member of the committee I am not happy with them. I say that to Mr Luster and to other Members who know my opinion on certain issues.

On the other hand, I am going to vote for them. I am going to vote for them because the present set of rules is bad. It is not our fault that the rules as they exist are bad. They were drawn up for the old Parliament which was half this size, and they were drawn up for the nominated institution rather than a directly-elected one. We have seen over the last year and a half the stupidity of trying to apply these rules in the present situation. The rules have needed revising badly. It has been a long process, but I am glad we are now near the end of our work. I am very sorry we will not be able to vote on them at this part-session because of the obstructionism of certain Members, and that we have

to defer the vote until the second part-session in March. The nonsense of the rules is shown by the fact that in that session alone, we shall be spending ten hours, at the very least, voting on amendments, some of which are extremely frivolous, and then we are going to have to have a final vote requiring a qualified majority so that we can get the report through. And this at a time, — this is the farce of the situation which I want to bring home to the obstructionists — when the Council of Ministers is waiting for our opinion on ninety separate topics. Ninety separate topics are outstanding! It makes the drawing up of an agenda for a part-session lasting one week per month a nonsense situation.

Besides that, you have members of committees who naturally want to participate politically on major issues; like unemployment, textiles and the crises in the various industries in Europe. Therefore they bring this forward and it goes into the committees, and we get the own-initiative reports. So we have this problem of reconciling our Treaty obligations *vis-à-vis* the Council and the Commission with the own-initiative reports put forward by Members of Parliament who quite rightly want to exercise their political judgment on major issues of the time. So I hope that these rules will work for the expedition of business.

If Parliament is to have any credibility, it has to have a proper framework in which to operate. No institution of this size and supposed credibility can do without a proper framework. We need this framework so that we can get on with our business.

But at the same time we must reconcile various interests that exist: the functioning of the institution, as I mentioned, the framework of the institution, also the position of individual Members. A great deal of stress has been laid on the position of individual Members in some of the amendments that have been put forward. But very often one demonstration of democracy is the ability of individuals to subordinate their own particular interest to the common good. A person like myself, who belongs to the largest group within the Parliament, recognizes that on many occasions and on many issues where I would like to speak, I cannot speak. I must subordinate my interests so that business can be expedited. If we all wanted to act as individuals, if we all wanted to insist on explanations of votes, if we all wanted to participate in every facet of the business of the Parliament, then it really would be a nonsense.

The other factor that has to be balanced in the situation and I think this has been said by Mr Luster is the harmonization of national interests and national traditions. We come from ten different countries, with different traditions and we must come together in a common situation. It is difficult not to want to insist on our own particular traditions. But I think that Mr Luster's report attempts to balance this situation.

Can I speak on one very specific thing, Mr President, something which I have been responsible for in

Rogers

preparing a report to the Bureau of the Parliament, and which I am hoping the Bureau will be able to take up, if not today, then at the reconvened meeting on Thursday. This concerns Rule 8, on the conduct of Members and the declaration of Members' financial interests and the maintenance of a register in relation to this. I had an extremely difficult time in the committee with this particular opinion. I hope that it will now be adopted by the Bureau as an annex to the rules. I think it is most important that this democratically elected institution should have a provision in its rules for a declaration of Members' financial interests and the maintenance of a register of those interests. The proposals that I am putting forward is that Members should declare briefly an interest when speaking in parliamentary debates, and then at the same time a register of Members' personal and financial interests will be available on a continuing, developing basis in the Secretary-General's office. This register will be available for public scrutiny and will be published annually.

As we know, in some assemblies there is no statutory provision or rules of procedure relating to this, but there is a self-imposed rule under which Members usually abstain voluntarily from speaking or voting. At the other extreme, in some assemblies such as the American House of Representatives and Senate, an attempt has been made to limit the external activities and earnings of Members to ensure that there are no potential conflicts of interest and that members devote adequate time to the posts to which they have been elected. We do not have this situation here. The European Parliament has been extremely slow in implementing such measures for its Members, although the matter has been under discussion since 1974. I feel, and I am sure the Parliament will feel, that it is now imperative that these measures be implemented as soon as possible, so that the electors of Europe can be afforded the same dignity and courtesy as other electors who elect people to their national parliaments. So, on that point, Mr President, I would like to finish.

I am not happy with the totality of these rules, there are various things that I would like to see altered, and possibly over the years we can do this. I am quite sure that I will avail myself of the opportunity to put down amendments to the report. But at the present time I do not think we have any option other than to vote for the compromise situation that is presented in the Luster report. Thank you for your attention, Mr President, and may I again thank Mr Luster for his very hard work.

President. — I call Mrs Boot.

Mrs Boot. — (NL) Mr President, I wish to join with all those who have this morning thanked Mr Luster in particular for his work. We believe that he and all those who have been involved in the drawing up of

this report have in every way succeeded in producing a balanced document. This is what we need in this new, elected Parliament so that we can, as it were, put on a new coat, now that we have grown out of the old Rules of Procedure, and we were all convinced, partly by the challenges presented by the new Members, that we should undertake a general revision. Mr Luster has viewed his task as rapporteur as the work of a law-maker.

In this Parliament there are really two kinds of rapporteur: rapporteurs who essentially produce their own documents and try to persuade their committees to accept them, and rapporteurs who try to reflect as accurately as possible the views that have been put forward in committee. I believe Mr Luster has been particularly successful in this. He has, in my view, thus come closest to performing the legislative work that a normal Parliament does.

I feel the Commission, on whose behalf Mr Andriessen has spoken this morning, appreciates particularly well that with Rule 35 of the amended version we are endeavouring to provide a more accurate definition of the consultation procedure. I should like to take this matter up briefly.

We have thus inserted a new rule permitting Parliament to vote on the Commission's proposals. This will be a new way of making our views known.

The rejection by the European Parliament of a proposal from the Commission must not be regarded as Parliament's final opinion. After the rejection of a proposal, the President must ask the Commission to withdraw it. If this is not done, Parliament will not vote on the motion for a resolution concerned, and the whole matter will be deemed to have been referred back to the appropriate committee.

This is what is new about this procedure. We are trying to gain more control over the proposals which the Commission submits to the Council. The Council, Commission and Parliament should be working together on the European task. If the Commission shares Parliament's views on a European question, it will take the hint and withdraw its proposals if they do not comply with the views that emerge in this Parliament. We will be happy if this is the way things are done.

If, however, the Commission should adopt a position with the Council that conflicts with Parliament's views, Parliament will be able to prevent the Council from taking a decision. That is the second option included in this proposal. Parliament's vote on the Commission's proposal does not therefore represent its final opinion: it means that the matter is deemed to have been referred back to the appropriate committee. In this way we may be able to delay a possible Council decision, and that represents a strengthening of our position.

Boot

I am sorry that the proposed Rule 35 does not refer to a reasonable time-limit, because I feel it is important there should be one. Mr Andriessen said earlier on this morning that it is in the interests of the European Community for decisions on Community policy to be taken promptly. Parliament must help to ensure that this is so. Mr Andriessen called on Parliament to act in this spirit. The Commission thus appreciates that Parliament may not be able to act in this spirit. I feel that that is where our strength lies. It would be particularly useful if, in view of the isoglucose decision, the European Court could make it known in some way or other in the future what is meant by a 'reasonable time-limit' by which Parliament must deliver its opinion.

President. — I call Mr Prout.

Mr Prout. — Mr President, first of all I would like to join the long list of those who have congratulated Mr Luster on all the work he has put into this excellent report. I am also very pleased to be following Mrs Boot, because I too want to talk about that part of the new set of rules which refers to the process of consultation.

In drafting the sections on consultation, that is, Articles 32 to 37, the committee had two objects in mind: first, to identify the precise moment at which the consultation procedure ends, and second, to devise a procedure which more accurately reflects the Commission's political responsibility to Parliament, which is enshrined in Article 144 of the Treaty of Rome. As to the first, our task has been enormously simplified by the decision of the Court of Justice in the isoglucose case, where the Court held that the consultation procedure is only complete when Parliament has delivered its opinion to the Council. For clarity's sake, therefore, Rule 32(2) now states that the consultation procedure shall end with a vote on the whole text of the motion for a resolution contained in the report.

The second object of the revised Rules is to engage the political responsibility of the Commission to us in our day-to-day work, which is reflected in the new Rules 35, 36 and 37. Here we are introducing a two-stage procedure. Parliament will first of all vote and amend the text of the Commission proposal, so that it can form an initial view without concluding the consultation procedure. Then, if there are substantial differences between the two Institutions, these can be the subject of further consideration, and perhaps negotiation, while the matter is still within the Parliament. It is only at the second stage that Parliament will vote on its own motion for a resolution and those amendments to terminate the consultation procedure.

Now I hope that the Commission will give full support to this new procedure. Mr Thorn spoke last month

about his intention to take a stronger and more independent line in his dealings with the Council; but how can he and his colleagues, who after all are appointed by member governments, do this on their own? What makes him think that he can succeed where his predecessor failed? Surely the solution is to engage the democratically-elected Parliament more intimately and more fully in the Commission's legislative plans and objectives. Backed by us, Mr Thorn has a much greater chance of achieving the objects he said he wants. I hope that the Council will also recognize that the changes we propose flow naturally from Article 144 of the Treaty and will respect them accordingly. Like the Council under Article 151, we under Article 142 have autonomy in deciding our own Rules of Procedure. Should the Council choose to consider actively a Commission proposal before our own consultation procedure were complete, I am sure that we can rely on the Commission to withdraw that proposal from the Council forthwith, as it indubitably has the power to do under Article 149 of the Treaty.

President. — I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (F) Mr President, I have sixty or fifty-eight seconds to speak in this major debate. So you are not giving me the floor: you are condemning me to silence.

I wish to say quite simply that we shall not be voting in favour of the new Rules of Procedure. These are not Rules of Procedure: they represent a settling of scores, and a poor one at that. In future, you will not be ensuring the order of the day, Mr President. Over the years you will be ensuring the disorder of the day, your disorder of the day.

(Interruption from the right)

This is a debate which, thanks also to your interruption, it would have been better to hold during carnival time rather than Lent. Thank you for allowing me to say that.

For my part, Mr President, I feel we should at least have allowed the Socialist, Christian-Democratic and Liberal Members, the representatives of the majority, calmly to read out the new laws, the new code of our Parliament. You have been very cunning with your authoritarian weakness, your powerless and cheating authority.

The sole aim of our amendment is this: we request, on behalf of all parliamentarians, the right to go home, to find this Luster on the mat, to think about it and to come back and vote on it in April in full knowledge of the facts. This is, I believe, a demand for dignity to be restored to Parliament.

Mr President, we will always find the means to speak because we have things to say. We do not only have things to suppress as is very often the case with you all.

President. — I call Mr Gondicas.

Mr Gondicas. — (*El*) Mr President, I noted with particular attention, and I hope you did too, how much time we wasted today talking about how much time should be allocated for speaking-time. For this reason, I, at least, shall be very brief. The basic assumptions of Parliament are, I believe, freedom to express opinions and unlimited freedom of speech. Furthermore, these assumptions are a fundamental principle of a large number of political groups including that of the non-attached Members. I must say that I was unpleasantly surprised by Mr Galland's speech as he ought to be aware of the special temporary conditions on the basis of which we, the 14 Greek MPs of New Democracy, are here. Moreover, on page 53 of the List of Members of Parliament our Group is referred to as temporarily non-attached and, in any case, each of us has decided individually not to become attached until later.

It has also, Mr President, clearly escaped my friend Mr Galland's attention that according to Article 132 of the Act of Accession Greece has the right to request an amendment to the Rules of Procedure which we are discussing today. If you have no objections, I will read the French text word for word. It says: 'L'Assemblée se réunit au plus tard un mois après l'adhésion de la République hellénique. Elle apporte à son règlement intérieur les adaptations rendues nécessaires par cette adhésion'. Therefore, we probably would have had the right to request a substantial amendment to Article 36(5) which refers to the composition of the groups. However, we did not do so. I had expected that Mr Galland's Group would particularly appreciate this fact. Indeed, it is true that we have recently received a good deal of praise from Mr Bangemann's Group as it has been interested in us for some time. I also understand the position of my colleagues who made strong speeches on safeguarding the speaking-time of the political groups. However, I do not share the opinion that in order to speak in this Assembly without being pushed for time you should have to belong to a political group. But let's face it, Mr President, what is being sought by these manoeuvres is the absorption of the non-attached Members by the large groups.

New Democracy's position is quite clear and open: all of us, for the reasons which we have repeatedly explained to the leaders of the political groups, are temporarily non-attached. Therefore we consider that the comments which were made do not refer to us. However, for objective reasons, we must make an effort to see that all Members in this Parliament are ensured the full amount of speaking-time regardless of whether they belong to small or large political groups or to none at all. This view should be upheld because each of us in Parliament, in accordance with the legal criteria of Article 2(2) of the Rules of Procedure which we are discussing today, is expressing his own personal opinions. No human enterprise, Mr Presi-

dent, is infallible or everlasting. The Luster report, doubtless an enterprise requiring many compromises, makes a contribution to the task of dealing with, for the most part, numerous minor and major procedural details. We believe that it meets the needs of today and therefore shall vote in favour of it. Personally I congratulate Mr Luster for his work and offer him my warm thanks. Thank you very much, Mr President.

President. — I call Mr Adam.

Mr Adam. — Mr President, I listened very carefully to the opening of the debate this morning by Mr Luster, and very broadly I agree with the objectives that he stated. But I do not think that the report actually goes far enough towards achieving them. It does not bridge the gap, as I see it, between the rights of Members to speak and to table resolutions and the need to transact our business in such a way that the voice of Parliament is clearly understood outside.

As I see it, there are three points where further changes are needed. First, we have to establish the priority for those items on which Parliament has been asked for its opinion or advice. I was very surprised at the figure that Mr Rogers gave a few moments ago, that 90 such opinions are now outstanding. My own guess would have been about 50, but that shows the very grave problems that we face. Secondly, we need to structure our agendas so that the debating and voting times are adhered to and Members and the staff of the Commission and the Council as well can make more efficient use of their time. Thirdly, we need to improve the working relations of the Parliament by establishing the accountability of the Bureau and the enlarged Bureau and the College of Quaestors to Parliament as a whole.

I have put down a small number of amendments which are designed to achieve those aims and which I hope Members will support. Since I wrote to the President last November and circulated the letter to all Members, I have noticed some slight moves to reduce the frustrations of Members and improve our working arrangements. But this week's draft agenda highlights the difficulties that we face. There are only three items on the agenda for debate on matters where Parliament has been asked for its opinion or advice — three only! And where are they on the agenda? They are on the agenda for Thursday. Are they at the beginning of the day? No — they are right at the very end of the day when we know that we are not at our best in debating terms and when the exodus from Strasbourg is already well under way.

Also in the draft agenda the word 'possibly' is used eight times. Possibly there may be a debate. Possibly there may be a vote. Perhaps there may even be a meeting of the Parliament. And it is these problems which regrettably I do not think the report actually

Adam

gets to grips with. But there is one further problem that must be studied urgently — it is a bit beyond the remit of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions but I must mention it here — and that is the need to ensure that the translation, the printing and the distribution services of the Parliament are compatible with what we lay down in the Rules. This is not the case at the moment and I have a suspicion that some of the recommendations that are made in the Luster report will make it even more difficult for the translation service to meet those needs.

It is the failings of this basic administration of the Parliament which threaten to undermine the good intentions of the report but nevertheless I will support it because we do need some changes and they are a step in the right direction.

President. — I call Mr Tyrrell.

Mr Tyrrell. — Mr President I should like to say that our Rules of Procedure ought to help us to discharge our responsibilities in the Parliament. In fact our Rules have during the 18 months since the directly-elected Parliament first met hindered us. The limitations of the Rules have been exposed again and again. And the ensuing chaos has undermined the morale of Members and has undermined the respect in which the Parliament is held.

Now we in this Parliament have of course particular problems that most parliaments do not have. We have the language problem. We have the working place problem. As far as the language problem is concerned, there is little we can do about that. The Council lays down in regulations what the official languages of the Community are. I take Mr Chambeiron's point as to the apparent inconsistency with which the committee has suggested that we deal with the language issue in our Rules but even having regard to that, there is nothing one can do about the number of official languages.

But as far as the other major problem that hampers our work is concerned, namely our working in three different places, it is a matter of regret that the committee did not take the opportunity that these amendments offer to change Rule 2, first to give it sense and second to enable us to meet in one place. Because as a result of moving from place to place this Parliament only has 35 hours a month in which to transact its business. Mr Gondicas said we should have freedom to express our opinions but the trouble is we only have 35 hours to divide between 436 Members. So how can we have freedom to express our opinions? And then we waste time month after month, week after week, day after day travelling from place to place.

Nor do the new Rules tackle the time problem? They go a little way towards it. Two prime candidates are obviously explanation of vote and urgency debates. In each of those respects the Rules take a step forward. Not as big a step as we would have liked but a step which is of some significance and which will save time to some extent. Those are the two matters which will enable people to speak more on matters which are the direct responsibility of this House.

To Mr Romualdi and others who have remarked on the lack of speaking time, may I say that the non-attached Members have two-and-a-half times as much opportunity to speak as the individual Members in my group do and I would remind them that majorities also have rights. One of the most astonishing features of this Parliament that I have noticed since I came here is that the majority has been so sensitive as not to use its majority in a way which might hinder minorities. Mr President, these Rules are a step forward; they are, I hope, the first of a number of such steps.

President. — I call Mr Luster.

Mr Luster, rapporteur. — (*D*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should first like to express my very sincere thanks for this debate. I am, of course, pleased that the report I have submitted has met with a great deal of approval, and in particular the approval of all the groups, leaving aside that led by Mr Pannella. But I have also learned a great deal from those who have been critical and made further suggestions.

I would ask you to appreciate that as rapporteur I am not at the moment in a position to assess the amendments that have been moved. As you know, a meeting of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions has been set aside specifically for a discussion of the amendments to see which of them can be adopted by the committee as a whole. This does not mean that I should not like to express my liking for various amendments, for example those tabled by Mrs Vaysade to Rule 34(1) and 48. The first seems acceptable to me, but we shall have to discuss the second, the amendment to Rule 48, at some length.

I was pleased to hear Mrs Vayssade tell us after moving the amendments she announced on behalf of the Socialist Group that the adoption of these amendments was not a *conditio sine qua non* for her group. For me — and I hope for the House as a whole — this does not mean that we will consider them any less important or that we will examine them less carefully to see — with a view to reaching agreement with the Socialist Group — whether these amendments should be approved. But I regard Mrs Vayssade's remarks as a good sign of cooperation to come.

I do not need to argue with those who have been positive in their remarks. The question of speaking time

Luster

has figured in various statements, and on the face of it, what both Mr Galland and Mr Vié said about doubling the speaking time of non-attached Members is, of course, very positive. I was also very impressed by what Mr Gondicas said on behalf of his Greek colleagues, who are non-attached for the time being. However, at least this is what we all hope, is not a permanent situation, but one caused by the specific national and electoral situation in Greece. We must try to make the best of what Mr Galland and Mr Vié have rightly said and of the temporary emergency situation in which our 14 Greek colleagues find themselves. I was further impressed when Mr Vié said that it could not be considered right for speaking time to be calculated entirely in proportion to the number of members in a group. A large group having a common front has only one opinion, which it can express only once. A small group also has only one opinion, which it can express only once, and for that it normally needs the same time. Everyone appreciates that a large group is allocated more speaking time, but a middle path must surely be sought between proportionality on the one hand and degression on the other.

What Mrs Dekker suggested to take account of the non-attached Members was, I found, important. We shall have to incorporate some of this. This is quite feasible, because this problem was in fact overlooked in the rush. It was not done out of ill will. It is doubtful, however, that all the suggestions made by Mrs Dekker can be incorporated.

To Mr Adam I should like to say that everything he said could also have been said by me. The reason why we have not come up to his expectations is simply that we repeatedly had to seek a compromise.

Mr Chambeiron criticized our work in his cultivated and refined way, but I was pleased to hear that he will be approving the result as a whole. What he said is worth noting, and we will have to look into it. In connection with Rules 48 and 12, he asked whether what is said here is really meant seriously. I cannot, of course, speak on behalf of the House as a whole, although I would in fact like to do so. All I can say to you, Mr Chambeiron, is that, with my limited powers, I could not have contributed to the reaching of a consensus in committee on these draft Rules of Procedure if I had not had the committee's confidence to some extent. I would be extremely grateful to you if you could also have confidence in me until the opposite is proved. I will always endeavour to be reasonable. I may not always succeed, but when I do not, it will be due not to ill will, for example, but to my weakness. At all events, I shall endeavour to keep to what I have said.

A word to Mr Pannella, who is not in the Chamber now, who has spent very little time in the Chamber throughout the debate, but who has been very scathing in his criticisms of all those who were not present. As he is not here, I shall do no more than say that I find it

regrettable that there must repeatedly be so many unjustified misunderstandings with a man of such intelligence and eloquence.

Mr President, my thanks for this debate. I hope we manage to achieve a satisfactory result during the vote at the next part-session.

(Applause)

President. — I note that there are no more speakers listed.

The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote, together with the amendments tabled thereto, at the next voting time.

The debate is closed.

4. *Welcome*

President. — On behalf of Parliament I have pleasure in welcoming the delegation from the French Senate, headed by Mr Jacques Genton, who have taken their places in the Official Gallery. I hope that their visit will be particularly fruitful and I thank them for coming to Strasbourg.

(Applause)

President. — I hereby suspend our proceedings, which will resume at 3 p.m.

The sitting is suspended.

(The sitting was suspended at 12.50 p.m. and resumed at 3 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR: MR FRIEDRICH

Vice-President

President. — The sitting is resumed.

5. *Membership of committees*

President. — The next item on the agenda is the election of members of the committees.

The motion for a resolution tabled by the chairmen of six political groups concerning the renewal of the

President

appointments of committee members (Doc. 1-976/80), which is placed before Parliament today, has been drawn up in accordance with the instructions given by the Bureau at its meeting of 18 February 1981.

At its meeting this morning the Bureau considered the proposal put forward by Mr Skovmand and others that Mr Pannella be appointed a member of the Committee on Development and Cooperation.

I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (F) Mr President, my proposals may be considered negligible, but I should at least like them to be left as they are. I had, more modestly, proposed that I be nominated for the Committee on Development and Cooperation, but that is very much of secondary importance. I would refer you to Rule 37(2) and (3) and ask you — with specific reference to paragraph 3 — when we may table amendments to the Bureau's proposal. Secondly, the motion for a resolution by six group chairmen was not tabled twelve days ago, as the Rules of Procedure specify. If that had been done, we would have had twelve days to table amendments. But how are we now to table amendments to the motion for a resolution by the six group chairmen on the one hand and to the Bureau's proposal, pursuant to Rule 37(3), on the other?

President. — Mr Pannella, you have submitted your amendments to the President in the form of a letter. Under Rule 37 (2) of the Rules of Procedure this constitutes a candidature. Candidatures are addressed to the Bureau, which places before Parliament proposals designed to ensure the representation of Member States and of political views.

Under the Rules of Procedure the Bureau must place a proposal before Parliament after it has considered the candidatures. The Bureau has taken note of your proposal and decided not to amend the current composition of the committees, since it provides an equitable representation of Member States and political views. It felt that to do otherwise would lead to imbalance. Now, under Rule 37 (3) of the Rules of Procedure, Parliament may vote on an amendment to the proposals of the Bureau, but it is admissible only if it is tabled by at least ten Members. Parliament votes on the amendment by secret ballot.

To answer your question I would point out that it was decided on Monday to fix the deadline for tabling amendments as follows: Membership of committees — Monday, 9 March, 6 p.m. No amendments had been tabled by 7 p.m. yesterday. This was categorically established in the Bureau today. Consequently, Parliament must now decide on the renewal of the appointments of committee members which political group chairmen have worked out on behalf of the Bureau.

I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (F) Mr President, I am much obliged to you for these explanations. Rule 37 (3), as you have very rightly pointed out, states that amendments to proposals of the Bureau are admissible only if tabled by at least ten Members. So, as regards the Bureau's proposal of which you informed us five minutes ago, that the Bureau should assume responsibility for the motion for a resolution tabled by the six group chairmen — an initiative of which, if you like, our Assembly is now deprived — when can we table amendments? You cannot tell me that amendments to the Bureau's proposal should have been tabled yesterday when the proposal was only made today. The problem would be a different one — although just as bad — if you referred us to the motion tabled by the six group chairmen. This motion is inadmissible. It does not exist, because it was tabled neither before the twelve-day deadline stipulated by the Rules of Procedure nor in accordance with the urgency procedure.

I therefore ask you, Mr President, how Members here present, ten in number, can, if they want to, table amendments to the proposal from the Bureau of which you have just informed us.

President. — Mr Pannella, since you have asked me to pay close attention — which the President is supposed to do anyway — I must now request you to note what the President reads out.

What I said a moment ago was that the Bureau gave instructions on 18 February 1981. In other words, the deadline was observed. We studied your letter carefully in the Bureau today.

I call Mr De Goede.

Mr De Goede. — (NL) Mr President, although we were informed yesterday that a motion for a resolution would be tabled or had been tabled, Mr Glinne being the first signatory, and that amendments might be tabled up to six o'clock yesterday evening, here again the Dutch text of the resolution did not appear until later. It was not put in our pigeon-holes until this morning. It is not therefore reasonable for you to continue to insist that amendments could have been tabled to it up to six o'clock yesterday evening.

President. — I have just been informed by the Administration that all texts were distributed on Monday afternoon. It is not possible for me to check whether given texts are available on the various subjects. The President has to rely on information from the Administration.

(Mr Pannella asked to speak, but was not called by the President. Parliament adopted the resolution)

6. *Preliminary draft agenda for the part-session from 23 to 26 March 1981*

President. — I now have to announce a decision taken by the Bureau this morning on the part-session from 23 to 26 March 1981. I would point out that this has nothing to do with the vote on the agenda for 23 to 26 March, which will of course take place at the beginning of the sitting on 23 March. Rather, the Bureau is concerned to give this House early notice of the part-session and the provisional agenda.

(The President read out the draft agenda)¹

I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — *(F)* Mr President, I believe that this time we must formally acknowledge that the Bureau has informed the Assembly in time. Many members of the Conservative, Labour and other groups have complained during previous part-sessions that they are always faced with a *fait accompli* as regards the place and organization of part-sessions.

Mr President, I feel it is a very serious mistake to hold this part-session in Strasbourg. I do not believe that Members agree . . .

President. — Mr Pannella, I must ask you not to go on. I have merely made an announcement. You may now speak on a point of order, but not on the question itself.

I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — *(F)* Mr President, when information concerning a Parliament is communicated to it and if that information seems to warrant it, Parliament should have the opportunity to say a few words. But since you refuse, I shall not do so.

President. — I have made an announcement. This is in the agenda.

I call Mr Linde.

Mr Linde. — *(D)* Mr President, you have informed us that an additional part-session will be taking place from 23 to 26 March. Unfortunately you did not say where it will take place. This is of interest to very many Members. Could you please give us this information?

(Laughter)

¹ See Minutes.

President. — The part-session will take place — as decided — in Strasbourg.

(Applause from various quarters)

I call Mr Enright.

Mr Enright. — Mr President, my point of order is a very simple one. We agreed here in Strasbourg that on principle the whole Parliament would be given a vote on the place of meeting. That was stated very clearly in the resolution. All I want to know is at what point we will be voting on whether we agree or not with the Bureau's decision that we should meet in Strasbourg.

President. — The decision has already been taken.

Mr Enright. — Point of order!

President. — I have just made an announcement and I would ask Parliament not to use this as an opportunity to amend the agenda.

(Applause from various quarters)

7. *Economic, social and vocational integration of disabled people*

President. — The next item is the report by Mrs Clwyd, on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, on the motions for resolutions concerning the economic, social and vocational integration of disabled people in the European Community, with particular reference to the International Year of Disabled Persons 1981 (Doc. 1-868/80).

I call Ms Clwyd.

Ms Clwyd, rapporteur. — Mr President, before we begin the debate, I notice there are some empty seats in the gallery. There are several hundred disabled people outside this Parliament at the moment. May I ask you to ask your officials to make those seats available to the disabled people who are waiting outside? I would ask you to do that, please, right away.

(Applause)

President. — I would first like to greet those handicapped persons who are following the proceedings today. Parliament is glad that they have come to Strasbourg and we intend to discuss their problems with all the seriousness that the subject demands.

(Applause)

President

It was certainly not our intention that some of you should be unable to find seats in the public gallery. The Administration will do all it can to remedy this.

I call Ms Clwyd.

Ms Clwyd, rapporteur. — Thank you, Mr President. I would like this debate today to be seen not in isolation but as part of a continuing dialogue between politicians and disabled people, as we strive together to find solutions to the many problems faced by disabled people in the Community. This debate today is therefore only part of our activities.

Earlier today I listened with great attention to the views of disabled people and I pay tribute to them — some of them are up there in the gallery — by starting my speech with the quotation from *Le Petit Prince* with which the general secretary of the European Area Committee of the International Federation of the Blind ended his passionate plea for help and understanding. He said: 'The eyes may be blind, but with the heart we see better'. I suspect that there are many people in the gallery today because they believe that we in the European Parliament are going to be able to help them, that we can somehow ensure a society which has genuine respect for the disabled and will provide the means to enable them to live as full a life as possible. I have had, Mr President, many moving letters from blind people, from deaf people, from spastic people, all believing that we are capable of achieving something that governments in their home countries cannot. I hope that this report will not raise expectations that we cannot achieve. I have tried to be realistic in recommending what I think we in the European Parliament can achieve and putting the ball firmly back in the court of member governments if it belongs there. There is no point at all in assuming a role which we cannot possibly fulfil.

I am sure I speak for my own committee when I say how pleased we are to see this impressive lobby by disabled people from all over the Community. I hope it demonstrates to the Council of Ministers — and I know the President-in-Office is here listening — that there are other citizens worthy of their support besides the farmers. It is high time that they recognized that when it comes to sharing out the Community's budget.

We often talk about social policy, but let us make no mistake! There is no such thing at present as a meaningful social policy in the European Community, and there never can be until the common agricultural policy can be brought to heel. Over the past decade there has been an increasing awareness of the problems faced by disabled people, as shown by the increase in the number of measures to help them, but at the same time many disabled people are still imprisoned inside antiquated institutions or within the walls of their own homes, isolated from their neighbours because of unsuitable housing and the difficulty of access to many public places.

I know it is wrong to speak of the disabled in general. The difficulties met in practice by a spastic child, a blind person, a mentally handicapped person, are completely different, but they are being considered today under the same umbrella because *we* are creating the gulf between them and so-called normal people and because the United Nations has declared 1981 the International Year of Disabled Persons, with the aim of promoting medical and social rehabilitation of disabled people and their full integration into society. That may sound to some of us a somewhat pious hope. There are, after all, plenty of precedents for feeling disheartened. International years have come and gone and seem to have done little to change the hearts and minds of those who have the influence to bring about change.

Accurate figures for the number of disabled people and careful assessment of their needs are fundamental to developing and implementing policies. The Commission estimates that there are between 13 and 23 million disabled people in the Community countries, but there are no up-to-date statistics and there are different criteria for assessing disablement in each member country. We are recommending that the Commission should undertake an EEC-wide survey to establish numbers and needs.

I would like, just for a few moments, to concentrate on what I think is one of the main observations of our report, and this is that a major distinctive feature of disability is poverty. The low income of most disabled people is, as you well know, caused by loss of earnings, by unemployment, part-time employment and inadequate social security benefits or, where the disabled person is a child, the loss of family income. Then there are, of course, the extra costs caused by disability, such as heating, clothing and convenience foods.

To try and alleviate that poverty is a function of the social security programmes in individual countries, and the response of different countries to the financial needs of disabled countries to the financial needs of disabled people varies widely in scope, purpose and organization. Some governments, I am sorry to say, have decided to celebrate the International Year of the Disabled by actually cutting back support for the disabled. I am sorry to say that my own country is one of the main offenders. It has imposed a pay cut of almost 5% on invalidity benefits. It has forced cutbacks on social services such as home helps, meals on wheels, telephones and other aids — the very services which enable people to live in their own homes and to help their families care for them. The list could be extended: I have chosen only the main items from a very sorry catalogue. The UK, too, spends much less than most other Community countries on disabled people, and this latest attack on their living standards is despicable.

Governments who are reluctant to recognize that poverty is one of the major problems facing disabled

Clwyd

people are only too ready to operate what I would call a policy. By that I mean making small concessions here and there, providing a little money today in order to avoid tackling the basic problem of the need for an adequate income.

In a recent survey, it was shown that the cost of heating at home was the most severe financial problem faced by disabled people. The reasons are, of course, obvious. Many disabled people spend a lot of time at home. A large number are elderly and need more heat, and certain illnesses make it essential for a person to keep warm. The point I am making is, of course, that a decent income would make it possible for them to choose what to spend their money on. They would, I have no doubt, however keen they are on history and culture, prefer being able to keep warm in their own homes to being given free passes to a national museum. What is needed — and there ought to be no further delay — is that each of the ten Member States provide an adequate income for disabled people, related to the average industrial wage in that country and recognizing the restriction of a person's range of abilities. A comprehensive disablement allowance could be introduced by stages in all member countries starting with the very severely disabled.

Poverty is a major cause as well as effect of handicap. Bad housing, poor working conditions and low income are closely associated with chronic ill health, disability and premature death. In some countries, the rate of perinatal and neonatal deaths and handicaps is twice as high in the lower socio-economic classes and among unsupported and very young mothers as in the higher social groups.

In the long term, the problem can only be overcome by raising the living standards of socially deprived groups. I do not need to remind you that one of the main aims of the Treaty of Rome is to reduce the gap between the rich and the poor and to transfer resources from the richer parts of the Community to the poorer, which is also the purpose of the Social and the Regional Funds; and that is why my committee says yet again that the Social Fund is grossly inadequate for its tasks. We are talking about the crumbs to be scattered after agriculture has bitten its greedy seven-tenths out of the loaf. Last year, only 4 % was left over for the Social Fund, while applications for that Fund were for double the amount available. Not much help there for the disabled people! In the short term, we would argue that immediate steps can be taken to prevent the birth of disabled babies, improving antenatal care and providing obstetrics services and financial support to disadvantaged mothers. The Community could assist in the funding of publicity, educational and nutritional programmes. Coordinated research on the incidence and effects of handicap would provide the statistical basis for the most effective distribution of resources.

The other priority for disabled people, in the view of my committee, is employment. Among the disabled,

unemployment has always been much higher than the national average, and in some countries at present it is two-and-a-half times as high. This high rate has often been due more to prejudice on the part of employers than to the disability itself. With 8 million out of work in the ten countries at the moment, job prospects for the disabled are getting worse, and as I emphasized in the report, the quota system of positive discrimination in favour of the disabled has become in some countries increasingly ineffective in providing employment. Indeed, it varies between 2 % and 6 % in each country. In general, however ineffective, it is supported by disablement groups as a necessary minimum safeguard until a more effective system is found.

The interesting exception, as I say in my report, is Western Germany, where unless a firm employs its specified number of disabled people it is fined each month until the place is filled. The fines are then paid into a special fund which finances vocational training schemes or the building or equipping of workshops for the disabled. That is why we are asking the Commission to draw on the different experiences of Member States and to assess the most effective ways of improving job opportunities for the disabled.

The greatest part of the Community's funds for disabled people has been put into vocational rehabilitation. Yet, unfortunately, it does not seem to be achieving its aims. Since 1974, the Commission has developed a network of 30 rehabilitation and training centres to assess and train disabled people. The report on these centres shows a need for better preparation and coordination of demonstration projects, studies and pilot schemes.

In many countries, the majority of registered disabled people are those whose disabilities have increased with age and may be related to their work. In some industries, particularly in the coal industry in my native Wales, the earning power of some people grows less with age, and as they become more disabled they have to move from the coal face to the surface. There is no doubt that there are some people who should be given the opportunity to retire early from heavy industry, if there were a policy for voluntary early retirement for disabled people of this sort.

The theme of this International Year is social integration. In our society, there is nothing quite as divisive as being unemployed. Someone who is unemployed is made to feel rejected, less than a whole person. If a person is unemployed and disabled, then there is a double rejection — a convincing message that the society of which they are a part has no place for them. That is why we are calling on the Commission to present a new action programme, to combat the growing threat to jobs for disabled people.

I turn briefly to housing. Unsuitable housing is a major cause of social isolation. In the past few years, there has been some progress in providing adaptation to

Clwyd

homes to make them suitable for handicapped people. Most encouraging are the schemes where disabled people live among able-bodied people, independent but able to call for help from their neighbours if necessary; but still too many disabled people are forced into residential care, often to their physical and psychological detriment and at much greater financial cost. Of particular concern to us are the young and physically handicapped who are condemned to living in homes for the aged.

For those disabled people who need or choose residential care, accommodation should be designed to give them the greatest freedom possible. Something which our Danish colleagues seem to excel in. The Commission, we think, should draw up a code of good practice and minimum standards in this regard. We are also asking, of course, that Member States should adapt public buildings to improve access for the disabled and to strengthen laws to ensure that in future buildings contain adequate facilities for disabled people.

Education, of course, is of fundamental importance to full integration but many disabled children are unnecessarily segregated in special schools and we would like to see Community funds being used to provide facilities in ordinary schools.

Some of my colleagues on the Youth Committee will, I know, want to expand this argument and I must say that I am very sorry that the opinions of so many committees were too late to be considered by the Committee on Social Affairs. The Committee on Social Affairs met on 28 October, 1 December, 19 January and 27 January and the report was adopted unanimously by the Committee on Social Affairs. Unfortunately, it appears that the Youth Committee, the Legal Affairs Committee and the Committee on Transport met after that date, between 27 and 30 January, and so their opinions were too late to be considered by the Committee on Social Affairs. I think it is a pity that there has not been better coordination by the Parliament of these reports, all of which I consider to be important and which contribute an important dimension to the debate. I know that some of our colleagues will be adding their views later on.

With rising unemployment in many Member States the plight of disabled school-leavers is especially serious and if the education budget were increased consideration could also be given to funding unemployment programmes similar to those available to those of working age.

Mr President, changing attitudes is, of course, as important an aim for anyone concerned with the welfare of disabled people and while education of the public was intended to be one of the parts of the initial Community action programme, the information

campaigns never really materialized. We believe that the fullest possible use should be made of the media during this year and that is why we suggest in the report a link-up between Community countries, or to use a word I have coined myself — a Eurathon — so that television programmes about the disabled, throughout the Community, should be brought into people's homes.

All of us, I think, need to be reminded that being on wheels rather than legs does not affect the brain; that blind people do not spend their lives waiting to be taken across the road; that being deaf does not mean that you are stupid. There is no doubt that in the field of disability and rehabilitation it has been the subject of innumerable official reports over the last 30 years. The need now, Mr President, is not to establish new principles but for politicians to show the political will to act on behalf of the disabled people of our ten countries.

(Loud applause)

President — I call Mr De Graaf.

Mr De Graaf, President-in-Office of the Council. — *(NL)* Mr President, I thank you for the opportunity to speak to Parliament on a matter which is undoubtedly worthy of our full attention, this being the plight of the handicapped in the Community, who, as we all know, form a very large group of 13 to 20 million people.

I very much welcome the fact that your Parliament has seen fit to regard the problem of the economic, social and vocational integration of disabled people in the Community in 1981 as a contribution to the International Year of Disabled Persons and that it intends to adopt a resolution based on the excellent report drawn up by Mrs Clywd on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment. My compliments to her.

I feel it can be said in general that the Community is fairly well equipped to improve the plight of our handicapped fellow citizens in this International Year of Disabled Persons and in future years.

Only a few months ago, in June 1980, during its deliberations on the Commission's report on the implementation between 1974 and 1979 of the first Community action programme for the vocational rehabilitation of handicapped persons, the Council pointed out that it attaches very great importance to the vocational rehabilitation of the handicapped and their integration into society. At that time the Council adopted a number of policy lines for the further implementation of the Community programme with a view to continuing and building on the appreciable results so far achieved under this programme.

De Graaf

The most important of these policy lines are as follows. Firstly, employment policy must make a greater contribution to the solution of the employment problem faced by the disabled, which has become particularly acute as a result of the present difficult situation on the labour market. Secondly, the part played by firms in providing work for the disabled should be strengthened by appropriate means. What we must achieve here is that employees who become disabled keep their jobs and disabled workers are recruited again. Thirdly, the role of the local authorities and local services must also be strengthened to make the vocational rehabilitation of the disabled more effective and to facilitate their integration into society. General information on problems the disabled face in the Community must be improved particularly by means of information campaigns aimed at the general public. The public must thus be made aware of the responsibility the whole of the population bears for the complete integration of our disabled citizens into society. Action taken to benefit the disabled in the Community should be aimed at achieving a situation in which those concerned are hampered as little as possible by their handicaps in their efforts to put an end to everything that discriminates against them or places them in an inferior position and also at encouraging them to participate in the drafting and implementation of measures by which they themselves are affected.

As regards the European Social Fund, which must continue to play an important role in activities connected with the vocational rehabilitation of the disabled, it should be pointed out that the appropriations entered in this year's budget are quite a lot higher than in previous years: 90m EUA in commitment appropriations, as against 74m in 1980 and 61m in 1979, and 44.8m EUA in payment appropriations, compared with 42m in 1980 and 40m in 1979, both under Article 5 of the basic decision on the Fund.

I would remind the House in this connection that in November of last year the Council adopted the framework directive concerning the protection of workers against the risk of exposure to chemical, physical and biological agents at the work place. This directive can undoubtedly play a part in preventing handicaps caused by accidents at work. I will leave it at these few figures, which show that the Council is making a great effort to tackle the problem of the disabled. I am convinced that the proposals Parliament makes in its resolution can provide a major impulse for Community action aimed at the vocational and social integration of the disabled.

That, then, is the statement I have to make on behalf of the Council. I should like to add a brief personal remark, although I am, of course, speaking as a State Secretary who is a member of the Dutch Cabinet. The economic situation which we all face is very unfavourable at the moment. In a situation of this kind the tendency is for little time to be wasted in adopting a

hesitant attitude towards social improvements, even where there is a real need for them. I feel that this attitude does not form the right basis for policy. In a situation such as the present we must be doubly aware of the position of the disabled. After all, it now becomes clear just how vulnerable the position of the disabled is in our society.

In the Netherlands we are therefore trying to draw the necessary conclusions from this situation. In addition to the policy aimed at reducing expenditure in the public sector, we are trying to pursue a policy of improving the position of the disabled. Our efforts are primarily directed at strengthening the position of the disabled in the labour market. In this context, we are working on an Employment of the Disabled Act. This is not, therefore, a study, but the actual preparation of an Act designed to strengthen the position of the disabled in the labour market. We are following the example of the quota system that also applies in the Federal Republic of Germany. As a basis we have taken a quota of 5 %, with obligatory registration and inspection, to make the measure really effective. This is a requirement that we intend to impose not only on private firms but also on all government agencies.

As an example of social integration I would refer to the experiments we have begun with a view to enabling seriously disabled people to live independence lives. We are trying to set up groups of 10 to 15 dwellings. It is essential for assistance to be provided with every-day activities.

Finally, Mr President, I have found that in the discussions to which the International Year of Disabled Persons has given rise the public in the Netherlands take a great interest in the position of the disabled, particularly those in developing countries. It is my hope that similar interest will be shown elsewhere in Europe.

(Applause)

President. — The Socialist Group has the floor.

Mr Oehler. — *(F)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, our Parliament is today holding an important debate, which we very much hope will result in practical and genuine progress being made.

The fact that many representatives of organizations of the disabled have come from all over Europe to listen to this debate is a demonstration of confidence in us, but it also imposes the utmost stringency on us. I feel that all the essential points have been made in Mrs Clwyd's report, a report which is of a high standard and high quality. I must emphasize this and congratulate the rapporteur. We must, however, make it quite clear that this International Year of Disabled Persons must not be considered by us, by the Member States or

Oehler

by our fellow citizens as an end in itself. It is one step and an appeal for a continuous and concerted national and Community effort.

We must not have another situation in which, after a fertile idea has been developed, this International Year of Disabled Persons sinks into oblivion. Have we not had International Years of Young People and of Women? The means of communication and dissemination of information to which the rapporteur has referred must be fully exploited to draw the attention of the general public to the meaning of the International Year of Disabled Persons. Words like pity and charity must be banished from our vocabulary for ever. The International Year of Disabled Persons is based on three principles: human dignity, collective solidarity and the moral obligation society has to disabled people. Besides this, we must aim at specific objectives: overcoming social prejudices and indifference and increasing their confidence in themselves and in their future.

We must therefore ask ourselves if the problem of the disabled does not have its roots in our society, because we know very well that it is not the laws, the regulations or even appropriations, important though they may be, which will ensure the complete social integration of disabled people. Disabled people must be accepted as equals. They must be helped to play a full part in public life. All in all, it is a question of gaining acceptance for a simple idea: our societies must not be allowed to ignore what is needed.

Recognition that some people are different, acceptance and integration into our daily life must, I believe, be the aim of all the measures and activities we propose and encourage. I have therefore tabled an amendment which calls on the Member States and the local authorities to enable the disabled to gain access to and use all urban infrastructural facilities, not simply public buildings, but leisure centres, sports grounds, public parks, swimming pools and, of course, public transport. So much remains to be done.

If our sole concern is to be complete social integration and enabling disabled people to develop their capacities to the full, we must take practical action and, above all, adapt all our public facilities. I recently received a letter from a student. He told me of all the problems he must overcome in getting from his parents' home to the faculty where he studies. This student is confined to a wheelchair and can use public transport only with difficulty. His faculty is located in a town 150 km from Strasbourg. Having gained access to a station, with all the problems that that entails, he cannot travel in a compartment. He is obliged to remain in his wheelchair in a corridor, near the exit, where he is jostled and shaken about. Nor have the facilities on the university campus where he lives been adapted as they should have been. This is only one example. There are unfortunately more

distressing cases and happily examples of successful integration enabling the disabled to develop their capacities to the full.

I feel that in the light of experience and the efforts that have already been made in the various Member States the Commission might draw up proposals addressed to the Member States aimed at eliminating the obstacles and dangers which disabled people face in every transport sector and particularly in cities and suburbs. Practical solutions such as reserving all or part of a carriage for disabled people, a special area where wheelchairs can be left and widening doors are very simple ideas which could be quickly implemented. I would welcome it if the Commission could put forward proposals or standards with which all public facilities should comply.

I come to my final comment. Although the social integration of the disabled must be the outcome of the sum of individual and collective efforts, it is important for all action to be taken in agreement with the disabled themselves. At present, loans from the Community's Social Fund are principally intended for vocational reintegration. The employment of the disabled is a major problem, but is it not revealing that the first thought anyone had was to make them productive? Many of us in this Assembly receive requests concerning the establishment of leisure centres, holiday camps and so on. The vocational rehabilitation of the disabled is one thing, their social integration, in the widest sense, is another. We must make every effort here to ensure that the latter objective is achieved.

(Applause)

President. — The European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group) has the floor.

Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti. — *(I)* Mr President, Mr President of the Council, Mr Commissioner, ladies and gentlemen, I am very pleased to be able to speak in the name of the Group of the European People's Party on the motion for a resolution concerning the economic, social, and professional integration of handicapped persons in the EEC, a question raised in connection with the proclamation of 1981 as the International Year of Disabled Persons.

I must emphasize that the Clwyd report, presented in the name of the committee on Social Affairs, was prepared in the course of several meetings. I must thank my colleague for being so receptive to the various modifications effected within the committee itself. I must also stress the importance of the contributions made by Mr Patterson from the Committee on Youth and Culture, and by Mr Moreland from the Committee on Transport, which combine to give us a complete picture of the situation.

I agree that the Commission and the Member States should commit themselves to acting on the recommen-

Cassanmagnago Cerretti

dations contained in the report on education which Mr Jorgensen drew up at the request of the EEC. It is important to continue the research work begun with the elaboration of this report.

Mr President of the Council, on 27 June of 1980 the Council of the Ministers of Public Education invited the Member States to adopt immediately a plan of action, and in particular the section dealing with equal opportunities for the handicapped. Such a programme must be included in the budget appropriations for 1982, and such appropriations must receive a qualified majority within the Parliament itself. This point is worth stressing because some appropriations were rejected by those who believe that the age of the Welfare State is over, and who wish to block any approach which conceives of problems in human terms.

I also think it is important to underline how necessary it is for aid to children with special educational needs to be given as early as possible, for the end result depends upon the early identification and accurate evaluation of the needs of the various individuals.

In this respect I think it indispensable to give particular importance to the improvement and propagation of methods of pluriprofessional evaluation. The Commission should take action designed to prevent certain disabilities, particularly through research programmes and measures aimed at protecting the mother and child in the perinatal period. It is also essential that the Member States understand the importance of pre-school education for affected children, for at this stage it is easier to provide for integration with other children, make early diagnoses, prevent the eventual exacerbation of disabilities and offer specialized assistance beginning in infancy.

It is important to point out that if pupils with particular educational needs are to be effectively integrated, their teachers must receive special training, and on this issue in particular the Patterson report underlines some basic points: the Member States must ensure that all future teachers are prepared in their initial training period to deal with pupils with special needs; teachers already working should have access to supplementary on-the-job training which would allow them to acquire qualifications in the field of special instruction.

I therefore believe it is necessary to emphasize how important it is that the Commission go ahead with its plans regarding comparative studies of teacher training and its relationship to education, and with exchange programmes between teachers and trainees, fully developing the measures concerning new training programmes.

I believe it important to involve the parents of handicapped children in all initiatives, and we call upon the Commission to contact parents' associations and to provide information about them at the national and at the European level.

It is vital to examine programmes for work experience in the framework of the higher education of the handicapped, furnishing basic information concerning legislative and social measures and financial support for handicapped persons.

It is impossible not to agree with the approach presented by Mrs Clwyd. It is certainly an example of social injustice to leave the care and social integration of a handicapped person to his family alone. It is unjust not to provide housing whose architecture does not constitute an obstacle to the handicapped in the exercise of their rights and normal activities. Certainly, legislation, living space, and professional experts are lacking. To overcome this lack, we need a vigorous social policy which should no longer aim at correcting the malfunctions caused by the economic system but rather provide an orientation for social growth and responsible participation.

I believe, Mr President of the Council, that I have described the essentials of such a programme. A policy of prevention should be coordinated with local, regional, and national policies, and especially with European regional policy so that new ground can be broken in this area. It is equally necessary to involve organizations, volunteer groups, and the European citizens themselves, who must realize along with us that consumer society has forgotten its non-producers. It is necessary to move once again in the direction of respect for human being, towards a true integration allowing each person the freedom to be responsible for himself.

President. — The European Democratic Group has the floor.

Mr Spencer. — Mr President, the debate this afternoon is concentrated on the International Year of Disabled Persons, and over the last six months many of us have probably thought 'Now what can we do? How can we mark it?'. I would suggest to you that, when we started to ask that question, we were asking the wrong question. We were treating the International Year of Disabled Persons as a one-off event. If we have learnt anything during the year, it is that our efforts will only be worthwhile if they can extend beyond 1981, beyond the eighties, and if they begin to permeate our awareness of subjects which apparently are not directly related to disablement.

I give Members an example. We tend to think of disablement in terms of something that happened, say in a car crash. But disablement does not necessarily come straight out of the blue. Day by day, week by week, we expose parts of our industrial workforce to industrial noise and industrial deafness creeps up slowly. People do not notice it happening. Now the Commission will have done something. Europe will have done something for the deaf at least if we introduce tougher

Spencer

noise standards in the course of the various harmonization proposals in the environmental programme.

Having given that particular example, I just want to give a few criteria which I think we ought to have in mind when we look at the report delivered by Ann Clwyd. I want us to look for practical aid which can be given at Community level. I do not take away or add one iota to her moving general statements on disablement, but I do hope, when we come to vote, that we will not fall into the oldest trick in the world and start to promise things in a moment of emotion which we know in our hearts we cannot deliver.

It seems to me that the Community through its institutions can help at various levels. If by comparison between ten countries we become aware that certain policies should be followed in a national state, then let us push them. Let us use this forum, if you like, to embarrass them or urge them forward; but don't let us automatically assume that because we were the first people to see it, it is something that must be financed out of the European budget. If there is a good case, as there are in certain instances, for doing something at European level because one makes a saving, then let us do it. If it is something which should be done by the Member States, then let us tell them to do it, ask them to do it, embarrass them into doing it, but let us not automatically take it upon ourselves.

The Commission, I think, have a major role to play in spreading good practice across Europe; in taking bright ideas in Copenhagen, or Milan, and making sure that they are fully understood in Manchester and in Lille. They can spread information, they can spread best practice, but in order to do any analysis on the European levels, they are going to need consistent statistics and in this figure as in so many of the areas of social concern, the statistics mean different things in different parts of the Community.

Parliament I see as providing primarily a platform, not just here but when we go back to our constituencies and our own countries, a platform for this debate and, I hope, for future debates on specific parts of this agenda. I hope Parliament will exercise its rights to insert into the Community budget certain specific things, extra pilot projects, for instance, relating to disablement. I hope Parliament will vote later this evening for the amendment down in the name of the Legal Affairs Committee which seeks to remove charities connected with this and other fields from the payment of value added tax.

(Some applause)

All too often governments say, we cannot exempt you from VAT because of Europe. Well, we are Europe; you are Europe. At this level, at least we ought to be able to do something for those working in the voluntary field in disablement charities and others.

There is a third field where Parliament could have an influence and I am sure the Commissioner will understand if I direct his attention particularly to item 5, paragraph 4, which points out that the Parliament ought to have a greater involvement, I say only involvement, in the drafting of the guidelines for the Social Fund. There was much which the Committee on Social Affairs wanted to say to the Commissioner before those guidelines were set in concrete and sent to the Social Fund Committee. We sadly, in the five minutes which you have spent with us this year, did not have that opportunity.

I hope he will take the opportunity of this debate to say that he will come and discuss the guidelines with us in a spirit of their flexibility and that he will not tell us that because they have now gone to the Social Fund Committee, he is unable to change them. I hope he will take the opportunity to make that comment which would at least clarify and improve the atmosphere of general discussion in the Social Affairs Committee.

I want to dwell, almost finally, on the position of the disabled in a time of increasing unemployment and to praise the work of the disablement resettlement officers in my own country and particularly in my own constituency where a rather clear example arose of what can be achieved. A small engineering company, Silk Engineering of Derby, with absolutely no record and no particular involvement in employing disabled people, was approached by the Disablement Resettlement Officer. On his advice it accepted someone who had poor sight. The technical ability was there to change the items of the production line to make him a valid and worthwhile worker. And now that company, for reasons absolutely unconnected with altruism, employ more and more disabled people because they find that work is more important, because work contributes dignity if you are a disabled person.

On that production line the first worker they took on who suffered from a disability was nearly 30 % more efficient for that company. He had a better attendance record than anyone else in the company. He was a pleasure to work with. In a way his presence in that company changed the attitude of that small company's whole emotional attitude to disablement. Suddenly it was no longer something out there and different, but something in here and personal.

I hope in that context that Members in other countries will look at similar schemes and that the Commission in particular will look at a workable system of quotas because, as the rapporteur pointed out, in many countries they have become more observed in theory than in practice. I do see that there is a case for some element of harmonization, a possible directive in this area, and I trust that the Commission will examine this as a matter of urgency.

Finally, I come back to where I started. One cannot achieve anything just by words but if words lead on to

Spencer

actions, if the consideration necessary even to stage this debate has done one thing, it has educated a few hundred politicians. That may not be very much but hopefully it is a start. If it is a start which takes '81 into '82 into '83, then we will not have let down the disabled of Europe.

(Applause)

President. — The Communist and Allies Group has the floor.

Mrs De March. — *(F)* Mr President, the UN has decided to make 1981 the International Year of Disabled Persons, and the French members of the Communist and Allies Group welcome this decision, which we owe to world-wide progressive forces. We hope and we want, beginning in our own country, to help to translate this decision into practical and positive action.

A subject of this nature, with its emotive aspects and its human implications, must not be seen as a pretext or alibi to give a clear conscience to those who, in the governments of the Member States of the Community, opt for austerity in health care and social investment and, as unemployment increases, aggravate the situation of all disabled people. We are among those who are fighting to give France a different kind of growth, a different line to follow, its basic objectives being social justice, equality and respect for the individual, enabling the development of all the capabilities and possibilities inherent in a nation's basic asset which men and women themselves represent.

Consequently, total participation by the disabled in social life, their equality with able-bodied citizens, access to decent living conditions and a retreat from reactionary attitudes are far from being personal matters: they affect society as a whole.

Solving these problems cannot be a question of class, either at national or at Community level. The disabled and their organizations are not asking for charity. They want recognition of their rights and of their dignity as human beings who exist and suffer.

Recognizing the right to be different does not mean abolishing equality of rights.

We are aware of the ambiguity of the term 'disabled', which must not result in all the human, economic and social problems and preventive, treatment, social integration and vocational training measures to which the various handicaps caused by illness, accidents or chromosomal anomalies give rise, being brushed aside.

There can be no disputing the risks faced by the disabled in a society greedy for quick profits. In France the result of this profit race, particularly in private

companies, is an indictment of society, which mutilates a worker every minute, causes an on-the-job accident every five seconds and kills two people per working hour, while making for inequality in living conditions in that 70 % of Lorraine's iron and steel workers do not reach retirement age. The fact is that the percentage of handicapped children is higher where women work in arduous conditions that wear them down physically and mentally.

These facts from my own country show that a health and security policy cannot be promoted in the struggle involving the disabled and their families, who, if they are to have freedom of choice, must have their basic rights recognized. Having listened to Mrs Clwyd, with whose statement I basically agree, and having read the report of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, I should like to make two comments.

Firstly, we agree with the following analyses and proposals:

- prominence should be given to the poverty which is a feature of the lives of the disabled (this is true of France, where thousands of disabled people live on FF 1 400 a month and whom the Government refuses to grant the 80 % of the index-linked guaranteed minimum wage;
- the need for an adequate and decent income;
- exploitation through protected jobs must be rejected. It is essential for coercive measures to be taken in this respect. In France, the National Council of French Employers is trying to impose controls on the labour market protected by the multinational companies;
- payment of a national disability allowance to enable the disabled to play a part in society and to be financially independent;
- the use of medical advances to help children and the social rehabilitation of the victims of accidents (in France, the National Council of French Employers no longer wants to meet the cost of door-to-door accidents, which would not then be considered on-the-job accidents);
- the coordination of studies and research in this field;
- the encouragement of campaigns to inform the general public;
- the improvement of infrastructure and means of transport.

We agree with all these comments and proposals.

With my second remark I wish to make it clear that we are opposed to the reference contained in the report to the present system in the Federal Republic of Germany, since the 5 % quota of disabled people to be employed by companies is lower than the present figure in France, where a 1957 Act stipulates 10 % as the proportion of disabled people and invalids to be employed.

This European harmonization would be an attempt to do away with much of what has been achieved for the

De March

disabled in my country. We are in favour of harmonization at the highest level of social legislation. At a time when the major French employers refuse to have anything to do with the 1957 Act, we do not want to see their hopes legalized at Community level. And as Mr De Graaf referred to this problem on behalf of the Council, why not fix the figure at the 10 % provided for in the French legislation? Thanks to the popular struggle, France is the only country in Europe where State allowances are paid.

Here again, the major employers seek to question this unique form of social protection by taking as their social security model the system used in the Federal Republic of Germany, where each risk is taken separately and where family allowances are financed by the State and not by the employers.

'Harmonization' would only result in a decrease in the resources of the French disabled, while Community money is going in its thousands on the British compromise and on the funds established in preparation for the enlargement to include Spain and Portugal, which the report refers to as priority regions.

To conclude, I should like to inform the House of the proposals which the French Communist deputies champion in France and which were presented to the associations of the disabled by Georges Marchais on 14 January of this year.

Firstly, we propose that the monthly allowances paid to adults should be increased to 80 % of the index-linked guaranteed minimum wage, because financial resources surely form the basic condition for a minimum level of independence, with the victims of on-the-job accidents receiving 90 % of their wages.

Secondly, we feel that the disabled must be given vocational training and retraining opportunities.

Thirdly, we want to see the immense potential of science and technology today used to the benefit of the disabled.

We also propose that the International Year should be taken as an opportunity for television and radio to be used in the service of the public.

We believe it is necessary for ever better qualified personnel to be employed for the disabled so that the real needs can be met and special training measures maintained. We are convinced that the implementation of these proposals would represent a genuine advance for these women and these men, who in 1981 have in common with a musical genius like Beethoven the fact that they are different and full members of our human community and have an equal right to happiness.

President. — The Liberal and Democratic Group has the floor.

Mrs Nielsen. — Mr President, when the United Nations decided a number of years ago to make 1981 the International Year of Disabled Persons, its reasons for doing so were the same as when in the past it had declared the International Women's Year and the International Year of the Child, that is to focus attention on certain universal problems where a great deal of effort was needed to obtain improvements. Much is expected of this International Year of Disabled Persons, many fine words have been spoken over the years, and many high sounding declarations have been made, but we are still a long way from action in this field, and that is where we have to make our contribution, to ensure that action emerges from this debate and from the general debates being conducted in our countries.

In a forum such as the European Parliament we have to say at the outset that the problem of the handicapped cannot be viewed in our ten Member States in isolation. Ours are not the only countries; there are the developing countries, where it is often a far more serious matter to be handicapped than it is here. Nevertheless, by holding a serious debate on the subject, we can help exert pressure initially on the Commission and the Council and, through them, on the various Member States. The next stage is to exert pressure via international channels on the rest of the world in the hope that the matter will be treated seriously, and the many words translated into real action. Full participation and equal entitlement has been the UN's slogan for the International Year of Disabled Persons, with the aim of helping the handicapped to adapt physically and mentally to society, and to influence and inform public opinion as to the right of handicapped persons to take part in the various aspects of economic, social and political life in the community. Although we now talk more openly about the problems facing various groups in our society, a great deal is still to be desired. That is why we hope that this year for the disabled will lead to greater knowledge of and understanding for the problems and difficulties of the various forms of disablement. We must play our part in persuading the public to accept that our disabled fellow citizens enjoy full rights in our society. If we do not, we shall be failing to meet one of the UN's, and the disabled themselves', principal hopes, that the disabled should enjoy equal status as members of society with the non-disabled.

As we have already heard, there are between 13 and 20 million disabled persons in the Community. They are therefore a minority; but one criterion for a democracy and a welfare State is the way it treats its worst-placed minorities. The disabled should be put in a position where they are able to help themselves. In other words, it is our society which must be adapted to all its members, not the disabled who must adapt to society. Compensation must therefore be given to the disabled, and although money will not buy everything, it might help many disabled persons enjoy a better existence and to live on an equal footing with those

Nielsen

who are not disabled. That is a right which the disabled should have, and the Liberals believe that it should have nothing to do with charity. It is society's duty to create a material and economic framework within which the disabled can live as equally entitled citizens.

There are many different forms of disablement. I shall be speaking in general terms only. I know that one should be more specific, but it would be difficult to do so today. As I said, we must exert pressure on the competent authorities to ensure that they actually put this policy into practice, allowing for the differences which will always exist. They always will so long as it is acknowledged that we humans, whether disabled or not, are individuals and have a right to individual consideration.

I must return to the problem of compensation, which is so vital to the disabled. The fundamental point is that the disabled should be financially independent, in the sense that they should not suffer financial disadvantage because of their disablement. They should be assisted, for example, to get to work in special vehicles. They should be helped to obtain prostheses, equipment, aids and the medicaments they require, without scruting of their financial situation, for if that is done, the disabled are being penalized by comparison with the non-disabled. For example, if a disabled person has to obtain a specially equipped vehicle to travel to and from his place of work, where he is able to perform his duties on the same basis as a non-handicapped person, he is put at a financial disadvantage, and that is not the aim. In general terms, it is vital to a person's self respect to know that he can do a job of work and that there is a place and a need for him in society.

Families including a disabled child are at present faced with the question of how to cope at home with the extra work involved in caring for such children. A great majority of parents very much want to care for their children at home. It is therefore important that this should be possible. Although various kinds of institutions can do a great deal, they can never completely replace a home. The personal care and feeling of security received within the family are of incalculable value. It is therefore vital that society helps these families, for we all know that the home care of a disabled person involves onerous and unceasing work and self-denial for the family. It means quite simply that one does not have the energy to cultivate outside friendships or family or even perhaps to take the shortest holidays. Work can be affected as well, and in general great demands are put on the closer relatives to create the best possible conditions for the handicapped child. Society must do what it can to help these families and relieve their burden. This includes financial compensation for the extra amounts the family has to spend in the home, whether in providing special facilities, in obtaining outside help in other respects, leave, etc. Financial compensation for this

extra work, which, moreover, relieves the public purse of the expense of providing institutional facilities, should of course be granted without regard to the family's financial situation, and I repeat, it is essential that a physical, mental or other handicap must not also become a financial handicap.

There are of course other important points but I do not have the time to go into them here. I am speaking as a Liberal, but also to a great extent as a Dane, not that the two are mutually exclusive. If I mention the fact that I am a Dane it is because I would like to stress that the Danish Liberal Party strongly objects to the change in social policy forced through by the Social Democratic Government, with the narrowest possible majority, to take effect from 1 January this year — the very year proclaimed as the International Year of Disabled Persons. Before that date the ideas I have just put forward were the official Danish policy towards the disabled, but at the very start of the International Year of the Disabled changes were made in Denmark which entail the abandonment of the principle of compensation; a family intending to care for a disabled child in the home will no longer receive the same economic support as it did previously. Disabled persons needing special vehicles e.g. for taking them to and from work will no longer receive the same financial aid as they did before. These are just examples. What has happened is quite simply that the Social Democratic Party, in order to save money, has hit those who are already hit hard by deciding that, for those whose income exceeds a certain level, compensation will be reduced or completely eliminated. The result is that, however it is twisted, in Denmark a handicap is now also a financial handicap, which I find deeply regrettable. Even in times of crisis that is not worthy of a welfare State which, as I said before, is characterized by the way it treats minorities.

In conclusion, I should like to express the hope that the International Year of the Disabled will not disappear in a cloud of fine words, but that we will combine our efforts to translate them into action. This involves the Commission: we must have a plan of action, a programme, so that things can get started. It involves the Council and thus the governments of the Member States, and most of all, it involves us all in our daily existence, where people, whether disabled or not, have to live side by side.

(Applause)

President. — The European Progressive Democrats have the floor.

Mr Vié. — *(F)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I take the floor to move the various amendments that have been tabled to this report. The report we are debating, on the integration of the disabled, is worthy of a more extensive debate and undoubtedly of better

Vié

attendance because — and we must thank the rapporteur for this — it has not simply been prompted by the International Year of Disabled Persons. It is a report of which its author can be proud and of which Parliament can be proud if, as I am sure it will, it adopts it. But I believe there is more to it than that: it is a warning that, once this report has been adopted, the page should not be turned straight away and interest in the disabled should not disappear with the passing of 1981. It must not be a flash in the pan but a fire that is not allowed to go out.

The problem of the disabled is difficult because the importance it is gaining, if only as regards the numbers involved, is not due to fate or some modern-day plague of Egypt. Quite the contrary: I feel it is largely the consequence of relentless and increasingly effective medical research, which keeps alive children who, if it had been left to the pitiless forces of nature, would have died either in their mother's womb or in the first weeks of life. Nor is it a question of fate when the numerous genetic anomalies that occur are joined by the increasingly long and appalling list of industrial and road accidents. All these effects taken together truly make the problem of the disabled a difficult one. Primarily, of course, for those directly affected, but also for their families and for society, which has an increasingly large bill to pay. Undoubtedly, it may only be scattered rumours, but it will not be news to you that that old demon eugenics is quite ready to take over again. I therefore feel that our Parliament should preface this report with the loud and clear assertion that every disabled person has a complete, unconditional, absolute right to life and to a better life. However serious his physical or mental handicap may be — and they are often tragic — he is and remains above all a human being.

As I have said, Ms Clwyd can be proud of this report, and I have nothing to say against it, simply the desire to see some aspects which appear important to me gone into in greater depth and perhaps explained better.

For example, I find it important not to confine our concern to the vocational or social integration of the disabled person, because his mental, physical or sensory handicap is always accompanied — and this is sometimes the most distressing part of it — by a considerable handicap in his emotional life, his sensitivity and his sexuality. We must be mindful not only of vocational integration but also of the development of the inner life, difficult though that may unfortunately be. Of course, as other speakers and the rapporteur herself have said, the role of the family is of prime importance. But we should not forget the bitter ordeal the families have to endure. They spontaneously seek mutual support by forming close-knit groups, and it is essential that they have backing and assistance in their efforts, just as it is essential for these groups of parents of handicapped children to be involved in any overall solution. Of course, there is a need for technical solu-

tions which only the financial power of the State can provide. But to prevent them from becoming technocratic solutions directed at the disabled like any category of assisted persons, it must be possible for these groups to be lavish with their human warmth. We must also look further. It is not simply a question of State responsibility or parental responsibility, but of solidarity between families and at the level of the neighbourhood, which must play its part to permit the personal development, as far as possible, of the disabled person through the welcome he feels around him.

The report also refers to preventive action. I should like to stress this, because it is essential. We have a veritable obligation to help medical research, which is already so deeply involved, but is so heavy a burden. There is no reason why the tremendous progress that has been made in keeping these children alive should not be used to eradicate the diseases which are becoming increasingly controllable. I very much hope that our debate will not simply be academic or emotive: I hope it will also be constructive. I hope that in 1981, by way of exception, the Social Fund will make donations to doctors, teams of research workers and laboratories to shorten the time that separates them from a true victory over disease.

To conclude, I should also like to make some constructive proposals regarding the prevention of the other causes of handicaps: industrial accidents and road accidents.

As regards industrial accidents, many employers are perfectly aware of the problem and often do their best in this regard. But who better than the worker concerned knows the risk and is able to eliminate it? I should therefore like to see, throughout the Community, an increase in the powers of the workers' representatives who are responsible for hygiene and safety matters. If necessary, directives should be adopted to harmonize legislation and make it more effective. I should also like to see those responsible for medical studies in our various countries attaching far more importance to the role of industrial medicine, which at present is something of a second-rate speciality, which is tolerated but whose role is not very well understood. Above all, there is a lack of understanding of the role those engaged in industrial medicine might play if, having been suitably trained, they could be included in the teams of workers responsible for hygiene and safety as technicians highly skilled in the definition of jobs both in factories and on building sites.

Where road accidents are concerned, the problem is too well known, too topical for it to be enough to recall the responsibility the State has to ensure vehicle safety, road safety and also, I feel, the proper teaching of driving skills. Driving schools must teach people that when they drive, there is often a danger of their colliding with someone else. When it comes to awareness of the existence of others and of others' freedom, people often suffer from a kind of car racism, which should be eradicated.

Vié

To conclude, we must not be — and the report certainly is not — patronizing in our consideration of these sad cases. What we all must do together is fight for life and justice, and this is a fight that can and must be won. I thank the rapporteur for reminding us of this and also for reminding us of our responsibilities in this fight. It is ultimately but one of the aspects, a new one perhaps, in the overall fight for the rights and liberty of man, of every man and of man as a whole.

(Applause)

President. — The non-attached Groups have the floor.

Mr Pasmazoglou. — *(El)* Mr President, I should like to point out how important the report presented today is and draw attention to the conclusions proposed in it. It needs to be pointed out yet again that the problems of disabled people can only be dealt with effectively if the economic crisis is overcome and economic progress is assured by developing the regions and reducing economic and social inequality throughout Europe. These problems are becoming more acute as social inequalities and equalities between our regions and countries remain and become more widespread. Therefore I want to stress that the subject under discussion this evening is of major importance and the International Year of the Disabled provides a great opportunity for the European Community to take a positive initiative, as was pointed out by the rapporteur and the previous speakers. I should also like to point out that in order for disabled people to become integrated into the daily life of our society there is a considerable need for more flexible social attitudes, greater understanding and guidance and specialist teachers. The European Community's support for research into these and other matters is, as pointed out by the other speakers, of particular importance. I also want to stress the need for the Community to take positive measures in adopting procedures designed to attract young people with various disabilities into professional careers. This is an extremely important objective and enterprise for the European Community.

I mentioned how important the Community's European Social and Regional Funds are for social investment programmes when I commented on the measures and the programme which Mr Thorn presented to the Community. I should like to make reference to three groups of disabled people of special importance in Greece. The first of these is handicapped children. The efforts which have been, and are being, made in Greece are not insignificant but they are far from sufficient. The number and qualifications of specialist teachers are much lower than required and there are no programmes or policies for ensuring the maximum integration of handicapped children with other children and citizens in Greece. The second special group

to which I want to draw attention — and it is a large group — is the blind. Their particular problem is especially distressing as the majority of blind people have a highly developed intellect and sensitivity but do not have the opportunity to exploit these qualities. For these people the goal to be aimed at is the establishment of adequate basic social assistance in the form of a pension, as proposed in the report, and the formulation of plans for their professional development giving them absolute priority of employment in certain jobs. There is draft legislation in Greece which I hope will soon become law. The third large group which I want to mention is those people whose disabilities were caused as a result of war. For the majority of these people State pensions in Greece are pathetically small. European solidarity in advancing the needs of this group of disabled people is one of the most important initiatives of common action for strengthening the feeling of solidarity between our peoples and for ensuring the success of our attempts for peace and unity in Europe.

(Applause)

President. — The Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members has the floor.

Mr Pannella. — *(F)* Mr President, I am particularly disgusted to find that once again the majority of this Parliament is giving me only three minutes to speak on the subject of the disabled because I am myself the elected representative of very important organizations of the disabled in my country. But I must begin by thanking the rapporteur not only for what she has said but also for what she is. Only a member of the workers' party, a party which has voted in favour of unilateral disarmament, has a genuine right to speak about these problems here. When you, the pharisees of all the groups, clear your conscience on the cheap and then, at home, vote in favour of armaments, you are the ones who ignore reality at home. To clear your guilty conscience, you use fine words here to compensate for the only things you can see: arms, profits, the multinationals and cynicism. I therefore pay tribute to Mrs Clwyd for what she has said and also for what she represents. We have here a German Socialism which is a Socialism — as Jean Jaurès said — of downright serfs. They come here to talk about social justice, to talk about attending to handicaps which are due to society far more than nature and then they vote in favour of increased appropriations to sustain aggression, to keep the Turkish military in power, Mr Fellermaier, as you do. I tell you, you are the ones who cannot see, the ones who do not hear, the ones who are not capable of taking a step towards mercy. Those who cannot see, those who cannot hear are sometimes lucky enough not to see us. It is not a fine spectacle that your political forces, your governments, your poor fine words present this evening.

(Applause from certain quarters)

President. — We now come to the committees asked for their opinions.

The Committee on Transport has the floor.

Mr Moreland, draftsman of an opinion. — Mr President, first of all I would like to thank the President-in-Office for being with us this afternoon, a day that is not normally a Council day. I think it shows the dedication of the Dutch Government and the Council to this subject, and I think it should be recognized.

(Applause)

My report is directed towards helping the disabled person but, as mentioned by a number of Members, including Mr Vié, I am conscious that transport is relevant as a cause of disablement. If I can leave the Minister a message to take back to the President of the Transport Council it is that, if they can follow up the agreement on the Community driving licence with agreement on a higher standard driving test for the Community, further safety measures and perhaps encourage more people to use the railways rather than the road, I think they will have been making a contribution to the Year of the Disabled.

Now, mobility is clearly a problem for many disabled persons, and we believe that the situation could be improved. The Committee on Transport believes that the major priority must be to meet the specialized transport needs of many disabled persons such as improvements in the equipment for the crippled, special buses to collect disabled people from their doorstep, special parking near shops, and so on. As you can hear, I am not placing the first priority on concessionary fares. Indeed I am critical of the way in which funds are too often provided for concessionary fares which could more usefully be used to help provide the specialized transport that I have outlined above. What is the point of providing a concessionary fare on a bus when the disabled person may be unable to walk from his house to the bus stop. So the main point I want to make is that the existing uses of funds could be re-examined. Local transport is usually the main transport need of the disabled — travel to shops, to the school, to the doctor. Thus, the main responsibility must lie with local authorities and I therefore hope that all of us will encourage our local authorities throughout the community in this task.

I have stressed that concessionary fares are not the first priority. I also stress that concessionary fares are no substitute for ensuring that the disabled have adequate incomes to meet their costs of living. But I would not wish to give the impression that concessionary fares should be totally disregarded. Indeed, of course, a number of concessionary fares are given and I suspect that they ought to be made available to disabled persons particularly at off-peak hours so as to use otherwise empty seats.

Indeed, why is it that so often one finds that concessions on local buses are available only to local residents. Why cannot the residents of my area, in the Midlands of England, have reciprocal rights not just in London, but also in Paris, Bonn and across the Community. At the moment the concessionary scene across the Community is a ragged mess. Can we not develop a system whereby categories of the disabled have rights across the Community? I suggest that this would apply only for off-peak travel using otherwise empty seats. In other words the extra cost should be minimal. Is this really beyond our ability to establish and is it really beyond our ability, despite the difficulties, to establish a pass for the disabled to use across the Community?

Now in my report, Mr President, I make a number of other recommendations related to the use of the Social Fund for pilot schemes and for research into the mobility needs of the disabled. Surely we should get away from this ridiculous situation in which each country of the community is carrying out its own research. Can we not have coordinated research if only for the sake of that aim that is no doubt dear to the heart of government, saving money? Now there will be those who will respond to the committee's proposals with the word 'difficulties', but difficulties can be overcome. There are many people, many voluntary workers, giving their time and devotion to the disabled. These unsung heroes do not talk of difficulties, they talk of opportunities. I hope the Commission and the Council will talk of opportunities and that at the end of the year we in this Parliament can boast about what has been achieved for the disabled.

(Applause)

President. — The Legal Affairs Committee has the floor.

Mr Dalziel, draftsman of an opinion. — Mr President, I would like to add a few comments to the debate this afternoon.

I think all of us on the Legal Affairs Committee were extremely encouraging and indeed wanted to be as helpful as we possibly could to Mrs Clwyd. But we are after all in the Legal Affairs Committee, and what help we could provide to her is inevitably framed in a rather legalistic terms.

But having said that, the specific motion for a resolution we were asked to give an opinion on, was, in fact, that by Mr Ghergo on the possible introduction of a pass for the disabled. Having said at the beginning that we wanted to be as helpful as we possibly could to the rapporteur, we were allowed to extend our examination and the scope of our opinion to all the motions for resolutions which are presently in Mrs Clwyd's report. I think the basis for that is that we felt that the

Dalziel

disabled are affected by every area of legislation in the Community just as the able-bodied and, therefore, it was quite appropriate and correct for the Legal Affairs Committee to extend its opinion into that area.

Looking at the Treaty of Rome, as we inevitably did, we found a great deal of talk about freedom of movement, the right of establishment and the right to travel across frontiers and provide services; but, of course, on further inspection there was absolutely no mention of the disabled at all. The word 'disabled' or 'handicapped' is not even mentioned. As a consequence of that aberration in the drafting of the Treaty of Rome, the action by the Community so far has been both piecemeal and inadequate. One of the things which we discovered during our researches was that there were probably only one or two people working for the Commission who were specifically handling the problems of the disabled in the Community, which is quite deplorable.

Let me make two general observations. The first is that there is a regrettable lack of information, which has been referred to by previous speakers, on the plight and the problems, the kind of general environment in which handicapped people have to live. Secondly, there is no standard definition of what is meant by 'handicapped'.

As to the legal basis for my opinion, there is no question that such a basis for legislation does exist, and it is that basis which, I hope, will give the Commission some protection in its work this year.

It was accepted in 1973 in a ruling by the European Court of Justice that general principles of law common to Member States are automatically subsumed as Community law, and I do not think anybody in this Chamber would disagree that it must be a general principle of law to help the handicapped. Therefore, under Community law, there is a basis for the kind of work which I hope this report will bring forth from the Commission and from the Council. To be more specific, although the Treaty of Rome does not refer to handicapped or disabled persons, in Articles 3 and Articles 117 and 118 and, what is perhaps more important, in Article 235 there is certainly scope for the kind of work which this report is proposing.

Nevertheless, there is still not nearly enough being done for the handicapped, and there are two points which I particularly bring out in my opinion. The first has already been referred to by my colleague, Mr Spencer: I find it rather scandalous — and I think that is the right word — the way in which charities are treated in certain countries on the issue of value-added tax. Secondly, I think much more needs to be done under the Social Fund. Many more schemes for the handicapped need to be introduced. Even though it is not possible for a handicapped person to enjoy full-time employment after going through a scheme funded by the Social Fund, surely it is not beyond the

imagination of the drafters of Social Fund legislation to try and incorporate the handicapped and the disabled into the broad umbrella of the Social Fund.

I add my congratulations to the rapporteur and hope that something positive will come out of this, that it will not prove to be simply a year fated to disappear like so many previous years, whether for music or women's rights or whatever. My final words are these. As again my colleague Mr Spencer has said, we have put down certain amendments to the report in any name but on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee, specifically referring to the treatment of charities with regard to value-added tax, particularly in our country, and I very much hope that both that amendment and the amendment on the Social Fund will meet with the support of the rapporteur and of this House. I thank you again for giving the Legal Affairs Committee the opportunity of expressing its opinion, and we wish you all the very best in your work on behalf on the Social Affairs Committee.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

Vice-President

President. — I call Mr Peters.

Mr Peters. — *(D)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, what we are now having in the European Parliament is an important political debate. Beside the major discussions we have on industrial policy or on working hours from time to time, this is a debate in which the various political groups largely agree. This is particularly important because in the International Year of Disabled Persons it is not so essential to tell the general public about everything that can be done to help the disabled. What is essential is that the many helpers in all the important sectors should be mobilized.

In this respect particular thanks must go to the rapporteur for her work. With her report, which incorporates many proposals and suggestions from all sides of the House, she has provided a very good basis for the debate and submitted for adoption by the European Parliament an opinion which in its entirety paves the way for the proposed measures really to be taken.

I do not want to discuss every aspect, because there is not a great deal else that can be said. I should simply like to stress a few facts. First, as regards the rapporteur's remark that the most difficult and most important task is to give the disabled an opportunity to earn

Peters

themselves an appropriate income of their own: we know that people in our society are accepted only if they are able to earn a living. It is therefore particularly important that we create these opportunities.

Mrs Clwyd says that, if the disabled are given this support, they achieve a kind of independence and with it an opportunity for self-development and self-confidence and the right to choose, which is one of the fundamental human rights that cannot be denied by the community. This is especially important.

Then, ladies and gentlemen, the rapporteur proposes that the German employment model should be adopted, a certain percentage of jobs being set aside for the various kinds of disabled persons. I fully endorse this. It creates employment opportunities of the type that is needed. The European Community should adopt framework directives in this area, but it should also ensure that it is not possible for employers to buy themselves out of this requirement for a small sum, particularly in times of rising unemployment. In fact, other measures must be taken to put pressure on employers. In the Federal Republic we repeatedly find that increasing numbers of employers buy themselves out of this requirement and that this happens particularly where the best opportunities exist for the employment of disabled persons on equal conditions, for example in the public service and in the various administrative bodies. The European Community would do well to press on and itself show it takes this task seriously.

Another idea arises in this context, ladies and gentlemen. Various kinds of work expose the worker to particular dangers as a result of noise, dust and other major difficulties, for example the handling of heavy and noisy machines or work underground, where the worker is exposed to stone dust. Jobs of this nature result in handicaps or permanent diseases. An important task connected with what we call for in this report will also be to put in motion and encourage industrial safety measures that eliminate this cause of handicaps. The protection and humanization of the workplace form an essential part of the fight against handicaps.

I should like to put forward a third idea as well. Where town planning is concerned, it is astounding that buildings, and not only public buildings, are still being constructed without the provision of suitable access for the disabled or the very seriously handicapped. This is a further point which we must get the local authorities to accept. Above all, such facilities must be provided for children and young people to enable the integration of the disabled into society from the outset. There must be no more kindergartens and no more crèches that are not structurally designed for use by the handicapped. In this respect, it is soon decided whether limits are to be imposed or not.

The same applies to education. There must, of course, be special schools with sophisticated equipment and specially trained teachers to cater for a range of very different handicaps. Deaf and dumb children must, for example, be given an opportunity to learn as much as they can. For those with very serious mental handicaps special facilities may, of course, be necessary. But on the whole we should ensure, when building schools, that the handicapped can also join in normal school life. However, these schools should have properly trained teachers and should be designed and equipped with teaching aids and facilities for teaching small and very small groups of handicapped children so that they have a chance to obtain an equal education and the same school-leaving certificates. This may be expensive, but it is necessary. To save on this is to give no more than lip service to the integration of the disabled into society.

The fourth idea I should like to develop is that we have, for example, concentrated the construction of housing, particularly publicly assisted housing, on people without handicaps. People with serious physical handicaps, those confined to a wheelchair for example, must be provided with appropriate housing, where all the facilities, that is to say the entrance, transport, the width of doors, the size of rooms and the accessibility of sanitary equipment, are so designed that normal living and a normal family life are possible. This too will, of course, be very expensive. But this money must be found. Society has a duty to find it.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the quality of a democratic and social society must be judged by the action it takes to enable all its members, including the disabled, to live in it as equal members. Taking Mrs Clwyd's report as a basis, we must create one here which sets in motion and encourages such integration through appropriate guidance, instructions, directives and pilot projects in the Member States. I hope the new Commissioner will regard this task as a priority and will help to push it through.

(Applause from various quarters)

President. — I call Mr Henckens.

Mr Henckens. — *(NL)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, how civilized a society can be regarded as being is largely determined by the extent to which it respects life. And this respect for life, which in fact forms the basis of our debate, is all the more important where respect for deformed and imperfect life is concerned. In our society and in our civilization this respect has not always existed. It is not so long ago that the right of the strongest applied in some Western European civilizations, or racial purity was regarded as the yardstick, or all kinds of measures were taken that were in fact prejudicial to the respect we owe to life. I want to stress this respect because it is a basic principle

Henckens

that has always been cherished by Christian Democrats. The second important point in this debate is, in my opinion, that, proceeding from this enormous, almost scrupulous respect for life, including imperfect and deformed life, we must be prepared to tackle this problem in complete solidarity. I should like to emphasize this because a united society represents an outstanding Christian Democratic principle and one which we apply in many areas. We want solidarity between the rich and the poor, between those who have a job and those who are unemployed, between the sick and the healthy and between many other categories, and we also want solidarity between the able-bodied and the disabled. I feel we must underline this principle in this debate, and I should like to take this opportunity to offer my sincere congratulations to Mrs Clwyd on the unusually masterful way in which her report summarizes what was said in our committee, a major contribution having been made by the other rapporteurs as well.

The third idea I should like to put forward is that being disabled — as Mr Pannella has said, and it was perhaps the only good thing he said — in fact points to a disharmony, an incongruity between the person concerned and his environment and, to take it a little further, society. Mr Pannella was right when he said that some handicaps do not stem from the person himself but from the society we have created. There is thus a disharmony, an incongruity between a person, sometimes deformed, on the one hand and society on the other. And the social environment — and this is spelled out in the report — begins with the physical environment, buildings, trains that the disabled have to get into, housing, footpaths. There is thus a lack of harmony between the person and his physical environment. The social environment in which he lives is also important, and I am here referring, for example, to social security. Have we made social security sufficiently accessible to the disabled? Further examples can be given of the cultural environment, theatres, stadia, cinemas. Are they accessible? These are all obstacles that our society has created, and we now face the challenge of removing the obstacles again. The economic environment in which a disabled person lives is, of course, very important. And, as Mr Peters emphasized, one of the most important factors that determine whether an individual can pay his way is, naturally, the right to work. We must do our utmost to achieve this harmony in society between the individual and his environment in all these areas with a view to integrating him into normal daily life.

A fourth idea, Mr President, I would submit is that we in Western Europe have set a standard for deciding whether or not someone is to be classified as disabled. And in practically every country, as far as I know, a purely medical evaluation model is taken as the basis. It is thus the doctor who decides how deformed someone is when he has lost an arm or his hearing or his sight. The evaluation model thus places almost too much emphasis on the medical aspect, since it is on the

basis of these medical yardsticks that it is decided whether and to what extent someone is disabled. And if my premise is correct, that in fact a handicap is an indication of a relationship between a physical person and his general environment, then we have a far wider concept and the handicap must be appraised in multi-disciplinary terms, and this must, of course, include the doctor's opinion, but unquantifiable information provided by a social assistant, an architect, a psychologist, a tax expert and so on should be added, so that the file is not based on purely medical information or concepts but on a multi-disciplinary approach, thus making it possible for a basic file to be compiled on every disabled person.

Mr President, I should also like to call for a distinction to be made between, on the one hand, a substitute income, designed to compensate for the loss of earnings caused by the handicaps of disabled people and, on the other, the increased expenditure incurred by a disabled person in overcoming certain difficulties that can be ascribed to his handicap. This is a very important distinction and one which has major financial repercussions. The Commission and the national legislators must not overlook this distinction between substitute incomes on the one hand and increased expenditure incurred as a result of a handicap on the other.

Mr President, other speakers have already referred to the prevention of handicaps. Industrial accidents and road accidents have just been mentioned. Thousands of able-bodied people become handicapped as a result of the many dangers to which they are exposed, and by this I mean not only industrial accidents or road accidents. I have read that, according to the UN, 110 000 people a year become handicapped as a result of perfectly ordinary accidents in the home. Such accidents can perhaps be largely prevented. Malnutrition causes blindness in 250 000 children a year. We should really feel ashamed when such figures are quoted. Mr President, it is clear from what has been said that the number of disabled people is growing. I believe that in the spirit of a united society with a very high level of respect for life, as I said earlier on, we must all work together to ensure that even the weakest members of society have a chance to save themselves and to live independent lives.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Prag.

Mr Prag. — Mr President, we all tend to think that we are immune to disability, if we are fortunate enough to enjoy good health. We think that we cannot join the number of disabled who are between 13 and 23 million in the Community. We think it cannot happen to me, and it cannot happen to my family. But

Prag

it can and does, whether through accidents on the road, in the home, in sport. We are all potentially disabled people. And it can happen from one day to another. I am not, of course, talking about the minor ailments of old age, but of the sudden inability to cope on one's own.

As has been made very clear in the Clwyd report, the handicaps of being disabled go beyond actual physical or mental disability. We have heard that it affects one's possibility of employment, it affects the level of income, because life costs more and the disabled earn less. Also it meets the incomprehension of the able-bodied, who may show no lack of goodwill, but frequently fail to understand the needs of disabled people, do not think about their need, or are not aware of the need to plan for those needs.

Fortunately, there is a great revolution under way in this field in the attitudes of the press and radio and television. Because of that I welcome the proposal in the Clwyd report for a telethon which would not merely raise some money for a Community project, but would help to increase the essential publicity about the needs of the disabled.

The Community, it seems to me, has a very special part to play. The Clwyd report, is by and large practical and reasonable; those are great virtues. Now my colleague Tom Spencer spoke of some of the ways in which the Community can carry out its special role. It can compare the best practices and urge their adoption. There is an enormous amount indeed that we can learn from each other, even though we all think we are the best at everything. But there is a great deal more. There is the possibility of innovation through pilot projects under the fourth section of the Social Fund which has hardly any money but which we hope will have more in future budgets. It seems to me that the Community can do a great deal in the field of innovation, not for everything, but for the most important and most promising projects.

Then there is the Community method which we all too often neglect, the fact that a directive can set objectives and a timetable for the Member Governments to reach those objectives. Several of the amendments which have been proposed recognize this. It seems to me very important indeed that we should, through a directive, set standards of mobility of disabled people, their access to transport, whether it is to buses and trains or the transport between their own personal means of transport, the wheelchair, and public transport, an aspect which is all too often forgotten. We can set standards on access to public buildings, including, as Mr Oehler's amendment suggests, leisure centres and places where sports are available—swimming pools and so on. We can set standards on housing policy and legal rights, and I very much welcome the opinion of the Legal Affairs Committee in the latter field. The Community can set standards in all these matters, which to my mind would be one of the

most worthwhile tasks the Commission could undertake, and fix a timetable, i.e. a period over which the member governments have to conform to those standards in those fields.

Another field in which the Community can undertake a special kind of action is in that of aids for the disabled. There are many more different kinds of aids than there are even forms of handicap, but there is a great reluctance on the part of manufacturers to manufacture the latest and best aids, simply because the market may not be big enough or the profit too small. This is essentially the kind of operation which the Community could help, at the same time ensuring that the best types of aid are developed.

In the longer term we as a group certainly accept the aim of integration within practical limits. We welcome integration to the greatest possible extent—the integration of disabled people in economic, social and cultural life and also integration in education, provided it is genuinely feasible and will not do harm to the disabled.

In my own country and constituency there are special schools enjoying special facilities which, if reproduced over the whole field of education, would cost a tremendous amount of money. So we advocate integration where it is feasible and desirable without doing harm to the interests of disabled people.

On equality of income, my own party in my own country has an aim very similar to that set out in the Clwyd report, namely — and I quote from our own manifesto — 'to provide a coherent system of cash benefits and to meet the costs of disability, so that more disabled people can support themselves and live normal lives'. We went on to say that we would work towards this as swiftly as the strength of the economy allows. That is unfortunately a practical limit which imposes itself upon the policy of all governments.

Finally, there is one very important field which has already been mentioned by several people, and I want to add my voice to their plea. Because the Community determines the base on which value-added tax is levied, the Community could and should clarify the position of charities in regard to value-added tax. That, it seems to me, is a relatively easy but very important step, because the work of voluntary organizations in the field of disablement is enormous and fundamental. This is again a task which it will be easier for the Community to carry out than for the Member States themselves, because of Community jurisdiction in this field.

I should like to say one last word, Mr President, on the role of this Parliament. We have formed, as I think everyone here knows, an all-party disablement group in this House which includes members from every political group. We are determined that the Clwyd report and today's debate will be only the start of a

Prag

determined Community effort to increase the Community's role in working for disabled people in the Community. We will continue to work on an order of priorities and to put pressure on the Commission and the member governments to ensure that the recommendations of the Clwyd report are carried out. No fewer than 74 Members from this House, Mr President, have given their backing to this all-party disablement group, and so have voluntary organizations throughout the Community. We do not intend to allow the Clwyd report to be buried in the august vault specially constructed for parliamentary reports by the Council of Ministers.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Kappos.

Mr Kappos. — *(E)* There is no doubt, Mr President, that the question of actually establishing and ensuring rights for disabled people is a problem of keen topical interest. From this point of view it is a positive step by Parliament to concern itself with this problem and to advance the cause of the disabled during the International Year of the Disabled. We have not discussed, of course, the question of preventing disability and, more particularly, of safeguarding workers from industrial accidents and occupational diseases which are in fact crimes, even though those who are responsible for them are not considered as criminals in a class-based society.

Mr President, I should like to take this opportunity to say that the situation of disabled people in Greece is unacceptable. First of all, there is no provision for basic education for handicapped children and disabled people in general. The available statistics show that in 1976-1977 only 2-3 % of children needing special training and education were catered for by existing schools and institutions. A bill which was adopted recently makes no fundamental change in this direction. And naturally the vast majority of these institutions are privately owned which means that disabled people, their parents and relatives are being exploited by private enterprise in a shameful manner. Besides this no measures have been taken on employment for disabled people. According to certain statistics only 500 out of 13 000 blind people are employed. Finally, the level of financial support for disabled people is totally inadequate. For example, the assistance which some blind people receive comes to no more than 1 000 drachmae or, in other words, a humiliating sum which is not enough to cover the living expenses of healthy people, let alone those of disabled people. It should also be pointed out that war pensions for disabled people are completely inadequate. People disabled in the war refer to these pensions as starvation hand-outs. This makes blind people turn to the humiliating act of begging. However, disabled people, their parents and relatives have in recent years launched

themselves into the struggle with meetings, marches and so on, using the slogan 'Education — Food — Work — Not begging'. So, Mr President, it is clear that in Greece basic human rights are being violated, at least in the case of disabled people, and the working class cannot allow the situation to continue.

The solution to the problem does not in any way lie in the philanthropic gestures which, to a certain extent, the report calls for, but in the State providing the necessary expenditure for education, financial assistance and social security, and in taking appropriate measures for the occupational rehabilitation of disabled people.

The excuse which is often given, that such measures are not possible because the financial resources do not exist, will not hold water. Huge amounts of money are set aside for other aims, in particular for weapons, in other words to create a new generation of disabled people. Consequently military expenditure should be reduced and the necessary finance provided to ensure that disabled people receive their rights. At this point I have to point out that we have struggled and are continuing to struggle, to abolish the existing unacceptable situation and to secure rights for disabled people.

President. — I call Mrs Pruvot.

Mrs Pruvot. — *(F)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I would say that we cannot talk about the problem of the disabled if those who have all their senses and all their faculties do not want or do not agree to demonstrate solidarity, wide-ranging solidarity. I believe that that is the essential basis for any action taken in favour of the disabled around us. It is this sense of solidarity that inspired Mrs Clwyd's report, and I therefore congratulate her on behalf of my Group and thank her for drawing up this report.

As I do not have a great deal of time and as my colleagues have spoken at considerable length and in detail on all the aspects possibly surrounding action taken in favour of the disabled, I shall confine myself to three points.

As regards education, quite obviously, it is a question of increasing and improving the measures that have been taken to prepare physically handicapped young people for working life. To this end, we should concentrate our efforts on the integration, wherever possible, of handicapped children into traditional establishments so that they can meet other children and enjoy a normal relationship with them. I know the value of this since I have spent all my working life in charge of nursery schools. In my country, many children first attend nursery schools at the age of. I know from my own experience that handicapped children, whether they suffer from psychomotor handicaps or

Pruvot

are mentally handicapped, derive a great deal of benefit from attending schools with other children and from being given the same kind of attention as other children. This, of course, raises the problem, in education, of the training of the teachers, which is exceedingly important because a teacher must be very highly trained to look after handicapped children, whose needs are, after all, different from those of other children. But a particularly high level of training is also needed to detect, in some cases, certain handicaps in very young children, which may prevent them from having far more serious handicaps in the future. I feel that these essential measures are not difficult to take and do not require enormous efforts on the part of each Member State. I believe the Commission has plans along these lines. They should be completed and above all implemented very quickly. I should also like to say, secondly, that it seems fundamental to me that encouragement should be given to the integration of the disabled into working life, and here again, a change of attitude on the part of employers is needed. Employers should be better informed on how valuable certain disabled people can be. And talking of incomes, employers should be informed and shown that it can sometimes be as profitable to employ certain disabled people in certain activities as to employ someone who is not disabled.

The Commission, as Mrs Clwyd says, has found that many public and private undertakings no longer respect the job quotas for the disabled and some of them even prefer to pay the fines rather than meet the Community standards. There is therefore an urgent need for the Commission and the Member States to take the necessary steps to ensure these directives are enforced. The third aspect of a policy for the disabled consists in taking account of the role played by the family. We must make a distinction between two forms of handicap here. While the integration into social life of certain people suffering motor handicaps is necessary and possible, we must not close our eyes to the fact that some people with serious and deep-rooted mental handicaps cannot be integrated into social life. It is therefore essential to demonstrate the solidarity to which I referred just now, solidarity with the disabled and with their families. Let us think for a moment of the tragedies that strike the families of these handicapped people and let us think of bringing them some relief too, not only financially but also by helping them with all our heart.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to say on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group how sensitive we are to this problem, and I should also like to congratulate Mrs Clwyd again on the excellent report that she has submitted to us today.

President. — I call Miss De Valera.

Miss De Valera. — Mr President, Ladies and Gentlemen, I wish to thank my colleague on the Committee on Social Affairs, Mrs Clwyd, for this excellent report. After centuries of neglect the problems of handicapped persons are now being looked at more sympathetically and realistically in our Community. This can be seen in the implementation of the Community first action programme for the occupational rehabilitation of handicapped persons, 1974-1979, which was made possible by the degree of importance which the then Irish Commissioner, President Hillery, attached to it.

What I would like to see, Mr President, is the implementation of the Commission's report to the Council of June last year. The Council approved the conclusions concerning the need for employment policy to be more closely linked to the action programme for the disabled. I also agree with the Council that the role of the Social Fund should be extended and that information campaigns on handicapped persons for the public at large should be expanded.

Despite the action being taken by the Community I feel that had it not been for the UN declaration that 1981 was to be the International Year of Disabled Persons, we would not now be giving this very special problem all the attention it deserves. I am thankful therefore to Mrs Clwyd that she has presented us today with a report that recognizes the impetus provided by the United Nations and emphasises the need for concerted action. Mrs Clwyd, in her address to us today, mentioned that there were between 13 and 20 million disabled persons in our Community and this, if you take it at its highest level, represents twice the number of people presently unemployed in the EEC. This points up the heavy burden that is on the shoulders of each Member of the European Parliament to seek to eradicate this tragic situation.

In the second point of her resolution the rapporteur recognizes that poverty is not only a major cause of handicap but is a distinctive feature of the lives of many disabled persons. In this respect I have already asked the Commission in a Written Question to carry out a study on the relationship between poverty and the handicapped in the Community. I am also particularly anxious that efforts should be continued and broadened wherever possible to integrate disabled children into ordinary schools. This, of course, is urged in the report. Such children have a great deal to offer and it is often their refusal to give in to their disability and instead to carry on in adversity that is such an inspiration to others. I therefore also support the need to provide adequate funds for the training of teachers whose special skills can be of great value to disabled children.

The final aspect of this report, which I would like to draw attention to, concerns the major role played by the family and the many voluntary organizations with regard to disabled persons. Their patience and understanding through the years when the handicapped

De Valera

were neglected needs recognition. It is all very well for us to discuss this question today which, naturally, is of major importance, but it has been the members of the family, and indeed these voluntary organizations that have had to work through the years against great difficulties. I think that we, recognizing this problem today, can do much to help and, indeed, give support to these families and these organizations. I would recommend and would agree with the recommendations that Mrs Clwyd makes in the report that the Member States should increase the services provided to disabled people and their families in their homes. This must be urgently examined.

A report entitled 'Training and Employing the Handicapped', which appeared in 1975, was a milestone in creating an awareness of the capabilities of the disabled. It found that many disabled persons were able, and indeed willing, to work provided that they were given that opportunity. It set in motion new developments and vocational rehabilitation in which the voluntary organizations have been to the fore.

Finally, I would like to refer to a statement made in the course of a speech by the Irish Minister for Health and Social Welfare, last year, when he pointed out that we must involve the disabled themselves in planning, organizing and arranging events and activities. For who knows better the aspirations and the needs of the disabled than they themselves. Let this therefore be the first of many steps in promoting their full integration in our Community.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Vandemeulebroucke.

Mr Vandemeulebroucke. — *(NL)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the report we are discussing here is very important because it adopts a global and integrated policy approach. I must express my great appreciation for the excellent work the rapporteur has done and for the wealth of recommendations to be found in the report. But I do find it rather cautious. For example, we repeatedly find requests addressed to various Member States, whereas we would have expected the European Parliament to make an urgent appeal for proposals for directives, decisions and regulations wherever possible in each of the areas concerned. The well-intended proposals for a massive collection of money through the mass media, for instance, are also cautious. We find this still smacks too much of charity. It would be better for the report to emphasize the need for the Member States to make more public money available. This must be given top political priority.

Equally fundamental is the choice the European institutions face: do we continue to place the principal emphasis on Europe as a kind of free trade association

and so at the service of, above all, the large companies, or are we in fact prepared to develop into a social Europe? For example, we find that the European Social Fund accounts for barely 4.4 % of all the Community's expenditure and that it has not been possible to approve four-fifths of the applications received because of a shortage of money. These figures surely speak volumes.

I therefore hope that this report, as a well-meant declaration of intent, will form the basis for further action. Adding a few specialized officials to a directorate-general is not enough. I was therefore pleased to hear that the working party with its 25 members will continue to appraise the situation in 1981.

One of the deficiencies of this report is that it does not say a word about a sports policy, sports' accommodation and the integration of the disabled into sports. And then there is, for example, scientific research. In the new technological revolution, are the disabled not being left completely to their fate?

To conclude, the European institutions might themselves set an example. The report calls for the appointment in each Member State of a minister specifically responsible for policy on the disabled. But is the Commission also prepared to appoint a Commissioner to take responsibility for an integrated policy on the disabled? At the moment, this subject is hidden away somewhere among social affairs.

The report also recommends that public buildings should be made accessible to the disabled. Mr Peters referred to this several times. But have we counted the number of steps in the Commission's building in Brussels, here in the Palais de l'Europe in Strasbourg or even in the new Berlaymont?

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, my predecessor Mauritz Coppieters, who initiated three of the seven motions for resolutions, once said that politics is the shaping of human fellowship. Let this be our principal source of inspiration in 1981.

President. — I call Mr Frangos.

Mr Frangos. — *(EL)* I offer my warmest congratulations and thanks to everyone who had a hand in making this deeply interesting discussion possible and, in particular, to the rapporteur for her extremely well-detailed report regarding the social aspects of the problem. I should also like to thank all the rapporteurs of the committees responsible who submitted constructive annexes, proposals and opinions. The subject is very broad, complicated and delicate and it raises many problems which are touched upon in the reports.

The social or ethical question is posed whether it is the definition of a disabled person which entitles him to

Frangos

special treatment that also makes him feel inferior to other human beings. This is the reason, so it is said, why we should not issue special cards for the disabled but should include them in the European health card of all the citizens of the Member States of the EEC. My position is that we ought to be practical and realistic. A disabled person knows that he is disabled and he is not going to find this out from a card which will give him certain essential benefits. Furthermore, the definition of a disabled person, in other words of a person who should receive assistance, is difficult insofar as it involves stipulating both the attributes of the disabled person and the degree of disability which every State should acknowledge, not in accordance with its own criteria but on the basis of objective and clear-cut criteria which must be jointly determined and valid throughout the whole Community. From the point of view of Community law there does not appear to be any special legal safeguards or protection for disabled people apart from the provisions laid down in Articles 2 and 3 of the Treaty establishing the EEC and in Articles 100, 117, 118, 122 and 235, which can be used as the legal basis for the protection of disabled people in accordance with the proposal of the Legal Affairs Committee, the annexes and amendments to which, I think, should be incorporated in the decision on the matter.

There are many kinds of disabled people in Greece, as in many of the EEC's Member States. The main groups of disabled people are those who were handicapped in the war — it is well known that Greece has had to go to war on many occasions sacrificing its sons and daughters for world peace — and people disabled in peace-time, most of whom receive certain special assistance, pensions and other benefits such as tax and duty exemptions on motor vehicles, free petrol, exemption from income tax up to a certain level, exemption from stamp duty, etc. However, apart from these two groups there are many disabled people whose disabilities are due to accidents, the incompatibility of their parent's blood groups, quirks of nature, drugs like thalidomide and so on. The circumstances of blind people and of deaf and dumb people are amongst the most striking and distressing in this group.

In Greece the first people to show concern for the disabled were almost all philanthropists who established various institutions. Later, however, the State reviewed its position and began to accept that it had a duty to take responsibility for the care of disabled people and it made every effort to provide welfare facilities, education, occupational rehabilitation and to integrate the disabled into society. Respect for the dignity of the individual and the increasing socialization of the State were instrumental in bringing about the change in government attitudes. Thus we see in the 1975 Greek Constitution the Government binding itself to assume responsibility to provide special care for disabled people. This was followed by the adoption of primary legislation such as Law 963 in 1979 on occu-

pational rehabilitation for disabled and handicapped people, and the law on special training, special vocational training, employment and social welfare, etc. These laws marked the beginning of a new policy in Greece and created the legal framework which formed the basis for a new contemporary approach to the problems of disabled people at each stage in their development. Obviously this legal development does not solve all the problems created by the various forms of disability which, for the main part, are problems of welfare, education, occupational rehabilitation and social integration.

To give a more detailed explanation of these laws, they place an obligation on governmental organizations, public services and public companies to employ certain categories of disabled persons as telephonists, messengers, porters, night-watchmen, lift operators, etc. Also, Article 11 of the law which I mentioned to you earlier solves the problem of those candidates for jobs who are deprived of limbs or suffering from a disease, because up until now they were not able to take part in examinations, but now, with the new law, their disability is no longer viewed as an obstacle.

Today in Greece people believe that disabled people should be respected and receive all the special assistance required from the government and society in order that they can develop all their abilities and skills and make a living by gainful employment, enjoying all the rights which this entitles them to. Nevertheless it is true that there are still many problems. Here I should state that there is a problem of determining the numbers of disabled people in the various categories because there are no clear and adequate statistics. On the other hand, various disabilities are diagnosed early and treated effectively in Greece. Wherever possible a system of after-care and advice should be provided for disabled people and their families by creating modern medico-educational centres where scientific knowledge can be applied to the treatment of these conditions.

In Greece there are many gaps in pre-school preparation for dealing with disabilities as, unfortunately, there are no suitable nurseries for handicapped children. However, the problems of school-age children are dealt with more effectively and the Ministries of Social Services and Education have established a number of special institutions. In general, the Government's position is that these institutions should only be used as a last resort, in other words children should only live in them if they are unable to live in their own homes and with other children. Finally, in serious cases there are hospitals where chronically disabled people can remain for the whole of their lives.

I will finish by outlining the main problems facing disabled people in Greece. These are the lack of the essential specialized scientific and other staff in the

Frangos

fields of treatment, education and rehabilitation, the lack of economic resources for the implementation of educational programmes, the lack of welfare programmes for disabled people living outside institutions, and the quantitative and qualitative inadequacy of existing welfare institutions which care for people who cannot remain with their family. It is my opinion that the EEC can help to solve many of these problems by financing programmes in all the Member States, such as vocational and pre-vocational training programmes.

Mr President, I hope that today we all decide upon some definite guidelines and policies so that we can offer something positive to disabled people in all the Member States which will also be a constructive contribution to our society in general. This decision, which I believe will be adopted unanimously by us today, should in all the Member States of the EEC without delay form the basis for a legally enshrined principle based not on charity towards the needy poor, but on the principles of mutual dependence and personal equality for all men. And I believe the common voice of the Ten in Europe will serve as an important contribution to the efforts aimed at reducing the problems of disabled people, for as the old Greek proverb says: 'All of us face the same fate and the future is uncertain'.

(Applause)

President. — The Commission has the floor.

Mr Patterson. — ... Mr President, I really must protest. I am draftsman of the opinion of one of the committees, and it really is important that the committee should be heard before the Commissioner replies. My name has been on the screen as the next speaker for some time now. It should have been much earlier in this debate according to the practices of this House.

President. — I call Mrs Maij-Weggen on a point of order.

Mrs Maij-Weggen. — *(NL)* For Mr Richard not to speak at the end of this debate, but to be followed by other speakers would be a rather unusual procedure. Mr Patterson has already protested. I am sure that Mr Richard will understand. The people who want to speak now may have questions or remarks to address to Mr Richard, and they have a right to an answer. I would therefore very much appreciate it if Mr Richard spoke at the end of this debate and not half-way through it. Any other approach I would find rather discourteous to the Members of this House.

President. — After Mr Patterson, all the draftsmen of opinions will have been heard. There are also a few

more speakers listed. I think that the Commissioner should speak now. If afterwards questions are asked, I think that Mr Richard will agree to answer them.

I call Mr Patterson.

Mr Patterson. — Mr President, as I was saying, it is usual for draftsmen of opinions to come on rather earlier in debates so that the Groups can comment on those opinions, and this is particularly important when that opinion has to be an oral one, under Rule 44 (4), because it has not been possible to get a written opinion in on time. The reason why this has happened in this particular case has been explained by our rapporteur earlier on.

I also have to move Amendments Nos 12 and 13, which are in the name of my committee, and Amendment No 13 is particularly lengthy. The same reason applies. It is because, for one reason or another, the three committees asked to give an opinion were not able to do so before Mrs Clwyd's committee took a decision.

What is the reason for having a separate section on youth and education? I think everyone here will agree that the disabled are at risk in all our societies and no disabled people are more at risk than disabled children. I think it is also quite clear, is it not, that at a time of high unemployment, young people are particularly badly hit, and of all youth it is the disabled young people who are hit worst of all. Two weeks ago I visited a number of schools in my constituency with special departments or special schools for the disabled, and in one school I asked what percentage of those in the school would find work when they left. I was told by the headmaster that some years ago 90 % would have been placed in full-time employment, but that now they would be very lucky if 10 % of them would find jobs. He said it was extremely depressing that they had been trained in the schools to take up useful employment and only 10 % of them would be able to find it. My second point, made in subparagraph (f) of my amendment, is that it is vital that handicapped children be given help at an early age—pre-school age if possible, since earlier diagnosis can sometimes prevent the development of a handicap. What is more, the provision of skilled help in the early years can often be absolutely vital to the later integration of handicapped children, both at school and in society as a whole. Here I must speak to the members of my own group, who for some unaccountable reason do not wish to support this point. It is one which all British Governments, including Conservative ones, and anyone who has studied the subject would think almost self-evident.

As Mrs Pruvot has said, the movement towards integration in our schools is particularly important, and this was the subject of my study visits to my own schools. But I must say — and here it is in my amendment — that a warning is needed: it cannot be done

Patterson

on the cheap. Schools with disabled children need to have special services. For example, children who are in wheelchairs cannot be allowed to sit in those wheelchairs all day. There is need of a physiotherapy department in each of those schools, and that cannot be done without some money being devoted to it. It is also necessary that teachers who are not trained to take disabled and handicapped children shall be given special training to do so, and that this shall be included as an item of special education in all teachers' training in future. What is more, and this is an important point, there will always be children who cannot be integrated in ordinary schools, and that means that special education of some kind is always going to be necessary. We should not use integration as an excuse for disbanding or downgrading special education.

What is the role of the Community in all this? I see from amendments which my own Group has tabled that there is some doubt that the Community has a role. As it happens, the Community has put in an enormous amount of study and effort already in this field, and those who have not read the Førgenssen report, produced in 1978, should now do so, because it shows precisely how the Community can help in this field. If only the Ministers of Education and the Finance Ministers would adopt the education programme, which was outlined in essence as long ago as 1976, then the competence and the budgeting of the Community in this field would be a great deal easier. So much for subparagraphs (a) and (b) of my amendment. In subparagraph (c), I make reference to the role of parents and parents' associations, and I think the Commission has a special duty here to make sure that the parents of disabled children are involved in their education. As for pilot projects, the Førgenssen report and the follow-up documents note very large numbers of projects which the Commission could usefully carry out and which it is competent to do: these are outlined in subparagraph (f), (h), (i) and (o). Most important of all, perhaps, the Commission has a role to play in the dissemination of information, and here I would mention the Eurydice data network. I put a question down recently to the Commission asking that education of disabled children be put on the Eurydice network and was disappointed to receive the written reply that this was not possible. I hope that Mr Richard will now say that this is possible, that it is one concrete matter which can be put right during this Year of Disabled Persons.

A point about teaching aids. Mr Prag mentioned the role which can be played by special equipment. This is nowhere more important than in the schools, where teaching aids can often be the vital link between the teacher and the pupil.

And finally, the possibility of using Community funds for integration and for helping some very small groups of particular disabled children who are in insufficient numbers in individual countries to warrant special

treatment. This is a task which the Commission could well take up.

We had in my committee hoped to produce a report of our own on this matter. The resolution which I and Miss Brookes put down as a result of a rather inadequate answer to a question of ours from Mr Vredeling intended that both the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport and the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment would produce reports. Because of the misunderstanding my report has to be in the form of amendments to the existing one. I hope therefore that it can be accepted as a whole because it is intended to be a programme of action which the Commission can undertake in the field of education and youth services. I think it is important, as I said, that we make use of the enormous studies which the Commission has already undertaken in the Jürgens report and beforehand and I recommend my Amendment No 13 to the House.

(Applause)

President: — The Commission has the floor.

Mr Richard, Member of the Commission. — Mr President, perhaps I ought to start off, in view of the point of order a little earlier on, by explaining, particularly to Mrs Majj-Weggen and the rest of the House, why I seek to intervene at this stage. She will remember — as I remember — the debate which took place last month on her report on the position of women in the Community. She will remember that she sat in the chamber for some ten hours, as indeed did I. She will also remember that, at the time when it seemed that the Commission was being called upon to do certain things, I was called to speak when, I think, there were two people in the chamber, the galleries were totally empty and indeed people had travelled quite a long way to hear the debate and, I suppose, to hear as well what we the Commission had to say about it. So I thought that on this occasion it might be more sensible if I intervened not right at the end, when there was a danger of something similar happening, but after all the reports had been spoken to, so that I could at least give some indication of the Commission's general approach. If there are specific points raised during the rest of the debate, of course, we will try and answer them in due course. But that is the reason why I will try to say something now.

May I also, Mr President, before speaking on the general position, deal with four specific points. One is a slight commercial. A film is going to be shown at 9.30 tomorrow morning on housing for the disabled in the cinema on the ground floor of this building. I have had the opportunity of seeing it myself. It is a very useful and valuable contribution, and I hope that Members and indeed their colleagues will be able to see it too.

Richard

I was asked by Mr Prag about charities and value-added tax. I will only say two things, if I may. First of all, if I were a chancellor of the exchequer in an unnamed country, I would no doubt be reluctant to relieve anybody, charity or otherwise, of value-added tax. On the other hand, if I were a charity in an unnamed country, I would no doubt be very anxious to be relieved of that tax. Again if I were a chancellor of the exchequer in an unnamed country, not inclined to relieve a charity of the tax, I would no doubt wish it to be understood that I could not do so because of some extra-territorial and extra-national obligation. As far as we are concerned, I will consult with the appropriate Commissioners in Brussels to see precisely what the position is. But one thing I cannot be responsible for, and indeed I am sure that Mr Prag will never wish me to be responsible for, is the conduct of British economic policy at the moment, or indeed what chancellors of the exchequer in England have to say.

Thirdly, I would like to say just a little about guidelines. Mr Spencer — I am glad to see is with us this afternoon — berated me somewhat for not appearing too often in front of the social committee. He also asked if I would give him an assurance that my mind was not fixed in concrete as far as the guidelines were concerned. If he had been present at the last meeting of the Committee of Social Affairs and Employment, he would have heard my deputy chef-de-cabinet who was present there, together with members of the services of DG V give a specific assurance to that committee that my mind is not fixed in concrete on the guidelines, and indeed at the next meeting I propose precisely to come along and discuss the guidelines with the committee. I hope that reassures Mr Spencer both as to the substance of what I will say at the next meeting of the committee and, I hope, as to our mutual presence. It would be nice if we were both there once at the same time.

Finally, I was asked by Mr Patterson something about Eurydice. I do not think he has got it quite right, judging by the way in which he put his question to me a moment ago. We are not saying that we cannot do it; we are not saying that we will not do it. What we have been saying is that we cannot give it the degree of priority that Mr Patterson wants. What we are prepared to do is to try and do it in the context of the transition of young people from school to work. Now — that probably will not satisfy him, but I have to tell him and the House that frankly it is the best I can do at the moment, but I am prepared to have another look at it to see if I can expand it a bit.

Mr President, on behalf of the Commission, may I say to Mrs Clwyd how much I welcome her report, and how much also I welcome the very extensive work that has been done by all four of the parliamentary committees which have taken an interest in developing Community activity on behalf of disabled people. May I also say that the Parliament has shown a fine example to other Community institutions in considering the

problems of the economic, social and vocational integration of disabled people from the different angles of employment and social affairs, education and information, transport policy and legal rights. The presence in the gallery today of so many visitors from organizations representing the interests of disabled people is, I think, evidence in itself of the direct importance of this debate to a large number of the citizens of our Community. It was on a somewhat similar occasion that I took the floor last month, when the hopeful eyes of women's organizations throughout the Community were focused on parliamentarians and on the Commission alike. On that occasion, as the House will remember, the vote became the main focus of attention. On this occasion I have no doubt that this House will show itself massively in favour of increasing the efforts made at Community level to provide a better life for disabled people.

However, we should beware of fine words. Disabled people themselves are by now very accustomed to, and indeed somewhat tired of, listening to policy statements and declarations of intent which then so often find only a very small reflection in terms of actual implementation and the allocation of resources. It is particularly fitting therefore that the International Year for the Disabled should be proclaimed by the UN in 1981, precisely because it is a year which finds the world, and Europe in particular, in an especially difficult economic climate when the plight of disabled people might very well be far away from the central concerns of policy-making. The International Year serves as a timely reminder to society and to our member countries to try to live up to their obligations towards its less-favoured and less fortunate citizens.

We should refuse to be distracted by symbolic actions to mark the International Year. We should, I think, instead try to use this opportunity to make a frank and realistic appraisal of the problems facing disabled people in a period when the economic recession is undermining many of the existing provisions and services developed only with difficulty in past years. It would be a major task simply to ensure that disabled people do not become the major victims of an economic crisis for which they, of all our citizens, are clearly not responsible. Cutbacks in public spending are indeed very often applied in the area of social infrastructure and support services. These are sometimes deemed to be dispensable luxuries for most of the population, but for disabled people they represent an essential lifeline, sometimes indeed making the crucial difference between a life of dependence and a life of dignity and relative autonomy.

There are, of course, some things the Community can do and some things it cannot do. It is very difficult for us, either in the Commission or in any other institution in the Community, to have much direct influence over the public spending policy of individual governments. Similarly with regard to employment, the problems of a diminishing labour market for disabled people

Richard

cannot be separated from the more global problems of employment policies. This means that we make and have been making efforts in terms of work-sharing. It means also that the question of job creation, on which I particularly wish to focus our work in the future, must be considered not only in relation to those who are currently losing their jobs but also in the light of the enormous potential demand for employment from those disabled people who aspire to lead independent lives.

There are many other areas of policy where one has to place the specific demands made on behalf of disabled people within a wider social policy context. Let me just take one. In her report Mrs Clwyd has quite rightly laid great stress on the need to provide disabled people with an adequate basic income. Quite right! It is an aim with which I entirely associate myself. No amount of special concessions and services can substitute for the security and autonomy for each individual that a basic income would provide. That is clearly true. Moreover, the close link between poverty and disability in the European Community is an appalling and indeed continuing reflection on the inadequacies of our respective welfare states. However, this problem raises, as it must do, the much wider question of a social wage to be guaranteed to all those who slip outside the social security net. In the early days of the Community's social action programmes considerable efforts were deployed in this area of incomes policy. We looked, as you know, into the problem of extending social protection and indexing social benefits. Our efforts were overtaken not only by the gravity of the economic crisis but also by the basic reluctance of Member States to operate in concert at Community level in a field which they considered to be highly sensitive. So the Community's means of action in this area, Mr President, must and does remain discreet. Mrs Clwyd has very realistically addressed recommendations to Member States on this question. I fear she has to. What the Commission can and will do, however, is to continue our work in providing comparative studies and information on this topic.

On the issue of parental leave for families, which is raised in the resolution, I think that this also has to be seen in that somewhat wider context and addressed primarily to Member States and not the Commission. There are, however, certain specific areas referred to in Mrs Clwyd's report in the resolution calling for specific Community action which, Mr President, I would now like to turn to.

I am grateful to this House for drawing attention to the numerous different policy areas at Community level where specific provisions could be made towards improving the situation of disabled people. Within the area of my own portfolio, that of employment, social affairs and education, I would like to announce to the House that I intend to bring forward a certain number of specific proposals shortly in the form of a new action programme to promote the social integration of

disabled people. I should also tell the House that this action programme, which is called for in Mrs Clwyd's report, will be of a more comprehensive nature than earlier Community initiatives, which I think have been rather fragmented.

Now, as I say, there are four specific areas that I would like to look at for the moment. First of all education. I would like to indicate how I see these four areas fitting into an integrated programme of general action.

The Commission hopes to place a special emphasis on the educational and training aspects of an integration policy and to develop further existing work in the area of vocational rehabilitation. I am particularly appreciative, if I may say so, and if he does not find it too embarrassing, of the recommendations put forward by Mr Patterson on behalf of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport. These recommendations reflect very closely the ideas that have been developed by the Commission following the excellent work done by Mr Jørgensen for us in this field. I do not think that I need to enter into the details of this here. I should simply like to stress two aspects that we will be seeking to develop on a cooperative basis with Member States within the framework of a new action programme.

First, we hope to look more closely at the actual concept of integration for the young disabled within the school system. We consider it essential, particularly at a time of economic stringency, that integration should not be promoted as a means of saving on expenditure for the essential specialized support services, which must continue to complement the facilities available within ordinary schools. You cannot integrate in education without maintaining the safeguards that the disabled at present possess. If one can, in fact, integrate while maintaining the safeguards then I am totally in favour of it and that is what we will try to do, and strive towards. But it seems to me that integration only for integration's sake, or for the sake of saving money on the fairly costly safeguards which may exist at present, would be wrong and I would certainly not accept it.

Secondly, we should like to lay particular emphasis on the scope for more integrated action within the local community. Parents, voluntary organizations, employers and trade unions all have a vital role to play in coordinating efforts and particularly in increasing awareness and understanding of the needs and aspirations of disabled people in the local community as a whole.

Secondly, let me say a word about the Social Fund. We have heard quite a lot about it today. Some people want it used more widely; some people want it used more restrictively; some people seem to think that we do not have treaties that bind us; some people think that we should have wider treaties, or more restrictive

Richard

or less restrictive treaties. Let me try to put this into some kind of context.

Many comments have been made about it and I am grateful to Mrs Clwyd for having identified some of the inadequacies. Of course there are inadequacies — I am fully aware that insufficient financial resources have been our main limitation. I will therefore be pressing — the House will not be surprised to hear — for a substantial increase in the Social Fund budget for 1982. It is true to say also that the disabled came out rather badly from the Fund review in 1977. The existing regulations impose difficult constraints and limited the major part of the Fund's interventions to the regional priority areas. Perhaps I can say this to the House as well I am looking forward to the opportunity of reviewing the Fund's regulations again in 1982, and one of the things that I will be trying to do is to remove some of these obstacles, provide the Fund with a clearer and more dynamic role, particularly with regard to the training and employment of disabled people.

Let me turn briefly to employment. In employment integration has got to be seen as a two-way concept. We must seek to promote movement by the disabled into the so-called mainstream of society and of economic life. We must also continually emphasise, I think, the need for other more fortunate members of society to modify their attitudes towards the disabled themselves. This applies particularly to action in the employment field.

I have listened to the discussion about employment quotas. The Commission has already done some work in this field — not enough, I think we will do more — we will certainly take up your suggestions to make an in-depth study of the various provisions for positive discrimination — affirmative action, as the Americans would call it, in the labour market. Can I say just two things about quotas: I do not see them as a panacea. The principal objective of quotas must be to break down barriers, not to erect them — technical, economic and psychological barriers which hinder the employment of disabled people. Quota systems will always require complementary measures to ensure that employment becomes a satisfactory and, indeed, a satisfying experience, for the individual handicapped person and for the enterprise in question. So I suppose that if I have a message to leave to the House about quotas my inclination in that direction is that my mind is not totally made up and I am going to look at it rather harder before I finally make up my mind. I am very interested indeed in the West German evidence which appeared in the report and I want to look at that in considerably greater detail.

Employment is, after all, still the most tangible sign of social integration. It is for this reason, after all, that we put so much emphasis on the need to improve employment opportunities for young people. Many of the arguments that apply to young people also apply to

disabled people, whatever age they happen to be. We should, therefore, I think, consider how to obtain for disabled people the same kind of priority and provisions for training and employment as those that have been developed over the years for young unemployed people.

Finally I want to say a word about definitions and statistics. The problem of the definition of disability has been raised here and I welcome the attention given to it: it is an important, though delicate, issue. Apart from the fact that no quota system can operate without a satisfactory system of definitions, it is vital to bear in mind to what extent definitions of disability may serve to exclude people from society rather than contributing to their integration. We hope to develop our work on the basis of the useful new definitions proposed by the WHO, making the distinction, according to the purpose envisaged, between impairment, disability and handicap. These distinctions become most important when one is considering such proposals as those for an international pass for the handicapped. I would strongly support the development of an internationally recognized individual health-card for those people at risk who wish to provide readily understandable information about their special needs when travelling. I would support that; I would indeed wish this issue to be considered at a meeting of Community Health Ministers, which I hope will take place in the not-too-distant future.

The question of reciprocal privileges for the disabled in the various Member States, I think, raises different issues. The emphasis should be, as this House has indicated, in the area of parking privileges, where international recommendations exist and should now be implemented.

Mr President, in conclusion — and I apologize to the House for taking so long but there were one or two things I did want to say on this issue — may I say once again how constructive and helpful I have found this debate. I welcome the initiative taken by this House to mark the International Year of Disabled persons, and I hope that the Commission and the Member States can now live up to the very realistic expectations which have been aroused. The Commission, for its part, will do its best with its limited resources to produce proposals for an action programme which does respond to your recommendations. I should say, however, that I shall count and shall need to count on this House for continuing support and interest in these issues. I do not think I need emphasize how much we shall need that support if the Commission is to obtain the financial and personnel resources necessary to develop our action in these areas. I hope, however, this debate will have started a process which will last long after the end of the International Year and produce a lasting effect on the situation of disabled people throughout the Community. It has been useful to me and those who have come to listen to our deliberations, some from many miles away — I believe one

Richard

delegation from Britain actually left at 8 o'clock yesterday morning in order to reach here by 3 o'clock this afternoon — will, I hope, take away the feeling that understanding of their particular problems is indeed growing at a European level. I hope too that they will appreciate that we in the Commission approach their problems with sympathy and indeed with urgency. We will do what we can up to the limit of our existing resources. I am sure that will not satisfy this House, nor should it, but, frankly, it is the best that I can do for you this year. As for next year and the years after, we will try to get more resources and do slightly better.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mrs Viehoff.

Mrs Viehoff. — *(NL)* Mr President, I should like to begin by saying that I find it a pity that only Mr De Graaf is here and not the Minister for Education. After all, educational matters are an important aspect of the care of the disabled. Fortunately, Mr Richard is still here even though he has already spoken. As I understand it, he takes a great interest in education. The Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport has tabled amendments specifically concerned with education for the disabled. The Socialist Group is less worried about whether they are adopted than about the reaction or absence of reaction to them. It is easy to write down fine words — paper is a very patient medium — but the important thing is that suggestions are actually implemented. In paragraph 18 (b) of Mr Patterson's amendment No 13, which calls on the Member States not to delay in approving the programme of action in the field of education that was adopted by the Council on 27 June 1980, one phrase is of particular interest to the disabled, and that is where it says that attention must be paid to the part of the programme which concerns equal opportunities for the disabled.

At present, almost all the Member States are reducing expenditure on education, and there is a real danger that education for handicapped young people, the retraining of those who have become disabled as a result of an accident and the part-time education of disabled adults will be particularly hard hit by these cuts.

There is something else to which careful attention must be paid, and that is the integration of the disabled into normal education, as Mr Richard has already said. Such integration is to be welcomed because it is a bad thing for the disabled to be isolated from the rest of the community. They form part of the community and should be integrated into it in every possible way. But, and this is a big but, however right this idea may be, it must not be used as a pretext for reducing the expenditure needed for satisfactory and responsible

education for the disabled. And here again, since cuts are being made in the education budgets of the Member States, vigilance is required.

During a discussion with a group of visually handicapped people this morning the lack of attention paid to sports, culture and recreation was mentioned. As I understand it, the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sports will probably be producing a report this year concerned more specifically with educational matters, but as sport and recreation also fall within this committee's terms of reference, I will ask the rapporteur to include these subjects.

I agree with Mrs Clwyd that it is a pity things are not better coordinated in this Parliament, because the contribution from the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport is now summarized in the form of amendments. Amendments always give the impression that their authors do not agree with the report to which they refer. That is in no way true in this case. We are all full of admiration for the report, but you just cannot cover every field on your own without the help of other committees, and that is why these amendments were needed. But we should have gone about things differently, on that I agree with the rapporteur. There may be one advantage. If the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport produces the report I have just mentioned, attention will continue to be focused on this subject for a little while longer, because, and I will close with this remark, I hope that all the fine words that are written and spoken will be translated into deeds and that at the end of 1981 we shall not be saying: That's it, we have had the Year of the Disabled and now let us go on to other things. I hope that at the end of 1981 we will have a review of what practical action has been taken, and I hope that there will be a very great deal of it.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mrs Maij-Weggen.

Mrs Maij-Weggen. — *(NL)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I am glad to see you are still with us, Mr Richard. Since 1974 the Commission has been looking at ways of improving the position of the disabled in the various Member States. So far pilot projects in housing and vocational rehabilitation have taken pride of place. The two reports the Commission has produced on this subject, in September 1979 and October 1980, provide an overall picture of what has so far been achieved with the aid of Community subsidies. Less well known, but no less important, have been the activities in the field of education, as Mrs Viehoff has just indicated, and activities in the field of preventive medical research. The Commission has been active in these areas since 1976 and 1978, re-

Maij-Weggen

spectively. Mrs Clwyd's report, which is, of course, principally intended as an opinion on the seven motions for resolutions that have been tabled, gives a brief description of the projects that have so far been implemented by the Community in favour of the disabled. This review is particularly important because it is useful to know what has happened in the past before we propose new activities.

While having every admiration for the good and difficult work done by the rapporteur, I do have a slight criticism to make, because this report gives a general description of what the Community has done so far, but it does not make a proper critical appraisal, it does not pass judgement on what has happened. What effect has been achieved and what these activities have meant in practice for the disabled remains somewhat unclear. I find that a pity because it is one of this Parliament's tasks to monitor the work of the Commission and Council and to ensure that Community money goes to the groups for which it is intended.

The report does not provide me with any clear information on this aspect. I find that a pity. I feel it would be a good thing if the Commission informed us, possibly through the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, precisely what results have been achieved with all the activities in the past. In her report Mrs Clwyd has made a number of suggestions for the extension and strengthening of the Community policy for the disabled. Although all her suggestions are very important, I would draw particular attention to her plea for the improvement of the social and economic integration of the disabled and to her suggestions regarding public transport and the accessibility of public buildings.

Assistance with social and economic integration is perhaps one of the most important aspects of the duty we have to our disabled fellow human beings. The ability to play an active part in all aspects of life, the ability to make a contribution to the development of our society and the ability to earn a living are important for those who are not disabled and at least as important for the disabled. And the obstacles the disabled must overcome to achieve all this are many times higher than the obstacles facing those who are not disabled. It is therefore no more than our duty to help our disabled citizens as far as possible to overcome these obstacles.

An added factor is that the present economic crisis makes it even more difficult for the disabled to take their place in our society. In this context, Mrs Clwyd's suggestions that firms and institutions in all the Member States should be required to employ a certain percentage of disabled people is particularly useful. Mr Richard has said that he has his doubts about the usefulness of these quotas, but I must say that my Group does not have such doubts. The best thing would, of course, be to introduce quotas, but I must say that my Group does not have such doubts. The best

thing would, of course, be to introduce quotas and then to find that they are superfluous in the long term. But it is increasingly obvious that we need them. I must also point out that employment, on which Mrs Clwyd has principally concentrated in her report, is only one facet of people's working lives. At least as important is that the disabled should participate, be integrated into and contribute to work in the home. Let us not forget that. I have tabled an amendment to this effect, and I hope that the rapporteur will incorporate it in the resolution — in fact I expect her to do so.

The suggestions made in the Clwyd report regarding public transport and the accessibility of public buildings are just as important. Everyone should really spend one day a year in a wheelchair or something similar to appreciate what surprises await the disabled in their daily activities. I should like to give you a nice practical example of this. When I was still a young mother with a baby and a small child, I once stood with a disabled person at the bottom of the steps leading up to a station. I could not get the pram with the baby in it or the little one up the steps, and my disabled companion could not climb them either. He then said to me: 'The dreadful thing about this is that you can help me, but I cannot help you, so you still have a slight advantage over me.' I then said to him: 'You can perhaps help by holding the baby on your lap, then I will take you up the steps, and after that I will take the pram apart and carry it up.' So together we managed, but we both missed the train. That is the kind of situation which faces the disabled every day and it is really very sad that such things happen. Such problems are usually caused by thoughtlessness when plans are being drawn up and buildings designed.

It would therefore be a very good thing — and I would ask Mr Richard to bear this suggestion in mind — if every public transport plan and every design for public buildings were first submitted to a committee of the disabled so that they could give tips on how to make such buildings accessible. Even when so-called experts have been involved, the result is often very disappointing in practice. In this respect I feel the Community might very well play a coordinating and also stimulating role.

Mrs Nielsen has also said in this connection that it is not a question of the disabled adapting to society, but of society adapting to the disabled. It is in just this kind of area that society can show its good side, and there is a very real need for that.

Mr President, I should also like to comment on paragraph 14. This is a completely different point in Mrs Clwyd's resolution. Some Members have called for the deletion of this paragraph, and I must say that I in fact sympathize, since I feel we must not make our disabled citizens dependent on charity, because that is what in fact is concerned here. I feel that financial assistance for the disabled must normally form part of

Maij-Weggen

our budget just like other areas of policy. We have systematically increased the appropriations for the disabled in our own Community budget in recent years, and I was very pleased to hear from Mr Richard that this will again be the case in 1982. I have no doubt that he will have Parliament's full support. We have had charity campaigns in the Netherlands, but it is the disabled themselves who are gradually beginning to protest against them. They do not want to be the subject of special campaigns: they want to be normally involved in normal policy, and I feel they have a right to this. My Group will have to discuss this again, but we are rather doubtful about the usefulness of the proposal contained in paragraph 14.

In this context, I should like to go back to my remark about the economic crisis. If we look at the social history of the Member States, it is clear that weak and vulnerable groups suffer far more from economic decline than citizens who are healthy and strong. And who is now paying the highest price at this time of unemployment and the highest price as social funds are dismantled? We have no difficulty in naming these groups. They are the young people, women, the minority groups, the migrant workers and above all the disabled. Mr Patterson has already given us an example of what is happening at a school he knows, 90 % of whose pupils used to find jobs as against a mere 10 % now. That is the hard reality we face.

This is not a natural phenomenon: it is a mechanism of the social and economic system, and it is an immoral mechanism. I said the same during the debate on the position of women, and I will say it again here. And I believe I must go on repeating it throughout the ten years the economic crisis will last. This has nothing to do with fate. If healthy and strong people do not use their place in society primarily to protect and improve their own position but as a shield to protect the weaker members of society, there is no need for this immoral mechanism to gain the upper hand at times of economic recession. Whether times are good or bad for us and above all for the disabled and any other vulnerable groups in society principally depends on ourselves and on the strength of our solidarity. The Christian-Democratic Group sees this as a special task, based on our sense of moral duty and above all on our respect for our fellow men. I believe respect for our fellow men will be one of the keys to our social policy in the 80s and that respect will also be the key to our policy towards the disabled.

President. — I call Miss Brookes.

Miss Brookes. — Mr President, a point that should be made at this moment is that if any Member of the European Parliament lived his life in a wheelchair it would be impossible for him to come from the back of the hemicycle on his own to take his seat in the front-

line rows, because the steps that lead down to the body of the hemicycle would impede him. I think this is a rather telling point at this very moment. I would also, while thanking Mr Richard for his philosophy for the future, ask him how many disabled people are employed by the European Parliament.

It is estimated that 1 in 100 people suffer some form of handicap, being either deaf, dumb, blind, mentally handicapped or suffering from some other form of disability. This shows how important it is for the European Parliament to involve itself in the word of this particular year. I am therefore very pleased that the Parliament is having this debate and is supporting the International Year of Disabled People, but I would like to stress, as my colleagues have done so, that the Campaign must not be of one year. It must be continuous; it must in fact be a Community crusade.

It is particularly important for the mentally handicapped to be integrated into society, because to a large extent mental handicap is still an unknown quantity and feared by many people. There should therefore be as much educational work as possible to acquaint people with the aspirations and limitations of the mentally handicapped. Until there is a greater degree of understanding of their problems, we shall never achieve worthwhile integration of the mentally subnormal into society. The Mental Health act of 1959 passed in the United Kingdom clearly stated: 'The emphasis in cases of mental handicap should be shifted as far as possible from institutional care to care within the local community' and that means family and friends and colleagues.

That sums up the very report we are discussing today. Our aim should be to integrate and not separate the mentally handicapped. Some people will always need institutional care, but this is not the answer for the majority of the mentally handicapped. They should not be treated as second-class citizens who need everything to be done for them, but should be encouraged and given the opportunity to gain a new self-respect by learning to do things for themselves, by opting into society and having the opportunity to opt into society. Employment is particularly important. The EEC should provide as much financial assistance as possible for Member States through the European Social fund to increase provision for training centres, sheltered workshops and educational projects, and I was delighted when Mr Richard said that there would be a broadening of the guidelines of the Social Fund and he would be taking another look at the regulation. Providing employment and training and above all educating the people to accept and support the mentally handicapped, these are important ways in which the European Community and the Member States can help to achieve the integration of the disabled into our society.

President. — I call Mrs Hammerich.

Mrs Hammerich. — (DK) Mr President, Mrs Clwyd has produced a very commendable report, but I should like to say a few words about the actual situation in my own country. In this, the UN Year of the Disabled, the Government there has set up a Government commission on which all the organizations of the disabled have refused to be represented. The federation of invalid associations has no desire to sit on a commission alongside a government that has broken the principles and laws that have prevailed since the 1930s, achieved by the efforts of the disabled.

The Government wants to make savings and cuts and has therefore introduced a means test for assistance to the disabled. The disabled regards this as a tax on every disabled person. Not only is this breach of Danish tradition the result of a weak economic policy, it also demonstrates an uncritical subservience to the EEC's economic guidelines calling for public spending cuts, for the EEC is not a benevolent society but rather a device to further the interests of commerce and money-making.

The result of this collaboration between the EEC and our own politicians has been to worsen the situation of the disabled to such an extent that they refuse to sit on the Government commission. Those are the facts. And I do not believe disabled people in my country hope for any help from the Community. What they are hoping for is a more independent economic policy, more in keeping with the traditions of our country, which will not tamper with what has been achieved by their organizations over the years. They see little use for the EEC in this connection, none for resolutions, and absolutely none for the economies urged by the Commission, to their detriment.

President. — I call Mrs Dekker.

Mrs Dekker. — (NL) How, Mr President, in so prosperous a society as ours, do we achieve a situation in which people with a handicap are involved as far as possible in social life and also play an active part in it? How accessible is our society to people with a handicap? In principle, everyone recognizes the equality of human beings, whether or not they have a handicap, but in practice, the disabled have far less opportunity than the able-bodied. And this is principally because our society has not yet adjusted mentally or physically to really living with the disabled. Despite all the efforts that have been made, there are still, literally and figuratively, many barriers that prevent the disabled from participating in social life. I would refer in this context to the accessibility of buildings, the lack of transport, needless separate education and the absence of therapy in the home. I could go on for some time, but I intend to concentrate in the remainder of my statement on the content of the report and on the amendments I have tabled to it. The report is entitled 'The social, economic and vocational integration of disabled

people in the European Community'. A very wide field. I very much welcome the fact that the first paragraph of the resolution places the emphasis on the development of the disabled in and outside the work context, since this presupposes independence, which boils down to the emancipation of these people. The second paragraph rightly refers to the poverty of so many of the disabled. You will not come across many rich disabled people. The text of this paragraph that finally emerged from our committee is rather too cryptic. I have therefore tabled an amendment seeking to make an addition to this paragraph to indicate the link between the level of prosperity and disablement, because it cannot be denied that the occurrence of handicaps is connected to some extent with income levels and consequently the health care facilities in the region concerned.

The motion for a resolution, which contains a number of good suggestions, covers four areas: social integration, economic integration, the employment situation, education and a number of specific EEC measures. But it is rather disappointing that the section on social integration, which is so vital to human relationships, is almost entirely confined to the question of the accessibility of buildings and housing. It contains absolutely no proposals for involving disabled people far more in social life. I realize, of course, that the opportunities the Community has in this area are limited, but we cannot deny and must not refrain from saying that, in this respect, a great deal more needs to be done, that able-bodied people must be made aware of the fact, so that they are also better able to cope with disabled people. Although the motion for a resolution does not say so explicitly, the proposals relating to buildings and housing, could, I feel, be used to draw up a directive. I should like to ask Mr Richard, who is unfortunately not here at the moment, whether he is prepared to put forward a directive concerning the accessibility of buildings and their environment. The British legislation in this area can serve as a guideline.

My amendment to the first part of paragraph 4 seeks to add the principle that the proposed economic and social integration should entail the participation of the disabled in social life on equal terms with the able-bodied.

The last part of paragraph 4 concerns health care facilities and housing. An amendment I have tabled seeks to add to this that such health care facilities must primarily be provided in the home by stepping up home help. Boarding houses or protected housing and social workshops should be no more than a back-up. Another amendment I have tabled seeks to add to the proposal that a directive should be drawn up on a quota system for jobs for the disabled the principle that the posts offered to the disabled should take proper account of their knowledge and skills.

Paragraph 5 (i) concerns fair wages for the disabled. I think this is a good thing. That is why I have also

Dekker

tabled an amendment on the subject. The term 'fair wage' is quite arbitrary, and I therefore refer in my amendment to a wage equal to that received by able-bodied persons. If disabled people are to have a job that accords with their knowledge and skills, they must also be paid in the same way as able-bodied people. We will then perhaps come a little closer to the objective of enabling the disabled to lead as independent a life as possible.

I have tabled other amendments, but I do not think I have enough time to discuss them all. I will therefore skip a few and just mention a few important proposals I would like to put to the Assembly, this being an amendment to paragraph 11, which proposes an international guide on measures to assist the disabled. I feel it would be more appropriate for there to be a European information and documentation centre where the disabled and the members of their families can go to obtain information on the assistance and other facilities available to them. It would also be a contribution to the formulation of policy at European level. In addition, several Member States already have national information and documentation centres, and I do not think it would be so major a step to set up a similar centre at European level as well.

In another amendment I have proposed that the disabled should be involved in decision-making at European level. I am thinking here of the Economic and Social Committee, in which many other groups are already represented. This is an important point in the manifesto drawn up by the European action group of the disabled in the EEC countries immediately before the direct elections to the European Parliament. I feel it is very important, particularly for the emancipation of the disabled, that they themselves should be present when discussions are held and decisions taken on matters that concern them.

Then I have tabled an amendment to paragraph 14 calling for the deletion of the reference to the collection. I agree with Mrs Maij-Weggen that expenditure on the disabled must be included in the budget as a matter of course.

I will conclude with the remark that we must now go on to talk about the emancipation of the disabled. All that is necessary has been said about the risk of the disabled getting less of what is their due because of the economic crisis and of their not therefore being offered what they have a right to. In this respect, we have heard some encouraging words from the Council. It remains a question of choice. That is what politics is about too, and we now have enough material to be able to set priorities in this respect.

President. — I call Mr von der Vring on a point of order.

Mr von der Vring. — (D) Mr President, according to my agenda the sitting ends at 7 p.m. I would ask you to abide by the agenda.

President. — There are still six speakers listed. It is very important that the debate should end this evening. I ask your understanding for the speakers still listed and I request those speakers to be as brief as possible.

I call Mr Boyes.

Mr Boyes. — Mr President, I realize that this Parliament is playing games, and I do not see why we should not all join in. This really is ridiculous. I have got a few notes here, Mr President, and it would make much more sense if I dictated them into a dictating machine, had them typed and entered into the record, because what we are doing here and now really does not make any sense to the few people in the chamber or the people in the gallery. I wanted to address a few remarks to the British Conservatives and normally I would be on my feet asking where they are. But in this case, the majority of them are probably exactly where they should be at 7 p.m. on this evening, and that is at their political group meeting to determine the policies for the rest of the week. So we are really making it a little bit farcical at the moment.

However, because there are some disabled people upstairs, I would like instead to address my remarks to them, and to ignore the few people who are here, because they should not be here; they should be somewhere else. First of all, we should be grateful to the Parliament for having a debate on the International Year of Disabled Persons, and to the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment for producing the report, because at least it has made us focus attention on the problems of the disabled. Maybe you could say it is too late, maybe you query why the directly-elected European Parliament, which has been in existence for almost two years now, has not bothered to do very much for disabled people or even to discuss their problems.

But I think you will agree with me that it is too easy to think up ideas, write them down, distribute them, debate them, so that everybody goes home saying 'oh, we have done our little bit now, we have paid lip service to the problems of the disabled. We have got no real funds to solve the problems but at least when disabled people press me in my constituency, and say to me 'have you done anything?' I can say yes, I spoke in the European Parliament to four people on one Tuesday evening in March'. It really is ridiculous. What I want to say to the House is that I was very pleased to meet some of them today, particularly in this building. A number of people came here and held a small demonstration within the building and a few people came and presented their views to Members of the Parliament. And I welcome that very much, and I

Boyes

hope that they at many times will have an opportunity to come to Strasbourg and to come into this building, because it is not the building of the parliamentarians who sit here, it is a public building; it is their building as much as it is mine. They are as welcome in it as I am and I will be pleased, as will many of my colleagues, — and I am sure I speak for all political groups in the House — if they take advantage of the resources that are available here to put their case.

I want to say to them too that I regret very much that member governments are often using disabled people as pawns in a great political game, a game of resource allocation where they are not getting very high priority. We get governments and this is particularly true of the government in my country — introducing measures to help and improve the quality of life of disabled people, and then, when we have an economic crisis, and as the crisis begins to bite, as it is at the moment, then the tap of aid and assistance is slowly closed until for some people in this unfortunate category, the tap is turned off altogether.

This simply is not good enough. A fair share of resources for disabled people must be guaranteed. They must be guaranteed irrespective of the economic climate. They have a right, they must have a right, and governments have a basic duty to provide them with sufficient resources to lead a life that will allow them to integrate with other people. No society can claim to be a just one if the living standards of one of its weaker sections — and I mean weaker in terms of bargaining power — are subject to fluctuations in difficult times and they have to make a disproportionate amount of sacrifice in an economic crisis.

I would like to address a few remarks to the two or three people that are sitting over there, the European Democrats — the group that no one else will sit with; no other political party, no other country of the Ten, will sit with them. Theirs is the government at the moment that is slashing into the living standards of the disabled people in my country. There has been a general proven reduction in the living standards of disabled people in the UK in the last 18 months. In fact a most distinguished body of gentlemen — the Association of Directors of Social Services — carried out a survey recently and found that the disabled and elderly were faring worse in our country at this present time. Savings were having to be made by delaying projects, cutting existing services and increasing charges. The people we generally have over there — a galaxy of earls, lords, knights and others — do not understand that people in our country are denied services because they live in a world and create a society where services are dependent on cash. So if you are paying the right insurance company or you have enough brass in your wallet — as most of them have — they go and get private services. It does not matter a damn to them whether the economic crisis is affecting the living standards of disabled people.

I find it atrocious that month after month I have to listen to floods of hypocrisy from over there, as though those people really care about disabled people. If you want to talk about disabled people I say your arena is in the meetings attended by Mrs Thatcher — she is the woman who is affecting the living standards of people. Do not talk to us over here, do not blame the Commission for the problem. Just look at Mr Prag there playing his little game: 'Can you tell me, Commissioner, what the VAT position is on voluntary organizations?' If you really care you would have found out before and if you really care you would be telling that woman to do something about it and change things.

I am fed up with the hypocrisy over there. To the disabled people we say this on this side: we will support the measures suggested in the Clwyd report; we will do all we can to see them implemented but we have this stumbling block in Westminster at the moment. We will do all we can from over here to get rid of it. But I hope that if my party gets into power I shall be as critical as they if they do not provide the services the disabled people deserve and need. They have a right to a standard of living as good as anybody else's in this Chamber. They should not be denied that opportunity.

President. — I call Mr Bournias.

Mr Bournias. — (EL) I want to offer, Mr President, my sincere thanks to the rapporteur, Mrs Clwyd, for the report under discussion which has 'hit the nail right on the head'. The importance of this document, to which we should give our attention, is shown by the fact that it was adopted unanimously in eight Commission meetings and, I am sure, it will also be adopted unanimously in this Chamber. I think that what Ms Clwyd has written and said today justly entitles her to be considered the foremost defender of the worthy cause of protecting disabled people, a cause which throughout this year will be proclaimed *urbis et orbis* not out of humanitarian reasons or out of charity, but as a duty to society. As I said, the fact that this report was adopted unanimously shows, as paragraph 18 correctly points out, that there is no need for another official study in addition to the numerous ones already existing on the subject, nor is there any need for a declaration of principles which have been understood and accepted for a long time. What is needed is the desire and resolve to implement a common policy based on these principles, a common policy which, as my colleague Mr Spencer quite rightly pointed out, is consistent and continuous and does not last for just one year but carries on into the future. This one paragraph alone which I referred to makes me believe that the report has dealt with the question of providing assistance for disabled people in a practical manner and, in this sense, it is a worthwhile and positive contri-

Bournias

bution for our fellow human beings of all ages who are suffering from physical or mental disorders.

Paragraph 5, subparagraph (III) and (IV), are, in my opinion the real acid tests of success as the Council and the Commission are asked to reconsider their decisions on funding by the Social Fund and it is rightly proposed that the European Parliament should be more involved in the policies and the operation of the Fund. As a Member of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, I have a duty to remind you of the resolution passed by this institution on 22. 5. 1975 on financial assistance to physically handicapped people in the Member States. In Greece, where the welfare of disabled people, which ceased a long time ago to be the prerogative of institutions established by philanthropists, is the responsibility of the State, the new democratic constitution of 1975, under the special provisions of Article 21, placed the Government's obligations towards disabled people on a constitutional basis. Since then other laws have been passed like Law 963 in 1979 on occupational rehabilitation for disabled people and handicapped persons, and just a week ago the Greek Parliament passed a new law on the care of the disabled. It would appear that my colleague, Mr Kappos, who represents the Communist Party in this Parliament, was absent from the many Greek Parliament sessions when it was voting on this law just a week ago. Despite all this and the fact that there are many institutions in Athens and the provinces for taking care of disabled people, I am the last to deny that there is still a lot to be done for the disabled.

My colleague from my own party, Mr Frangos, has already spoken about the measures which should be taken and those which are to be taken, and Mr Pemaszoglou, for the opposition, also spoke with the objectivity which the subject requires.

Even though I do not have time I ought to re-state what the weaknesses of the Greek legislation and Greek economy are with regard to the future of the disabled. However, I regret to say that I shall not do this. I am of the opinion that these are wider problems which Greece will tackle not just with the help of its own resources and reserves but also with the help of the Social Fund to which numerous requests are being made on behalf of the elderly and the young as well as for educational and medical purposes. Indeed, before the Commissioner spoke I was optimistic that these programmes would be accepted in accordance with the advice of the report which recommends a revision of the funding of programmes. I confess that the Commissioner disappointed me and I should like to ask him to reconsider his views about the funding of programmes if he wishes to support the worthy aim of upholding the rights of disabled people, otherwise they will not applaud his action this year, the International Year of the Disabled.

President. — I call Mr Ghergo.

Mr Ghergo. — (*I*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I join in the greetings offered by the presidency to our handicapped brethren, and I hope that our behaviour — specifically that of the Group of the European People's Party and of the national governments — will be such as to encourage their hopes for a better future and their faith in society.

The report presented by Mrs Clwyd on the proposals directed at encouraging the social and professional integration of handicapped persons in the Community seems to be complete in its examination of the many problems which concern these particular citizens.

I am grateful to the rapporteur for having included the substance of what I supported in the motion for a resolution number 205 of 23 May 1980 and in the course of the debate in committee. This represents the view-point of my political party on the issue.

The problem of disabled persons in the world has a greater magnitude than one might believe. At least one person of every ten in each country suffers from some form of handicap.

Among the most frequent forms of disability are physical infirmities, chronic illnesses, mental weaknesses and sensory infirmities.

The principal causes of disability in the world are

— accidents, particularly those which occur in the home; at least 20 million such accidents take place per year, leaving 110 000 people permanently disabled.

— street accidents: more than 10 million people injured every year, often with serious consequences such as amputations, cerebral lesions, paraplegia and quadriplegia.

— illness: the illnesses which cause disabilities are still very widespread. For example, there are 20 million lepers in the world. Disabilities connected with malnutrition are still frequently found in the developing countries, where, for example, around 250 thousand children a year go blind as a result of chronic vitamin deficiencies.

— mental illnesses: according to the World Health Association, one person out of ten is affected at some period in his life. People suffering from mental illness occupy one-furth of the hospital beds.

— blindness: there are 10 to 15 million blind in the world.

— deafness: 70 million people suffer from serious auditory disturbances.

— paralysis due to encephalopathy: 15 million people affected.

— epilepsy: there are 15 million epileptics in the world.

Ghergo

From the foregoing list, which, however, is incomplete, two imperatives arise: the first, underlined by the rapporteur, is the need to adopt a uniform and practically applicable definition of the terms 'handicap' and 'handicapped person' on the Community level. Without such a standard, the persistent divergences of the definitions now in use in the various Member States could nullify a large part of the effort made to solve some of the problems of those less favoured by fate. The second is the pursuit of a more effective health policy in regard to prevention, cure, and rehabilitation.

Equally desirable would be the creation of a permanent consultative body at the Community level for the problems of the handicapped. This body could take the form of a 'Forum' analogous to the 'Youth Forum', and it should include disabled persons from the various Member States representing the most important national associations for those suffering from the different kinds of disabilities (the blind, deaf-mutes, paraplegics, amputees, etc.). Such a body should receive an annual contribution from the Community budget.

I would like to call particular attention to the urgency of solving the problems of handicapped women, whose situation combines the problems of the disabled person with those of women in today's society.

I would also like to stress the primary importance of assuring to the handicapped, in addition to the fullest possible functional recovery, a type of work adapted to their capabilities through timely professional orientation. Appropriate training programmes for professional requalification and rehabilitation should be made available. To attain this objective, whose psychological effect is much more important for the disabled person than its mere economic value, the obligatory hiring of handicapped workers in the public and private sectors must be provided for in all the Member States. Community institutions should set an example by inserting in the Statute on Personnel a reserve of jobs for the handicapped.

I remind you that the disabled person should not be considered as merely an object of charity, but rather as an individual capable of making a contribution to social development, and he should, within the limits of possibility, have an adequate opportunity to do so.

In the EEC Commission's programme, there are indeed already plans concerning the savings to be obtained on social security payments resulting from the contribution of the handicapped to the gross national product.

In this way, social intervention would not be an essentially sterile activity, but rather a source of many benefits, for it would valorize working capacity, reduced though it may be, and combined with salaried labour it would bring about a two-fold result: the profitability of

the work and, more important, the integration of the handicapped person in the social reality.

I conclude with the hope that this resolution will make a contribution to a concrete beginning for programmes in favour of the handicapped, for on the level of the written word we have done a great deal, if not all that can be done.

Let the International Year of Disabled Persons also be the occasion for a particular and intense effort towards raising the level of awareness of public opinion on Community, national, and local levels through all available means, so that the handicapped person will no longer be misunderstood, neglected, or relegated to the fringes of society. Let him be loved, understood, and respected as a human being among other human beings and sharing the same rights as they.

President. — I call Mr Ceravolo.

Mr Ceravolo. — (*I*) Mr President, in the minute which remains to me I would like to express the appreciation of the Italian Communist Group for Mrs Clwyd's report and our support of the initiative which the Parliament is preparing to take.

I do wish to repeat, however, my conviction that if, after so many speeches and so many years we still find ourselves obliged to face the seriousness of this problem, there is a reason for it, and the reason should be understood.

If the European Parliament does not put the question of disabled persons at its proper place in the scale of values, we will not solve the problem. We are confronted with an absolute value which determines the nature of a culture and of a civilization: it cannot be subordinated to economic circumstances, to the availability of resources. If we do not approach the problem from this standpoint, we will be grappling with it for a long time to come.

A further consideration: integration in the schools is right, but teachers and auxiliary specialists must be highly qualified, for they have a decisive effect on this scholastic integration.

The last point. There is a problem: that of scientific and technical research. It is necessary to initiate promotional contracts, for we know that scientific and technical knowledge exists today which would be very useful for the handicapped, and that, unfortunately, its use is determined by market criteria — that is, it becomes as consumer goods. We should instead assert that a very important social demand does exist, which should stimulate scientific and technical research in favour of the handicapped.

President. — I call Mr Coutsocheras.

Mr Coutsocheras. — (*EL*) Mr President and colleagues, the position of disabled people in Greece is not as it was presented to us by my colleagues, Mr Bournias and Mr Frangos. Unfortunately, the general position for all disabled people in Greece is unacceptable — economically, professionally, socially, and culturally. As I am short of time I shall limit myself to one group of disabled people, Mr President, namely the blind, whose deputation is with us today in the hemicycle, which is another reason for informing you about this group of disabled people.

In Greece there are 13 000 blind people, for whom the government budget provides just 140 m drachma which comes, Mr President, to FF 14 million. This means that for each blind person there is about FF 100 per month. In order that you can make a comparison I would mention that in Western Germany the monthly disability allowance is DM 760, i.e. about 16 times larger than the amount received in Greece. Out of these 13 000 blind people only 500 are employed and only 250 are being educated, although more than 3 500 blind people should be able to work and a large number of blind people should be able to have education and vocational training. What are we Socialists asking for? First, we are asking that disabled people should be integrated in society as equal, not marginal members. Second, we are asking that they receive full social security and an adequate monthly allowance. Third, we are asking that they receive full vocational training in special schools equipped with suitable apparatus and we are seeking complete occupational rehabilitation for them. Finally, we support the just demands of all disabled people, not just in Europe but of all groups of disabled people throughout the world.

Mr Gondicas. — (*EL*) Mr President, thank you. I would not have spoken at all but the last speech by my colleague, Mr Coutsocheras, made me doubt if I live in Greece since my own impression is completely different. I don't want to tire you with internal Greek differences, nor do I want to follow the example of my English colleague, Mr Prag, and for this reason I shall come straight to the point. We can distil two points from Mrs Clwyd's report and the Commissioner's report. These are that for us and the Commission there are immediate and long-term objectives. I must disagree with the Commissioner as regards what he said before and very quickly list the five points to which the Commission, with our help, must give its immediate attention. The first is to establish an agree-

ment as to what is the definition of a disabled person. The second is to determine what rights disabled people shall have in all the countries of the Community. The third is to define what uniform obligations the Member States of the Community should have towards disabled people. The fourth is to ensure that the rights of disabled people are respected by countries who are not members of the Community. The fifth is to immediately ensure that disabled people are employed in economic activities which are profitable for society as a whole.

Mr President, I should like to end by asking all those who are here and those who are absent to adopt a slogan which accords with the contemporary spirit of the Community. In other words, let us develop a human source of energy which by definition remains unexploited against its will. For this reason, Mrs Clwyd's report holds out great prospects for the future.

President. — I thank speakers for ensuring that we did not go too far over the deadline fixed. It is already 7.40 p.m. I also thank the staff, who agreed to extend the sitting, which was scheduled to end at 7 p.m. The debate is closed.

8. Agenda for next sitting

President. — The next sitting will take place tomorrow on Wednesday, 11 March 1981, at 9 a.m. and 3 p.m., with the following agenda:

- Decision on urgency of various motions for resolutions¹
- Vote on the motion for a resolution contained in the Clwyd report on disabled persons
- Bocklet report on sugar
- Spinelli report on the financial and budgetary policy of the Community for 1982
- Conclusion of the debate on the Lalor report on the Western Sahara and vote
- Poniatoski report on Zimbabwe
- Castellina report on Stabex

5.30 p.m. to 7 p.m.: Question Time (questions to the Foreign Ministers and the Council)

The sitting is closed.

(*The sitting was closed at 7.40 p.m.*)

¹ Debate by urgent procedure: see Minutes.

SITTING OF WEDNESDAY, 11 MARCH 1981

Contents

1. Approval of minutes	69		
2. Decision on urgency:			
<i>Mr Pannella; Mr Chambeiron; Mr Haagerup; Mrs von Alemann; Mr Pranchère; Mr Glinne; Mr Bangemann; Mr Pranchère; Mr Bangemann; Mr Sutra; Mr Lücker; Mr Pannella; Sir Frederick Warner; Mr Seeler; Mr Cardia; Mr Klepsch; Mrs Macciocchi; Mr Van Miert; Mrs Le Roux; Mr Klepsch; Mr Segre; Mr de la Malène; Mrs Castellina</i>	70		
3. Welcome:			
Point of order: <i>Mrs Castellina; Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul</i>	77		
4. Decision on urgency (continuation):			
<i>Mrs Lizin; Mr Glinne; Mr Klepsch; Mr Fantì; Mr Costanzo</i>	77		
Points of order: <i>Mr Pannella; Mr Hänsch</i>	78		
<i>Mr Glinne</i>	79		
5. Clwyd report (Doc. 1-868/80): Economic, social and vocational integration of disabled people in the Community (vote):			
<i>Mrs Clwyd, rapporteur</i>	79		
Point of order: <i>Sir James Scott-Hopkins</i>	80		
<i>Mrs Maij-Weggen; Ms Clwyd; Lord O'Hagan; Ms Clwyd; Mrs Dekker</i>	80		
Point of order: <i>Mrs Nielsen</i>	82		
<i>Ms Clwyd; Mrs Dekker; Ms Clwyd; Mrs Squarcialupi; Ms Clwyd; Sir James Scott-Hopkins; Mr Boyes; Sir James Scott-Hopkins; Mr Rogers; Mr Patterson; Ms Clwyd; Mr Frischmann; Mrs Dekker; Mrs Gredal; Mr Moreland; Mr Patterson; Mrs Squarcialupi; Mr Vié; Mr Pannella; Mr Galland; Mr Ghergo</i>	82		
6. Regulation on the common organization of the market in sugar - Report (Doc. 1-839/80) by Mr Bocklet (Committee on Agriculture):			
<i>Mr Bocklet, rapporteur</i>	89		
<i>Mr Arndt, draftsman of an opinion</i>	91		
<i>Mr Woltjer; Mr De Keersmaeker; Mr Hord; Mr Vergès; Mr Louwes; Mr Nyborg; Mr</i>			
<i>Papaefstratiou; Mr Dalsager (Commission); Mr Vitale; Mr Howell; Mr Pesmazoglou; Mr Vernimmen; Mr McCartin; Mr Blaney; Mr Dimopoulos; Mr Georgiadis; Mrs Rabbethge</i>	92		
<i>Mr Turner, draftsman of an opinion</i>	105		
<i>Mr Kappos; Mr Dalsager (Commission)</i>	106		
Point of order: <i>Mr Enright</i>	106		
7. Financial and budgetary policy of the Communities for 1982 - Report (Doc. 1-936/80) by Mr Spinelli (Committee on Budgets):			
<i>Mr Spinelli, rapporteur</i>	106		
<i>Mr Arndt; Mr Notenboom; Mr J. M. Taylor; Mr Gauthier; Mrs Pruvot; Mr Ansquer; Mr de Ferranti; Mr Pannella; Mr Pesmazoglou; Mr Tugendhat (Commission); Mr Balfé; Mr Pedini</i>	108		
8. Question Time (Doc. 1-964/80) (continuation):			
Questions to the Council:			
Question No 63, by Mr Hutton: Attendance of Council members at part-sessions:			
<i>Mr Van der Mei (Council); Mr Hutton; Mr Van der Mei</i>	120		
Question No 64, by Mr Vié: Rejection of social measures to assist workers in the European steel industry; and Question No 70, by Mr Deleau: Effect of the postponement of decisions on the financing of the social aspects of the iron and steel industry restructuring plan:			
<i>Mr Van der Mei; Mr Deleau; Mr Van der Mei; Mrs Lizin; Mr Van der Mei</i>	121		
Question No 65, by Mr Paisley: Northern Ireland textile industry:			
Point of order: <i>Mr Howell</i>	121		
<i>Mr Van der Mei; Mr Paisley; Mr Van der Mei; Mrs Kellet-Bowmann; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Turcat; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Beazley; Mr Van der Mei</i>	122		
Question No 66, by Mr Israel: Human rights and political cooperation:			
<i>Mr Van der Mei; Mr Israel; Mr Van der Mei</i>	123		
Question No 67, by Mr Marshall: Arab boycott:			

<i>Mr Van der Mei; Mr Marshall; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Israel; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Tyrrell; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Sieglerschmidt; Mr Van der Mei</i>	123	<i>Point of order: Mr Israel</i>	129
<i>Question No 69, by Mr Lalor: Alternative sources of oil supplies:</i>		<i>Mr Van der Mei</i>	129
<i>Mr Van der Mei; Mr Lalor; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Hord; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Kirk; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Moreland; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Fuchs; Mr Van der Mei</i>	124	<i>Question No 98, by Mr Vlachopoulos: Measures against terrorism:</i>	
<i>Question No 71, by Mrs Fourcade: Transparency of the market in energy products:</i>		<i>Mr Van der Mei; Mr Vlachopoulos; Mr Marshall; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Tyrrell; Mr Van der Mei</i>	129
<i>Mr Van der Mei; Mrs Fourcade; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Schmid; Mr Van der Mei</i>	125	<i>Question No 99, by Mr Boyes: Contacts with non-aligned countries:</i>	
<i>Question No 72, by Mr Cousté: Capturing the market for integrated circuits:</i>		<i>Mr Van der Mei; Mr Boyes; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Boyes</i>	130
<i>Mr Van der Mei; Mr Turcat; Mr Van der Mei</i>	125	<i>Question No 100, by Mr Tyrrell: Transfer of prisoners:</i>	
<i>Question No 73, by Mr Ansquer: Introduction of an 'EEC' mark:</i>		<i>Mr Van der Mei; Mr Tyrrell; Mr Van der Mei</i>	130
<i>Mr Van der Mei; Mr Ansquer; Mr Van der Mei; Mrs Ewing; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Seligman; Mr Van der Mei</i>	126	<i>Question No 101, by Mr Van Miert: Afghanistan:</i>	
<i>Question No 75, by Mr Hänsch: Independence of Commissioner Tugendhat:</i>		<i>Mr Van der Mei; Mr Van Miert; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Spicer; Mr Van der Mei; Mr De Goede; Mr Van der Mei</i>	131
<i>Mr Van der Mei; Mr Hänsch; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Spicer; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Schmid; Mr Van der Mei</i>	127	<i>Question No 102, by Mr Patterson: Representation of the ten Member States in third countries:</i>	
<i>Question No 76, by Mr Bonde: Regional development in Denmark:</i>		<i>Mr Van der Mei; Mr Patterson; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Deschamps; Mr Van der Mei</i>	131
<i>Mr Van der Mei; Mr von der Vring; Mr Bonde; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Kirk; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Paisley; Mr Van der Mei</i>	127	<i>Question No 104, by Mr Paisley: Gibraltar:</i>	
<i>Questions to the Foreign Ministers:</i>		<i>Mr Van der Mei; Mr Paisley; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Simpson; Mr Van der Mei; Miss Hooper; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Patterson; Mr Van der Mei</i>	132
<i>Question No 97, by Mrs Ewing: Granting of emigration visas to Soviet Jews:</i>		<i>Question No 105, by Mr Kavanagh: Irish Rugby Football Union's South African tour:</i>	
<i>Mr Van der Mei (Foreign Ministers); Mrs Ewing; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Marshall; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Israel; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Paisley; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Turcat; Mr Van der Mei</i>	128	<i>Mr Van der Mei; Mr Kavanagh; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Paisley; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Marshall; Mr Van der Mei; Mr J. D. Taylor; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Enright; Mr Van der Mei</i>	132
		<i>Point of order: Mr De Goede</i>	133
		9. <i>Agenda for next sitting</i>	133
		<i>Annex</i>	134

IN THE CHAIR: MRS VEIL

President

(The sitting was opened at 9 a.m.)

President. — The sitting is open.

1. *Approval of minutes*

President. — The minutes of proceedings of yesterday's sitting have been distributed.

Since there are no comments, the minutes of proceedings are approved.¹

¹ Documents received: see minutes of proceedings.

2. *Decision on urgency*

President. — The first item on the agenda is the decision on the urgency of several motions for resolutions.

We shall consider first the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-921/80) by Mrs Vayssade and others: Dismissal of judge Bidalou.*

I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (F) I just want to repeat very quickly, Madam President, what we have said in the recitals. This measure, for the first time in France for nearly 40 years, is based on a magistrate's judicial activities. This procedure shows that France has failed to apply Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights. We are dismayed at this and find it intolerable. We hope that the French Government will stay notification of the judgment dismissing Mr Bidalou as a protective measure pending the outcome of the appeal to the Council of State. I believe that Parliament is duty bound to endorse these hopes addressed to the French Government and that they are in keeping with many others resolutions adopted by a large section of the House in similar cases.

President. — I call Mr Chambeiron.

Mr Chambeiron. — (F) Madam President, we shall give our support to this request for an urgent debate on this motion for a resolution on the dismissal of a French judge. Our response should come as no surprise since it goes without saying that we have here what I can call a professional ban, in other words a typical infringement of human rights. For a long time Mr Marchais has been asking on our behalf for a committee to be set up to look at various violations of human rights within the Community. I must confess that, patient as we are, we are somewhat surprised that nothing has yet been done about this proposal. It strikes me as rather odd that for the first time it has been impossible to decide which committee is the appropriate one. It looks as though there is a kind of two-tier system of human rights. There are the major human rights, it would seem, which we notice when they are infringed outside the Community, and there are the minor human rights which we do not want to know about when they are violated inside the Community. In our view, when human rights are at stake they are equally important whether we are looking inside or outside the Community. This is why we support this request for urgency. I do not want to go into the matter here. I get the impression that some people are very quick to jump on the bandwagon when human rights are being trampled on outside the Community. We have an opportunity now to say something about the infringement of human rights

within the Community. If you ask me, this is an opportunity we must not miss.

President. — I call Mr Haagerup.

Mr Haagerup. — (DK) Madam President, we in the Liberal Group see no reason for an urgent debate on the question before us. It clearly concerns an internal French matter, and we would in any case point out that there is an agreed procedure for cases of possible violation of human rights, whereby such alleged violations are dealt with by the Legal Affairs Committee. My group thinks that that procedure should be respected and will therefore in this instance vote against an urgent debate on the motion put forward.

(Parliament rejects the request for urgent procedure)¹

President. — We shall now consider *four motions for resolutions on Spain:*

- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-962/80) by Mr Bangemann and others;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-968/80) by Mr Lücker and others;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-978/80) by Mr de la Malène and others.

Since these four motions are on the same subject, I propose that Parliament take a single vote on urgency.

I call Mrs von Alemann.

Mrs von Alemann. — (D) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I do not think there is any real need to go into the reasons for urgency as regards this matter. I think we all feel that urgency is justified in view of the shock we all got and the sympathy we feel for our colleagues in the *Cortes* who were suddenly attacked at an awful moment when they were sitting in their own Parliament as the elected representatives of the people with the task of expressing their will and passing laws. The members of the Parliament-*Cortes* Joint Committee were here in Parliament yesterday and the day before yesterday. We talked to them and we discussed a joint motion which has not however been printed yet. I call on the House to vote for urgency and to support our motion.

President. — I call Mr Pranchère.

Mr Pranchère. — (F) Madam President, what is going on here? I have thought about this carefully, and it seems that the recent events in Spain are being used to speed up the entry of this country in the EEC. Let me say at this point that the elected Assembly here

¹ The motion for a resolution was referred to the appropriate committee.

Pranchère

has consistently blocked a proper debate on the enlargement of the Community to include Spain. It is not surprising when you consider the consequences, especially for democracy. Remember that the new President of the Commission said that the Twelve would have to be governed in a stricter fashion and would have to force extremely unpopular measures on the Member States. Enlargement, which is part of the grand plan of the multinationals, cannot go along with democracy. What is more, the Community's attitude to Turkey is another fine example of the fact that democracy is not the motive for its actions. The generals have taken over in Ankara and they have killed and imprisoned the country's democrats. And what did the Community do? It established relations with the *junta*, and now we are amazed to learn that this Assembly decided to send a delegation to Turkey where it could not meet local MPs because they are in prison. If this is the attitude, it is little wonder that plotters in Madrid or anywhere else are not going to be put off but encouraged instead.

We should like a wide-ranging debate on the enlargement of the Community. We have asked for one, and it really is needed. But we are against all this politicking that has been going on. People here do not want to discuss the real consequences of Spain's accession to the EEC because they know that the issue is fraught with risk for the people of the Community and the ACP countries and for the Spanish people as well. We are not going to be hoodwinked like this.

I want to say too that as the shadow of fascism appeared the Spanish workers, republicans and democrats, knew they could rely on the complete solidarity of the French Communists.

(Protests from the Liberal and Democratic Group)

It goes without saying that we are ready to stand by them in the struggle for democracy and against fascism. This is why we shall be abstaining from the vote on urgency.

President. — I call Mr Glinne.

Mr Glinne. — *(F)* Can I quickly add to what the last speaker said, Madam President, by saying that while there has just been an attempted *coup d'état* in Spain, it seems that another one could be on the cards. I am referring to press reports and to other information which we have all had a chance to look at. The need for Parliament to adopt urgency is even more vital.

President. — I call Mr Bangemann.

Mr Bangemann. — *(D)* Madam President, I think it is quite obvious that the honourable Member who

spoke on behalf of the French Communists went wittering on with the same old hackneyed phrases instead of talking about safeguarding democracy in Spain...

Mr Pranchère. — *(F)* How many Communists died in the International Brigades?

Mr Bangemann. — *(D)* ...the point here is that we have to strengthen and defend democracy in Spain — that is all. It goes without saying that the European Community offers its members a better opportunity for defending democracy than if they are not part of the Community.

And if you are going to bring up the Civil War in Spain, as the honourable Member has just done, I agree that Communists fought on the side of freedom and democracy. But the French Communists ought to be ashamed of coming out with the same old hackneyed phrases. The people who fought then were democrats but you only have an eye for the main chance and for how many votes you can catch. You do absolutely nothing at all for the Spanish workers or for democracy in Europe!

(Applause)

You are not worthy of referring to those Communists who fought for freedom in Spain. You ought to be ashamed of even daring to mention them!

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Sutra.

Mr Sutra. — *(F)* Madam President, we intend to vote in favour of urgency on this matter because what we are defending here is not simply democracy in Spain but democracy throughout Europe. The fact is that any assault on democracy in Spain would have affected us all. It was only yesterday that we had a meeting of the enlarged bureau of the Parliament-Cortes Joint Committee. I was there with my colleagues from the Spanish Parliament and representatives of the Spanish Socialist Workers' Party when Spanish Communist Party representatives revealed their fears of a second *putsch*. The matter is therefore really urgent. And contrary to what has just been said in the House, this has nothing to do with various attitudes to enlargement. My party, in any case, explained its attitude in Paris a week ago. This does not affect the issue and it means we can be quite categorical in expressing our solidarity to the representatives of the Spanish workers and to the representatives of the Socialist Workers' Party and the Communist Party who came to Strasbourg to inform us of their concern and anxiety.

President. — I call Mr Lücker.

Mr Lücker. — (*D*) Madam President, our group supports this request for urgency because we feel that this is a matter which affects the Community far more than many other debates we have in the House on events in countries in other continents. We are interested in what goes on in these countries of course, but not to the same extent as we are in a country which lodged an application to join the Community some years ago. I know of no European government, no government of a Member State of this Community of ours, which at the time did not welcome Spain's application in the same way as the entry of Greece and Portugal was welcomed.

I should like to contradict the French Communist Member, Mr Pranchère, who said that this House in the past had always spoken against the accession of Spain. The exact opposite is true. This Parliament has expressed a favourable view on Spain's accession in at least a dozen motions and resolutions, for the very important political reasons that we consider the expansion of the Community in this way to be the right thing. We cannot backtrack now. We all know that the entry of Spain and Portugal will entail certain problems but we can cope with these problems with the means we have available. It is my belief that at this moment Spain and the Spanish people, and also the people of the countries which already belong to the European Community, are waiting for a definite statement from the European Parliament in the critical circumstances of the last few weeks in Spain. This is why we have tabled this motion.

Lastly, I want to pay tribute to the House. Yesterday and the day before yesterday almost all the groups — apart from the French Communists, as far as I am aware — made a joint effort to agree on a text which is more than just the lowest common denominator of a compromise which no longer means very much. What this motion reflects is the political will which the democrats in the European Parliament have decisively and unanimously expressed. We are therefore in favour of urgency.

(*Applause*)

President. — I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (*F*) Madam President, I do not think there can be any doubt about our reaction to the attempted *coup d'état* and to those behind it. No one will question our determination to support at all times the ideals of liberty and democracy. We have proved this here on many occasions, Madam President, by voting for resolutions by groups with whom we disagree on most issues.

With every passing day, Madam President, we see that

hypocrisy rules in this House, especially when it comes to matters of liberty.

The fact is, Madam President, that the same people I am accusing here of supporting those who carried out the *coup d'état* in Turkey — and I mean Mr Fellermaier, above all — and the same people who refuse to do anything and allow Parliament to make a statement, as it did two months after the *coup d'état* in Greece, and those same people who exclude the members of a committee of enquiry from democratic groups are in fact the people who come here and tell us that they hope Spain will join the EEC so that liberty and democracy can be safeguarded. Here in this House, and in this Community, there are people who defend the perpetrators of military *coups*, whether they take place in Upper Volta, Mr Bersani, or in Turkey. There are people who defend the army in Turkey at a time when our colleagues there are languishing in prison. As for Poland, there are people who adopt the official line of the western nations which, as it were, are much closer to Moscow and Warsaw than to Gdansk. As a result, Madam President, we have no voting intention to outline; we simply have some comments to make. I believe that we have to defend Spain and Europe by defending democracy but we realize that there are people there, just as there are here, who are perfectly capable of defending a *coup d'état* in Spain or Portugal or Italy, as they have done in the case of Turkey.

(*Parliament adopted urgent procedure*)¹

*

* *

President. — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-966/80) by Sir Frederick Warner and others: EEC-Japan economic and trade relations.*

I call Sir Frederick Warner.

Sir Frederick Warner. — Madam President, this request for urgency was signed by 21 Members of this House who are interested in and attach the greatest importance to our trade and political relations with Japan. It includes 15 Members of the Japan Delegation but I wish to make it absolutely clear to my colleagues that this request for an urgent debate has nothing to do with the activities of the Japan Delegation. It asks for three things: it asks, firstly, for a short urgency debate on Friday morning in which this House can mark its support for the action recently taken by the Commission and the Council in defence of our interests against the threat of Japanese trade.

Secondly, it marks the importance which we attach in this House to our parliamentary relations with Japan.

¹ The item was placed on the agenda of 13 March.

Warner

This seems particularly apposite in that you yourself have called for an examination of this matter and a committee has been set up to look into it. We merely wish the House to have an opportunity to state its view for the benefit of that working party.

Thirdly, it asks that at a reasonably early stage there should be a full debate on our trade and political relations with Japan. By that time the report of the delegation will have been circulated presumably. It has in fact already been sent to you, Madam President, and you will have had the opportunity to study it and decide what you wish to do with it, as also will indeed the Bureau.

By that time also the Committee on External Economic Relations will have produced its own report, which has been drafted by a special rapporteur on trade relations with Japan and we will therefore sometime later in the year — perhaps in April, perhaps in May, depending on the decision to be taken by the machinery of Parliament — have an opportunity to discuss both the activities of your Japan Delegation in Japan last month and the questions of trade with Japan which are to be brought to our attention by the Committee on External Economic Relations. What we want this week is simply ten minutes to register our support for the Commission and Council and to state our support for better and closer parliamentary relations with Japan.

President. — I call Mr Seeler.

Mr Seeler. — (D) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, although the Socialist Group is not in favour of urgency on this motion, it is not because we feel that trade relations between the Community and Japan are not an urgent matter but rather because we feel that the matter is indeed so urgent that it cannot be dealt with in just a few minutes on Friday. We have had very thorough discussions on this matter on several occasions in the last few weeks in the Committee on External Economic Relations. The committee will shortly present a report to the House and this report will be the subject of a comprehensive debate on this important topic.

The problem with trade relations between Europe and Japan is that it is not just a matter of a short-term deficit in the balance of trade but that there has obviously been a considerable change in the pattern of our external trade. We cannot just deal with this matter in a few minutes on Friday morning along with so many other matters. It is apparent from the reasons supporting the motion that there is no immediate decision by the Council or the Commission pending, which would mean that a statement by Parliament was needed this week.

I therefore request the House to reject urgency, so that we then have an opportunity at the next part-

session to have a proper and thorough discussion of this matter on the basis of a report by the Committee on External Economic Relations.

President. — I call Mr Cardia.

Mr Cardia. — (I) Madam President, I was amazed when I discovered yesterday that urgent procedure had been requested in respect of the motion for a resolution which I and other members of the parliamentary delegation to Japan had signed in Tokyo. I was even more amazed when I saw that alongside the signatures of delegation members who were actually there in Tokyo there were also signatures — and I suppose they were there to make up the right number — of other honourable Members who are not part of the permanent delegation.

It is also a source of dismay — for me at any rate — to see how the fascinating but in some respects frightening visit to Japan has made some people conclude that the political and economic relations between the Community and Japan — and these are a crucial element in the external relations and development of the Community today — can be discussed in the Chamber as a matter of unjustified urgency in one short part-session, without the matter being properly considered by the Bureau, the permanent delegation, the Political Affairs Committee or the Committee on External Economic Relations.

I am sure Sir Frederick will agree that we are not here to support the Council and the Commission. The job of this Parliament is to work out its own, independent positions.

Consequently, Madam President, although there is no reason why I should withdraw my name from the document I signed in Tokyo, I should like, if I may, to urge Sir Frederick to withdraw his request for urgency. This is not the right moment and there is no justification for it, and it was not agreed on by those who originally signed the document. I agree with the previous speaker that this motion should be dealt with according to normal procedure. It would be a lot better if Parliament discussed the patterns of trade during a plenary sitting at the end of the Council's three-month monitoring period.

If this plea of mine is turned down, our group and I myself shall abstain from voting for the reasons I have outlined.

(Parliament rejected the request for urgent procedure)¹

¹ The motion for a resolution was referred to the appropriate committee.

President. — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-969/80) by Mr Klepsch and others: Food supplies to Poland.*

I call Mr Klepsch.

Mr Klepsch. — (D) Madam President, our group feels that the text of this motion speaks for itself. We have contacted the other groups and we are asking them to vote in favour of urgent procedure for this motion.

President. — I call Mrs Macciocchi.

Mrs Macciocchi. — (F) Madam President, I am against urgent procedure. It comes as no surprise to us that the Christian-Democratic Group has put forward a motion in which there is no mention at all of the current political situation in Poland. This is very serious, if you ask me.

I should like to remind the authors of this motion that Soviet and Polish leaders, meeting in Moscow on 4 March, announced a tough new line on the popular movement in Poland and called in particular for the course of events to be reversed. Frankly, I am very worried when I hear the Soviet leaders asking the government in Warsaw to take radical action to correct the situation in Poland, because this is an open invitation to repression. The Moscow communiqué went on to say that the government in Warsaw would get any Soviet support necessary to carry through this policy of repression and that the crisis in Poland was the concern of the entire socialist bloc. Is this enough for us to say that we want to supply Poland quickly with food aid? This is a tricky question, which we have had to cope with on other occasions.

The fact is that this food aid, if we go ahead and grant it to Poland, will nevertheless be aid to the Polish Government which is going to get the benefit today and then perhaps tomorrow become the oppressor of the Polish people. That is the problem. I want to ask the Christian-Democratic Group to withdraw this motion and I want to ask it, for the sake of the political reputation of this Parliament and for the sake of friendship with Poland, to table another motion, possibly in agreement with us because we intend to submit a motion on this subject tomorrow.

(Parliament adopted urgent procedure)¹

*
* *

President. — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-971/80) by Mr Van Miert and others: Situation in El Salvador.*

I call Mr Van Miert.

Mr Van Miert. — (NL) Ladies and gentlemen, this matter is, I think, really one of great urgency — firstly because we are all, I assume, indignant at the fact that the humanitarian aid to El Salvador has been suspended and I should like to mention three points which we regard as unacceptable. Firstly, a pressure of a somewhat irregular kind was brought to bear in such a way as to place the dependency, or at least the way in which some people view the dependency of Europe on the United States in the cold light of day. It was, I think, somewhat disturbing to many people to discover that the fact of the American Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs coming to Europe should immediately lead to the suspension of a decision the Commission had already taken. Secondly, it is a fact that people are turning a blind eye to human suffering in this political game they are playing. Only today, for example, a newspaper such as *Le Monde* contains the following passage:

(The speaker continued in French)

‘...The civil war has resulted in a rapid increase in the number of refugees who have left their villages for places which are felt to be safer. In the majority of cases they are in extreme hardship and the incidence of disease is high. The church has opened six camps in the capital. The largest of these, San José de la Montaña, currently accommodates nearly 1 000 peasants including 600 children. For about a year there has been an influx of refugees from all parts of the country fleeing from the brutal reprisals which they fear they might suffer in their villages. There are two further centres outside the capital run by the Green Cross, a charitable organization. In one of them Sincuera, 2 000 persons are living without supplies of foodstuffs or medicines. In collaboration with the government organizations, the Red Cross has provided aid for 22 000 persons in the provinces but has not given any aid to the twelve refugee centres ...’

(NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, as you can see, the situation is a dramatic one from the humanitarian point of view and it is therefore a downright disgrace that the European Commission has gone along with the request made by the representative of the American Government. This is a question of people, of humanitarian aid to our fellow men, regardless of their political colour and the situation they are in. Their situation is dramatic and for this reason it is quite unacceptable that the Commission should have gone along with a political request of this kind which has nothing whatsoever to do with humanitarian considerations. For this reason, we must call the Commission to account. It has, by its action, adopted a political stand. When it decided to provide humanitarian aid it either did not know what was going to be done with it — and in that case it took a wrong decision — or it did know. However, the latter would

¹ The item was placed on the agenda of 13 March.

Van Miert

appear to be the case and in that case it was really not on that it should have gone back on its decision. The Commission should account for itself to Parliament on this point and we hope this question can be cleared up during this sitting. However, there is a second reason, Mr President, which is just as important, and that is the fact that apparently the longer...

(The President asked the speaker to conclude)

Might I then finish with a request to Parliament to give its support to the totally justified request for urgent procedure in connection with this motion for a resolution regarding the situation in El Salvador?

(Applause)

President. — I have to inform the House that the Socialist Group has requested a roll-call vote on this request for urgent procedure.

I call Mrs Le Roux.

Mrs Le Roux. — *(F)* Madam President, the situation is getting worse in El Salvador. There is an urgent need to supply the medical and food aid which was promised. We are deeply shocked at the decision just taken by the Commission, at the prompting of the socialist Commissioner, Mr Cheysson, to suspend aid to the suffering people of El Salvador. We are even more annoyed because it only took a word from one of President Reagan's aides for the Commission to go back on its decision, and this was only a few months after the ACP-EEC Assembly had condemned all use of the weapon of hunger against any country for any reason at all. Democrats throughout the world, including those in the United States, and several Latin American governments condemn the interference of the US Government which is propping up the *junta* in El Salvador and providing the dictator there with the means of carrying on his bloody repression. And lastly, the French Communists strongly condemn the unacceptable interference designed to weaken the united front of democrats in El Salvador by refusing the *Farabundo Marti* Liberation Front a place at the talks.

Madam President, we must discuss the resumption of medical and food aid to the people of El Salvador as a matter of urgency. Anyway, this is what is called for in the motion for a resolution which has been tabled on behalf of the Communist Group by Mr Fantì, Mr Ansart, Mrs Boserup and Mr Kappos.

President. — I call the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

Mr Klepsch. — *(D)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, my group was unanimous in asking me to

speak against urgency. There are two brief points I want to make which will serve to explain our rejection of urgency.

First of all, we feel that at the present moment there are hopeful signs that a peaceful settlement may be in sight in El Salvador thanks to the useful talks between the chairmen of the international organizations of Socialists and Christian Democrats. This process is currently under way and we should not like to upset things with a controversial debate which is not going to help anyone in El Salvador. We feel that the efforts of these true democrats should be properly encouraged, so that we can find a way of achieving a peaceful and democratic future for El Salvador. Secondly, we have agreed with the Socialist Group, the Liberal and Democratic Group and the European Democratic Group to send a joint delegation to El Salvador to report on the situation there and to investigate the possibility of holding free elections. It is our view that we should wait for our colleagues' report. We also think that this should not be used as an excuse for political wrangling. In our view, the problem here is to find a way for this country to follow an orderly course towards a peaceful and democratic future.

A ten-minute debate on Friday morning is bound to result in heated argument which will not help future events in any way. Consequently, we do not think that urgency is justified in this case.

(Applause)

President. — I call the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Segre. — *(I)* Madam President, I imagine there has been some mistake in printing today's agenda because it does not list the motion for a resolution with request for urgent debate on the situation in El Salvador which the Italian Communists tabled alongside the motion on food aid which has already been mentioned.

We have tabled this motion because we believe that the tragedy afflicting that country urgently requires the European Parliament's attention and response. It is not a question of political wrangling, as Mr Klepsch seems to think, but a question of expressing this Parliament's desire — and I am sure it is shared by most of the House — for an end to this terrible situation. We want to see human right respected in El Salvador and we want to see freedom and national sovereignty respected, and we want a political solution to be found. This is the thinking behind our motion and we believe — contrary to what the chairman of the Group of the European People's Party believes — that a genuine and serious debate will not hamper in any way what he called the process which is under way and designed to achieve a political solution. We believe that a debate would give greater impulse to this

Segre

process and this search for a solution and encourage the democrats in El Salvador, by virtue of the moral strength which can and must be shown by the European Parliament.

President. — The Group of Progressive Democrats has the floor.

Mr de la Malène. — (*F*) Madam President, this Parliament has meddled in countries where it had no right to do so on so many occasions in the past that if there had been any legal grounds in this case we should naturally have applied them quite willingly. We are bound to admit that we have meddled in every country on earth and, under the circumstances, I see no reason why we should not intervene in this case where there is, after all, an important political problem.

This is why we are in favour of urgency. We are not in favour of urgency for any of the reasons outlined by Mr Van Miert and then by Mrs Le Roux, but for reasons which are quite the opposite. Neither Mr Van Miert nor Mrs Le Roux mentioned the blatant interference on the part of Cuba and other neighbouring countries which is the source of the problem and which hinders the democratic development of El Salvador which is needed to cope with opposition forces on the extreme right and even stronger forces on the extreme left. We have to help the democrats in this country to find a third course. This is the idea we have in mind for a motion which will be different from the one which has been tabled and which we intend to put forward. Anyway, for all these reasons, we are in favour of urgent procedure.

President. — The Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members has the floor.

Mrs Castellina. — (*I*) In a way, Madam President, I think it is perhaps ridiculous and ironic that we should be discussing El Salvador as a matter of urgency today, because Parliament should have got round to having a proper debate on this subject a long time ago. I agree, however, that the situation is now especially urgent, but I would disagree with what Mr Klepsch said earlier. There is no need to send delegations to El Salvador. Like many other Members in this Parliament I have been to El Salvador, and like everyone I was able to see what is happening there. There is no need for any more on-the-spot investigations.

As for the talks which are supposed to be going on between the Socialist International and the Christian Democrats, I know nothing about them and I am not interested in them here. I only know that the Democratic Front in El Salvador is led by a member of the

Socialist International who has said more than once that he would be willing to accept a government with the Christian Democrats, provided there were no place in the government and politics of El Salvador for Christian Democratic leaders, such as Napoleon Duarte, who are currently in power with the military and who share the blame with the military for the massacres which are going on. We have been asking the Christian Democrats for months to take an honourable stand on this matter, and it is now up to them to say where they stand. There is one other brief point I should like to make. We have just been in Freetown for the meeting of the EEC-ACP Joint Committee. The Caribbean States which are associated to the Community came out with a heartfelt plea. They told us they wanted their relations with Europe to be more than just agreements on sugar or tomatoes or rice; they want these relations to have some political impact. As things stand at the moment, if relations with Central America do have this political impact, the link with Europe can be a guarantee for the survival of national independence. And I am not talking about the threat from Cuba — just have a look at a map of Cuba, Mr de la Malène, and you will see that there is no common frontier between Cuba and Nicaragua or between Cuba and El Salvador — but about the real threat from the United States with Reagan in the White House. The time has come for this Community of ours to say whether it is going to toe the American line or not.

Mrs Macciocchi has already raised this matter in the Political Affairs Committee. It is a serious and pressing matter and if Parliament is going to assert its independence with regard to the United States, I think it urgently needs to make its views known and to show the associated States in the Caribbean and the countries of Central America that it will stand by its promise to defend their independence against the real threat posed by the Reagan administration.

(Parliament rejected the request for urgent procedure)¹

3. Welcome

President. — I welcome to the official gallery a delegation from the Moroccan Chamber of Representatives led by its chairman, Mr Dey Ould Sidi Baba.

(Applause)

We are very pleased at this first meeting with a Moroccan delegation which is going to give fresh impetus to relations between the Community and the

¹ By roll-call vote: see minutes of proceedings. The motion for a resolution was referred to the appropriate committee.

President

Maghreb countries. I hope they have a pleasant and successful stay during their visit to the European Parliament.

(Applause)

I call Mrs Castellina on a point of order.

Mrs Castellina. — *(I)* Madam President, the presence of this Moroccan delegation is simply the most recent example of the massive and intolerable interference which this Parliament has had to put up with in the last few weeks. I therefore request that we at least defer the vote on the Lalor report which was scheduled for this afternoon.

President. — The delegation's visit has been scheduled for a long time. We have regular meetings through the delegation with the countries of the Maghreb, and this Moroccan delegation was invited a long time ago in the framework of our relations with the Maghreb countries.

(Applause)

As for the vote on the Lalor report, it is simply for reasons of procedure that it is being held during this part-session instead of during the last part-session when it was supposed to take place.

(Applause)

I call Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul on a point of order.

Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul. — *(D)* Madam President, I just want to refer to what you have just said. I want to say that I am a member of the delegation on behalf of the European Parliament. We were told yesterday that it was only last week that the delegation had announced its arrival. I just wanted to inform the House on this point.

4. *Decision on urgency (continuation)*

President. — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-972/80) by Mrs Lizin and others: Increased repression and death sentences in Chile.*

I call Mrs Lizin.

Mrs Lizin. — *(F)* Madam President, the Socialist Group's request for an urgent debate follows on from the Van Miert report which Parliament adopted some months ago.

Since then, of course, there has been an important development in Chile: the referendum of 11 Septem-

ber 1980 and the changeover from a military to a civilian dictatorship. I was in Chile at the time of the referendum and I know just how phoney and anti-democratic it was. Pinochet's unconstitutional and anti-democratic victory, which was the result of daily terrorism and repression, now allows him to play the role of the tyrant, because he has just had five trade unionists arrested and they could be sentenced to death.

We want the European Parliament to show its condemnation of this and to call on the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation to take joint action so that a slow but inexorable veil of silence is not drawn over one of the democracies to which Europe was most closely linked.

This very day, 11 March, Pinochet is moving into the Moneda Palace, where he had President Allende attacked. We did not want this symbolic legitimization of the dictatorship to occur without some response from the voices of reason and democracy in Europe.

President. — I call the Socialist Group.

Mr Glinne. — *(F)* Madam President, the main event today, as regards the changeover from the military to a civilian dictatorship which Mrs Lizin has just mentioned, is the occupation of the Moneda Palace by the dictator Pinochet. In view of this event, and in response to a suggestion from several democratic organizations representing Chilean democrats in exile, I have talked to other group chairmen and I now propose that without having any debate we observe a minute's silence at an appropriate moment this morning.

(Applause)

President. — I call the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

Mr Klepsch. — *(D)* Madam President, I want to say on behalf of our group that we shall always support urgency when the subject is a death sentence. The fact is that we do not have all the information yet and we should like to have until Friday to get it. We are convinced, however, that a motion of this kind has not been tabled without reason. I should also like to second Mr Glinne's plea for a minute's silence at an appropriate moment during the day. Furthermore, we want an opportunity to table amendments to the text before we vote on it.

President. — I call the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Fantì. — *(I)* Speaking for the Communist Group,

Fanti

Madam President, I support the request for urgent procedure and I also support the proposal from Mr Glinne. At the same time, however, I feel I really must express my disappointment at the last vote. We cannot have two approaches to the same thing. On behalf of the European Parliament at the meeting with the Latin American countries in Bogotá, I remember we made quite strong and definite statements on the situation as a whole in Latin America.

As a result, I think we are going to raise the subject of El Salvador again tomorrow, with a fresh request for urgency, and I hope this will give the Christian-Democratic Group an opportunity to think again about the position it adopted today.

(Parliament adopted urgent procedure)¹

President. — I ask the Members who wish to observe a minute's silence to stand.

(Parliament observed a minute's silence)

*

* *

President. — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-973/80) by Mr Costanzo and others: Financial frauds against the Community.*

I call Mr Costanzo.

Mr Costanzo. — *(I)* Madam President, the subject of this motion for a resolution is certainly very interesting. Be that as it may, in our opinion urgency in this case applies more to the subject itself than to the procedure involved. What I mean is that we felt there was an urgent need to table a motion along these lines, because we really think the time has come to draw the attention of the Commission and Parliament to the frequent and indeed far too many cases of deception, fraud and swindling which the Community has to put up with in every sector and in every Member State.

As I said, though, we do not think there is any need for urgency as far as the procedural aspect is concerned, because there is no getting away from the fact that when urgent procedure is adopted debates on topics like this get held on Friday, at the very end of the part-session, with practically no one in the Chamber, when there ought to be a proper debate on the matter in our opinion. As a result, we shall be satisfied if the Chair refers this motion to the appropriate committees so that they can draw up a report for the House.

This will explain the appeal to the Commission to tell Parliament what has happened, at least over the five

years, and to say what it intends doing to cope with the problem and get on top of it without delay and — if I may make this point, Madam President — what it intends doing to achieve a minimum degree of approximation of legal proceedings in the Member States, since I do not think it is fair there should be legal sanctions in some countries while the whole thing is dealt with at an administrative level in others.

President. — Since the request for urgency has been withdrawn, the motion for a resolution is referred to the appropriate committee, pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure.

I call Mr Pannella on a point of order.

Mr Pannella. — *(F)* According to my copy of the agenda, Madam President, there is supposed to be a motion for a resolution on Turkey. If there have been some new developments, the House is entitled to know about them, since it was announced from the Chair yesterday that 21 signatures had been put down . . .

President. — If you had given me a chance to speak, Mr Pannella, you would have heard me say: We shall now consider the motion for a resolution by Mr Pannella and others. You interrupted me before I could say anything . . .

Mr Pannella. — *(F)* But you gave me the floor, Madam President. I did not interrupt you. You gave me the floor, and that is quite different.

*

* *

President. — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-5/81) by Mr Pannella and others: Situation in Turkey.*

I have been informed by the Socialist Group that Mr Lezzi, Mr Hänsch, Mr Ruffolo, Mrs Lizin, Mr Schinzel and Mr Arfé have withdrawn their signatures from the motion. As a result, it is no longer supported by 21 Members and I cannot put it to the vote. Pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure, the motion for a resolution is referred to the appropriate committee.

I call Mr Pannella on a point of order.

Mr Pannella. — *(F)* Right, Madam President, I want to refer to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure. Since Members are entitled and required to sign requests for urgency in person, the groups have no right to announce that Members have withdrawn their signa-

¹ The item was placed on the agenda of 13 March.

Pannella

tures. I think this is quite a nice point. The groups do not want to say that somebody or other is signing a request for urgency, especially when the Member himself has put his signature on it. I hope it is not any group bureaucracy which is to blame for these announcements. At any rate, I note that the Socialist Group is toeing the Fellermaier line. I suppose you are going to table a motion on Turkey and have it voted out on Friday, as usually happens. We shall see on Friday. I shall be asking for a roll-call vote.

President. — In connection with the withdrawal of signatures, the Members involved, particularly Mr Hänsch, submitted letters indicating their intention to do so.

I call Mr Hänsch on a point of order.

Mr Hänsch. — (D) Madam President, I can confirm what you have just said. I signed the motion in my capacity as an individual Member. I withdrew my signature this morning in writing. Any further discussion is therefore pointless.

President. — I call Mr Glinne.

Mr Glinne. — (F) I wanted to say that each Member from the Socialist Group who withdrew his signature made up his own mind as an individual. This does not alter the fact that we attach a great deal of importance to the problem of Turkey. Also, the Socialist Group as such will be putting a motion for a resolution before the House tomorrow.

5. *Economic, social and vocational integration of disabled people in the Community (vote)*

President. — The next item is the vote on the *motion for a resolution contained in the Clwyd report (Doc. 1-868/80): Economic, social and vocational integration of disabled people in the Community.*

(Parliament adopted the preamble)

Before paragraph 1, Mr Vié on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats has tabled Amendment No 39.¹

What is the rapporteur's position?

Ms Clwyd, rapporteur. — Madam President, before we start I would just like to say that there are a large number of disabled people in the gallery today, as

there were yesterday throughout the debate, and I am sure it would be your intention to welcome them most warmly here this morning.

I do not accept the first amendment, however kindly it is meant. I think it is too patronizing and I reject it.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 39)

President. — Thank you, Ms Clwyd, for pointing out that we have a number of disabled people in the gallery. They are naturally particularly interested in this text. I second what you said and I hope that the work of the committee, the rapporteur and the entire House will serve as evidence of our solidarity and show in particular that what we want above all is to see the people here with us today fully integrated in society.

(Applause — Parliament adopted paragraph 1)

I have three amendments after paragraph 1:

— No 3 and No 4 by Mr Dalziel on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee;

— No 49 by Mrs Maij-Weggen on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

What is the rapporteur's position?

Ms Clwyd, rapporteur. — I feel that Amendments No 3 and No 4 are useful additions and I therefore accept them. With regard to Amendment No 49 by Mrs Maij-Weggen, I have spoken to Mrs Maij-Weggen and she has agreed to the addition, after the word *disabilities* in paragraph 17, of the words:

and that action already taken by the Community in the area of preventive medical research, including the study of hereditary disorders, will be extended to include disorders which may occur before, during and shortly after birth.

President. — If I have understood correctly, you want separate votes on the first part of paragraph 1(a) of the amendment, the first four lines and then the last three lines.

Ms Clwyd. — I should make it clear that in Amendment No 49 Mrs Maij-Weggen originally envisaged a new paragraph to be inserted after paragraph 1. She has now agreed to my suggestion that it be inserted at the end of paragraph 17. I would ask therefore that this amendment be voted on when we come to paragraph 17 and that we now vote only on Amendments No 3 and No 4 by Mr Dalziel.

¹ Text of amendments: see OJ C 77 of 6. 4. 1981/Ann.

Clwyd

President. — The vote on Amendment No 49 will be deferred.

I call Sir James Scott-Hopkins on a point of order.

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — Madam President, I do not want to be obstructive to the rapporteur, or indeed to anybody else. But if oral amendments are tabled to a written text and we do not have them in front of us, it is going to make life very difficult. If we divide up various parts of amendments and take them separately, that is fine. If we change them to a different paragraph, as she just suggested, that also is acceptable. But to try to add words which we do not know about on to an amendment which is in front of us, that, honestly, is too much. We really cannot go along with that, Madam President, and I hope you will make that clear to the House.

President. — I think for the moment we ought to take note of the request to consider the matter when we reach paragraph 14. At any rate, we are not discussing Amendment No 49 by Mrs Maij-Weggen at the moment but shall discuss it when we get to paragraph 14.

Mrs Maij-Weggen, as author of the amendment, are you willing for consideration of the amendment to be deferred?

Mrs Maij-Weggen. — (NL) I thought it was paragraph 17, Madam President, but of course I am willing.

(Parliament adopted Amendments No 3 and No 4)

President. — I have three amendments on paragraph 2:

- No 40 by Mr Vié on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats;
- No 51 by Mrs Dekker;
- No 14 by Mr Spencer on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Ms Clwyd, rapporteur. — I am not in favour of Amendment No 40 or Amendment No 14. I am in favour of Amendment No 51.

(Parliament rejected Amendments No 40, No 51 and No 14 and adopted paragraph 2)

President. — On paragraph 3, Mr Dalziel on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee has tabled Amendment No 5.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Ms Clwyd, rapporteur. — I am in favour of the amendment, Madam President.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 5)

President. — I have six amendments on paragraph 4:

- No 52 by Mrs Dekker;
- No 15 and No 16 by Mr Spencer on behalf of the European Democratic Group;
- No 30 by Mr Oehler;
- No 31 by Mrs Squarcialupi;
- No 53 by Mrs Dekker.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Ms Clwyd, rapporteur. — I am in favour of Amendment No 52 by Mrs Dekker, Amendment No 15 by Mr Spencer and Amendment No 30 by Mr Oehler. I am not in favour of Amendment No 16 by Mr Spencer, Amendment No 31 by Mrs Squarcialupi or Amendment No 53 by Mrs Dekker.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 52, adopted Amendments No 15, No 16 and No 30, rejected Amendments No 31 and No 53 and adopted paragraph 4 as amended)

President. — I have four amendments on the introductory part of paragraph 5:

- No 46 by Mrs Gredal;
- No 54 by Mrs Dekker;
- No 17 by Mr Spencer on behalf of the European Democratic Group;
- No 26 by Mrs Nielsen.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Ms Clwyd, rapporteur. — I am not in favour of Amendment No 46 by Mrs Gredal. I am not in favour of Amendment No 54 by Mrs Dekker because I think it could be used as an argument against the employment of disabled persons. For the same reason I am against Amendment No 17 by Mr Spencer. I believe it will weaken the resolution which is intended to improve employment prospects for the disabled. I am against Amendment No 26 by Mrs Nielsen because it weakens the resolution.

(Parliament rejected Amendments No 46, No 54, No 17 and No 26 and adopted the introductory part of paragraph 5)

Clwyd

President. — I have two amendments on the first part of subparagraph (i) of paragraph 5:

- No 47 by Mrs Gredal;
- No 55 by Mrs Dekker.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Ms Clwyd, rapporteur. — I am in favour of Amendment No 47 by Mrs Gredal. If Mrs Gredal's amendment is not adopted, then I am in favour of Mrs Dekker's Amendment No 55.

(Parliament rejected Amendments No 47 and No 55 and adopted the first part of subparagraph (i) of paragraph 5)

President. — I have two amendments on the second part of subparagraph (i) of paragraph 5:

- No 50 by Mrs Maij-Weggen on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group);
- No 18 by Mr Spencer on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Ms Clwyd, rapporteur. — I am not in favour of Amendment No 50 by Mrs Maij-Weggen nor of Amendment No 18 by Mr Spencer. Neither adds anything to the original resolution.

(Parliament rejected Amendments No 50 and No 18 and adopted the second part of subparagraph (i) of paragraph 5)

President. — After subparagraph (i) of paragraph 5, I have Amendment No 32 by Mrs Squarcialupi.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Ms Clwyd, rapporteur. — I am not in favour of Amendment No 32 by Mrs Squarcialupi, Madam President.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 32)

President. — I have two amendments on subparagraph (iii) of paragraph 5:

- No 6 by Mr Dalziel on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee;
- No 23 by Mr Ghergo.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Ms Clwyd, rapporteur. — I am not in favour of Mr Dalziel's Amendment No 6, Madam President. The point is already dealt with clearly under the existing paragraph. I am not in favour of Mr Ghergo's Amendment No 23 either.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 6 and adopted Amendment No 23)

President. — I call Lord O'Hagan.

Lord O'Hagan. — Madam President, could you point out, with the greatest of courtesy, to Ms Clwyd that my colleague's name is pronounced *dee-ell*?

President. — I call Ms Clwyd.

Ms Clwyd. — Madam President, may I point out to Lord O'Hagan that my name is pronounced *clue-'ead*?

(Laughter and applause — Parliament adopted subparagraph (iii) of paragraph 5 as amended)

President. — On subparagraph (iv) of paragraph 5, I have Amendment No 27 by Mrs Nielsen.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Ms Clwyd, rapporteur. — I am not in favour of the amendment by Mrs Nielsen, Madam President. The Social Fund at 4% is clearly gravely inadequate for the tasks it is faced with.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 27 and adopted subparagraph (iv) of paragraph 5 and then the whole of paragraph 5 as amended)

President. — I have four amendments on paragraph 6:

- No 45 by Ms Clwyd;
- No 56 by Mrs Dekker;
- No 19 by Mr Spencer on behalf of the European Democratic Group;
- No 28 by Mrs Nielsen.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Ms Clwyd, rapporteur. — My own Amendment No 45 is in fact not an amendment but an improvement to the text, so I am obviously in favour of it. With regard to Amendment No 56 by Mrs Dekker, Mrs Dekker pointed out to me that there was a mistake in translation and she wishes to add the words *concerned individuals* and not *interested parties*. I am prepared to accept

Clywd

the addition of *concerned individuals*. Is Mr Spencer's Amendment No 19 withdrawn?

President. — It is not possible to alter amendments during the sitting. If there is a translation problem, the Secretariat will make the necessary changes.

I call Mrs Dekker.

Mrs Dekker. — (NL) Madam President, the fact is that my amendment was wrongly translated in English and I do think this is an important point. There was no question of any problem concerning language in the original version. The translation into English, the rapporteur's language, is wrong. Ms Clwyd accepts my interpretation and agrees to the amendment in that sense.

President. — I agree with what you have just said, Mrs Dekker. It confirms what I was saying just now.

I call Mrs Nielsen on a point of order.

Mrs Nielsen. — (DK) Madam President, I should just like to point out that there is apparently a mistake in the Danish version, where it speaks about *interested parties*. This is not exactly the same.

President. — The translation of this paragraph will be checked in all languages.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 45 — which meant that Amendments No 56 and No 19 fell — rejected Amendment No 28 and adopted paragraph 6 as amended)

On paragraph 7, I have Amendment No 12 by Mr Patterson on behalf of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Ms Clwyd, rapporteur. — I have, Madam President, reluctantly agreed to delete this paragraph because of the lateness that we received the opinion of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport. I would ask you as President to look into this kind of situation where the opinions of interested committees are not coordinated with the main committee producing the report. This has caused us considerable inconvenience.

I think this is a valuable addition to the report, although in many ways it upsets the balance of the report. I am prepared to add it at the end of the report. I am prepared to add a large section on education at the end of my own recommendations although the

number of recommendations from the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport total in number as many as my recommendations in the whole of the report. If we had had the opinion earlier, obviously we could have included it in the report more easily. So I am prepared to delete this paragraph, but I would ask you to look into the lack of proper coordination between the various committees.

President. — This is a question the enlarged Bureau has considered on several occasions, but it is up to the committees to get their opinions to the relevant committee on time.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 12)

After paragraph 7 which has now been deleted, I have Amendment No 41 by Mr Vié on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Ms Clwyd, rapporteur. — I am prepared to accept this paragraph, Madam President, but only if Mr Vié agrees that it should be attached to the education section at the end of the report. Not at this point in the report.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 41)

President. — I have three amendments on paragraph 8:

- No 42 by Mr Vié on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats;
- No 59 by Mrs Dekker;
- No 33 by Mrs Squarcialupi.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Ms Clwyd, rapporteur. — No, I am not in favour of this amendment, I prefer the existing text.

Mrs Dekker has again made the point on Amendment No 59 that there is an error in translation. I would like her to put this point to you, Madam President, before I say yes or no on this particular amendment. Could I ask you to call Mrs Dekker?

President. — I call Mrs Dekker.

Mrs Dekker. — (NL) I shall speak very slowly because we have the same thing here as we had with my other amendment. There is no problem as regards the original version but the translation into English,

Dekker

for example, is wrong. This completely alters the drift of the amendment. I should like to suggest that the rapporteur comment on the amendment as I drafted it, in the way I intended it. The other language versions can then be corrected.

President. — Since this is a matter of translation, Mrs Dekker, could you read out your version in the original so that the interpreters can translate it, particularly into English?

Mrs Dekker. — (NL) I know what the problem in English is, Madam President. My amendment in Dutch called for the paragraph to be replaced by the following text:

that services provided to the handicapped and members of their families in their homes should be changed or extended so that institutionalization would be avoided.

This means that the word *phenomenon* in the English version has to be deleted. The English should read:

... so that institutionalization would be avoided.

President. — This is a translation problem. The French version also seems to me to be a bit dubious. At any rate, any misunderstanding has been cleared up as a result of the explanations given by the author of the amendment.

What is the rapporteur's position in view of the author's comments?

Ms Clwyd. — In the light of the explanation, because I agree with the sentiment, I would accept this amendment.

(Parliament rejected Amendments No 42, No 59 and No 33 and adopted paragraph 8)

President. — I have two amendments on paragraph 9:

— No 7 by Mr Dalziel on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee;

— No 24 by Mr Ghergo.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Ms Clwyd, rapporteur. — I am not in favour of Amendment No 7; it is already covered adequately in the existing text. I am in favour of Amendment No 24 tabled by Mr Ghergo.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 7 and adopted Amendment No 24 and then paragraph 9 as amended)

President. — On paragraph 10, I have Amendment No 21 by Mr Spencer on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Ms Clwyd, rapporteur. — I am in favour of Amendment No 21 tabled by Mr Spencer. I think it improves the original text.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 21 and then paragraph 10 as amended)

President. — On paragraph 11, Mrs Dekker has tabled Amendment No 62.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Ms Clwyd, rapporteur. — I am not in favour of this amendment because although I think it is an interesting idea I do not think it will work in practice. I think the Commission needs to improve its existing information centres.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 62 and adopted paragraph 11)

President. — After paragraph 11, Mrs Dekker has tabled Amendment No 60.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Ms Clwyd, rapporteur. — I am not in favour of this amendment.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 60 and adopted paragraph 12)

President. — On paragraph 13, I have Amendment No 8 by Mr Dalziel on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Ms Clwyd, rapporteur. — I am in favour of this amendment, Madam President, from Mr Dalziel.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 8 and then paragraph 13 as amended)

President. — I have three amendments after paragraph 13:

— No 1 and No 2 by Mr Moreland on behalf of the Committee on Transport;

President

— No 25 by Mr Moreland.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Ms Clwyd, rapporteur. — I am in favour of all the amendments, Madam President.

(Parliament adopted Amendments No 1, No 2 and No 25)

President. — I have five amendments on paragraph 14:

— No 34 by Mrs Squarcialupi;

— No 48 by Mrs Gredal;

— No 35 by Mrs Squarcialupi;

— No 61 by Mrs Dekker;

— No 44 by Mr Boyes.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Ms Clwyd, rapporteur. — I am not in favour of Amendment No 34. I am not in favour of Amendment No 48. I am in favour of Amendment No 35, as an addition to paragraph 14, not instead of it, if Mrs Squarcialupi would agree to that. Amendment No 61, by Mrs Dekker, I am not in favour of. As this, perhaps, is a controversial paragraph, Madam President, I must explain that the intention is not to provide charity for the disabled. It is intended to bring the fullest possible information into the homes of the public on the various opportunities for the disabled in the various member countries. It is certainly not an attempt to provide charity for the disabled. Amendment No 44, which is to delete the parenthesis, I am in favour of.

President. — I call Mrs Squarcialupi.

Mrs Squarcialupi. — *(I)* Madam President, the amendment was meant as a replacement and not as an addition, since I feel it is a serious matter for Parliament to comment on an organization like the European Broadcasting Union which includes independent bodies which have nothing to do with the parliamentary bodies.

President. — I call Ms Clwyd.

Ms Clwyd. — I do not in that case accept Mrs Squarcialupi's amendments.

(Parliament rejected Amendments No 34, No 48, No 35, No 61 and No 44 and adopted paragraph 14)

President. — I have two amendments on paragraph 15:

— No 22 by Mr Spencer on behalf of the European Democratic Group;

— No 9 by Mr Dalziel on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Ms Clwyd, rapporteur. — I am not in favour of Amendment No 22. I prefer the original text. I am not in favour of Amendment No 9, as women do bear the burden of so-called community care.

(Parliament rejected Amendments No 22 and No 9 and adopted paragraph 15)

President. — On paragraph 16, I have Amendment No 10 by Mr Dalziel on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Ms Clwyd, rapporteur. — I am not in favour of Amendment No 10, Madam President.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 10 and adopted paragraph 16)

President. — On paragraph 17, I have Amendment No 43 by Mr Vié on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Ms Clwyd, rapporteur. — No, I am not in favour of this amendment, Madam President. It is too detailed and I believe it is covered by other amendments.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 43 and adopted paragraph 17)

President. — After paragraph 17, I have Amendment No 49 by Mrs Maij-Weggen. The amendment was presented earlier but with the rapporteur's agreement the vote was deferred until after paragraph 17.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 49)

President

After paragraph 17, I also have Amendment No 36 by Mrs Squarcialupi.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Clwyd, rapporteur. — I am in favour of this amendment, Madam President.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 36 and then paragraph 18)

President. — I have two amendments after paragraph 18:

— No 13 by Mr Patterson on behalf of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport;

— No 11 by Mr Dalziel on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Ms Clwyd, rapporteur. — I am in favour of both Amendment No 13 and Amendment No 12, Madam President.

President. — I call Sir James Scott-Hopkins.

Sir James Scott-Hopkins. — Madam President, am I too late to ask for a vote paragraph by paragraph on Amendment No 13?

President. — I call Mr Boyes on a point of order.

Mr Boyes. — Madam President, I am opposed in principle to what Sir James Scott-Hopkins is saying, and that is why I am raising this point of order. You had already announced that voting had commenced. Is it in order, even for the chairman of a group, to produce another point of order after voting has started? I think we should carry on with the vote on Amendment No 13 as a whole.

President. — The voting had not started . . .

Mr Boyes. — I would only say to the President that that is a very fine distinction. She may have a legal mind, but her ruling may rebound on her at some time and some of us may remind her of it.

President. — I call Sir James Scott-Hopkins.

Sir James Scott-Hopkins. — The President is the very last person I would want to embarrass. Perhaps it is a moot point as to whether or not I may have been two seconds late. I withdraw my proposal.

President. — I feel I must say that trying to change an entire committee report with a single amendment is hardly likely to help the efficiency of our work. If Sir James had not withdrawn his request, I should have ruled in favour of separate votes because a section-by-section vote on a document of this importance might have been more in keeping with the spirit of this Parliament.

I call Mr Rogers.

Mr Rogers. — Madam President, because of the momentous implications arising from this manner of tabling an amendment and because the Bureau has already decided that committees can provide minority reports, is it not the proper procedure to follow that amendments should be tabled to specific paragraphs of the report as submitted? You can't actually submit a composite amendment as such. I think this a very important procedural point. It may, of course, be overturned by the general revision of the Rules of Procedure envisaged in the Luster report, but it could land us in severe difficulties. Mr Patterson should know this; he is an expert on the Rules of Procedure. Surely if you have a report from a committee, then amendments ought to be tabled individually against parts of that report. There is provision for the submission of a minority report. Now I do not know if the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport was so late in submitting its opinion that it could not be taken into account by the rapporteur. But if that is the case, they ought not to manipulate the rules like this, and I am sure Mr Patterson would agree. Although he may be technically right, it is a very bad practice to follow.

President. — Let me make it clear that it was not a minority report but a committee report. It does not refer to what has just been put to the vote; it is an addition to it. The report consists of four full pages and I imagine a document this long may contain some paragraphs which some Members agree with while others do not agree with them. Taking a single vote on such an important document as a whole does not seem to me to be in keeping with our usual practice.

I call Mr Patterson.

Mr Patterson. — Madam President, I entirely agree with what you have said. This procedure should not be followed in normal practice and it is only because something went wrong with the appointment of draftsmen on this particular matter that I find myself in the situation I am. I was only appointed draftsman

Patterson

after the main report had gone through the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment. I do not know who is responsible for that situation, but it should not be allowed to occur again. I proposed my amendment as instructed by the committee as an amendment to paragraph 4 of Ms Clwyd's report, and that is in accordance with the rules. At the request of Ms Clwyd and because it would have clearly disrupted the flow of her report I changed it so as to make it an addendum at the end, in other words a new paragraph 18. That is the reason that it appears in this particular form. Now I hope that we won't get bogged down in a produce wrangle. It is very important, is it not, that we produce a report in the International Year of Disabled Persons putting forward those recommendations we believe to be correct. Ms Clwyd has put forward recommendations and so has my committee. Could we not now vote on it without establishing a precedent, because if we do not I assume the whole of this work on education of the handicapped will be lost. The Commission yesterday accepted it and welcomed it, therefore it must be in principle a good series of recommendations. Could we not now forget about the procedure and vote on it as a whole as accepted by the rapporteur?

President. — I shall therefore put to the vote the whole of Amendment No 13 and then Amendment No 11.

(Parliament adopted Amendments No 13 and No 11)

On paragraph 19, I have Amendments No 38 and No 37 by Mrs Squarcialupi.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Ms Clwyd, rapporteur. — I am not in favour of either Amendment No 38 or Amendment No 37, Madam President.

(Parliament rejected Amendments No 38 and No 37 and adopted paragraph 19)

President. — Explanations of vote may now be given.

I call Mr Frischmann.

Mr Frischmann. — *(F)* Madam President, our fundamental agreement with the views and proposals in the Clwyd report was outlined yesterday by our colleague, Mrs De March. We shall therefore be voting for this report. This is not to say that we go along with the German model or the idea of European harmonization which, in the light of experience, moves in only one direction: downwards. For our part, we shall carry on fighting this trend and these claims. Lastly, we shall watch to see that the best parts of Ms Clwyd's report

are not left in limbo. We shall be behind all the necessary initiatives and actions which set out to satisfy the legitimate claims which are expressed.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mrs Dekker.

Mrs Dekker. — *(NL)* Madam President, I noted that groups such as the Christian Democrats and the British Conservatives who are in the habit of making fine speeches about what ought to be done — in this case for people who have a handicap — have this morning come out against the principle that the participation of handicapped persons in the life of society ought to be equal to that of people without a handicap, against the principle that the working environment of handicapped people should be adapted to their knowledge and capacities, against the principle that handicapped people deserve to earn a wage which is comparable with that of people without a handicap, and against the principle that as much progress as possible must be made towards avoiding institutionalization by constructing housing which is adapted to their needs.

What is more, these two groups have shown here that they are not aware of what is contained in the manifesto of European Action on Disability, which is an organization of handicapped people from the nine Member States. This document calls expressly for a European information and documentation centre and for representation at European level in the Community decision-forming procedure.

Madam President, if the reason for the attitude of these groups was that these proposals came from me, and indeed from my party, and if they do not feel it to be necessary for them as large political groups to vote in favour of these proposals because they originate from a small grouping in this House which has not joined any of the larger groups, I feel this to be a very great pity indeed. After all, what is at stake here is that, as from 1981, disabled people should be given a much better chance in our society.

President. — I call Mrs Gredal.

Mrs Gredal. — *(DK)* Madam President, I will explain very briefly why I cannot vote in favour of this resolution. My attitude to disabled persons is quite clear: I am in favour of their full integration in society. As a Minister I myself helped to introduce legislation providing for the full integration of disabled persons in Denmark. I believe that in many cases the intentions behind this report are good but its proposals do not provide for full integration. Let me mention just one example: it is proposed that disabled persons receive a reasonable wage. I do not think that is fair treatment

Gredal

of disabled persons; they should have a normal wage in line with the normal wage settlements in the rest of society. And I must confess that I feel that on many points the report contains a hint of a kind of charity. I do not fully understand the reasons for the collection to be made on behalf of disabled persons. I think that if there is acceptance of the principle of integration for disabled persons, then it is unthinkable to talk about making a collection on their behalf. Therefore I cannot support this resolution.

President. — I call Mr Moreland.

Mr Moreland. — Madam President, I shall be supporting this resolution, but I have considerable reservations about its unbalanced nature. Yesterday, I spoke as draftsman of the opinion by the Committee on Transport. I hope I am still speaking for my colleagues on that committee. My committee submitted an opinion. It is attached to the Clwyd report. Although there are many points we would like to have made, we submitted only two amendments on the main points. The Committee on Youth Culture, Education, Information and Sport was not allowed to submit an opinion but has submitted one very detailed amendment. The net result is that the resolution is overwhelmingly loaded on the side of education and youth matters, rather than on other matters which affect the disabled.

Now I am not blaming the Committee in Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport. There has of course been a muck-up over the submission of opinions, and I emphasize that that was not the fault of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport or the Committee on Transport, but I am concerned that the aspect of mobility for the disabled may be downgraded by those who read this motion in its particular context. My concern is further highlighted by the fact that Commissioner Richard spent a lot of time yesterday on education, and very little on the mobility problem. He is not the Commissioner for transport, he is the Commissioner for education.

Of course, I wholeheartedly support the resolution but let us remember that the disabled are not just the young people. They are the middle-aged and the elderly, and with these groups mobility, transport problems, are very major problems indeed. I therefore hope that the Commission and the Council will take account not just of the resolution, but also of the many detailed points in the opinion from the Committee on Transport.

President. — I call Mr Patterson.

Mr Patterson. — It would be a pity, Madam President, if this final explanation of vote turned into a

battle between the old and the young and between transport and education. I think you will agree that on the merits of what work the committee has done, twenty paragraphs are not too much to devote to education. It is a question of balance. My committee will come back to the matter of education for the handicapped later on, but as I said earlier on, we thought it important to pronounce on the matter in this International Year of Disabled Persons as early as possible. I apologize to Ms Clwyd for the effect it has had on her report, which I consider to be absolutely excellent, and my committee and I personally will be voting for it.

President. — I call Mrs Squarcialupi.

Mrs Squarcialupi. — *(I)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, Parliament has certainly done a good job on this report on the disabled, although the committee should have spent more time on it. If you ask me, three meetings are not enough to discuss a long-standing problem which is as widespread as this one. The fact that there are 60 amendments simply shows that there should have been more discussion on the matter.

Madam President, in the last few minutes I have been giving a great deal of thought to how to vote on this motion for a resolution. I have come to the conclusion that the sensible thing for the Italian Communists to do it to abstain from voting. I shall explain why.

Parliament has made tremendous efforts but the general approach to the problem of the disabled still seems to be one of protection and social welfare. For example, the proposal to provide incentives for small undertakings to take on disabled people was rejected. It is in fact in the small undertakings where there is a more human environment for placing disabled people in work. On the other hand, there are plans to provide incentives for taking on young people. What this means is that we have made a distinction between healthy young people and the disabled, and we have planned incentives for firms which take on unemployed young people but none for the small firms which ought to be giving jobs to the disabled. We are guilty here of a very serious case of discrimination.

Madam President, those in power have not shown the imagination which the young people of 1968 were hoping would develop among politicians. The House rejected, for example, the idea of assisting the formation of integrated employment cooperatives consisting of handicapped and healthy workers. This would have created various types of independent work in which handicapped people would have had a better place in the working environment. The idea of granting subsidies and incentives to firms engaging handicapped people was also rejected.

There is also the serious discrimination in favour of healthy and normal young people against young dis-

Squarcialupi

abled people. There was support for the old idea of sheltered employment and of sheltered jobs in sheltered workshops, which are still in any case a source and a butt of discrimination. I know, some people are going to say that these workshops are really needed, but did we realize 20 years ago that disabled people would be capable of doing all the things they do nowadays and the things they are going to be able to do in the future?

The mentally handicapped are still treated in the same old way, for example, and no one thinks of gradually phasing out the idea of putting them in institutions. What it amounts to, Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, is that it is a lot cheaper and easier to use tranquillizing drugs in the mentally ill and the mentally handicapped than to find jobs for them. This is what you can read between the lines of this report.

There is one last comment I want to make about a radio programme about helping handicapped people.

I think it is very bad that politicians should pass the buck on complex issues like the problem of the disabled to other bodies which are not Community institutions. They are trying to offload responsibility to broadcasting authorities which are certainly not perfect. It is up to us to act so that they do something and contribute in this area. In short, I feel that after this report handicapped people are still going to be far too isolated from the rest of society.

President. — I call the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

Mr Vié. — (*F*) Madam President, I want to refer very quickly to the speech I made here yesterday in support of this report which we are considering and voting on this morning. I should just like to say how sorry we are, of course, that the one or two amendments I had tabled on behalf of the group were rejected. I am not so young as I was but I am new to this Parliament and there are still things which come as something of a surprise to me. I must confess I am rather surprised that a straightforward amendment on a human being's inalienable right to life should be thought patronizing. I am also surprised that when we ask for Community directives to extend the powers of safety and health committees and the scope of industrial medicine, the Socialist rapporteur says it is too detailed. Be that as it may, I shall be voting along with the group in favour of this report, which does have some excellent points.

President. — I call the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members.

Mr Pannella. — (*F*) Madam President, let me say that I shall be voting for this report by way of particular

tribute to the political strength of the Labour Party, represented here by our rapporteur, Ms Clwyd. The excellent job she herself did is another reason for voting in favour.

However, Madam President, if people are going to be consistent, they have to produce certain ideas, especially when they go on about military expenditure and support unilateral disarmament — which is what the Labour Party claims to be in favour of — and when they attack the common agricultural policy which while benefiting the multinationals is more and more to blame for the crisis in the farming world. The only way for this Parliament to live up to the concern which it claims to feel for the disabled is to work towards a society in which social expenditure and social justice can really cope with the human beings in society.

I might not be so ready to vote for this report if it were a bill awaiting approval, because I should feel there was something missing. I do understand the rapporteur, however. The task here is simply to produce a few rough ideas, guidelines which in any case are not going to be followed in practice — we all know that, Madam President — by the Commission or the Council. The fact of the matter is that if you are going to implement a basically fair policy you need money, and in this place money is reserved for arms, for the profits of the multinationals, for everything which controls and divides our society, and for the people who more often than not are all smiles when speaking about the disabled, the unemployed and the various people who suffer as a result of social injustice but who, when it comes to it, are actually to blame for the fact that handicaps are a tragedy when at times they could easily be rectified and overcome.

And so I am going to be voting in favour of the report. I do not think this Parliament is entitled to be listened to with any confidence by handicapped people. This is the Parliament which approves military budgets and which represents the governments and politicians who are to blame for the tragic circumstances of disabled people in our countries and throughout Europe.

Mr Galland. — (*F*) Rubbish! Bunkum!

President. — I call Mr Ghergo.

Mr Ghergo. — (*I*) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, in the more serious speeches we heard yesterday, starting with the rapporteur's speech, there was mention of the concern not to raise handicapped people's hopes and dreams, if they were then going to be disappointed. In this respect, the report is well balanced and is constantly aware of how feasible things are.

Ghergo

There is a lot to be done. I believe, however, that if the national governments respond to the calls and recommendations addressed to them, the disabled will benefit to some extent. I am sure we all want to do more and we pledge to do it at the right time and the right place. The one thing we do not want is to make rash promises. Fine but empty words serve no purpose and only rebound on the people who use them.

(Parliament adopted the resolution¹ — Applause)

6. *Regulation on the common organization of the market in sugar*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-839/80), drawn up by Mr Bocklet on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on the

proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-471/80) for a regulation on the common organization of the market in sugar

I call the rapporteur.

Mr Bocklet, rapporteur. — (D) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the Commission's proposal on reorganizing the market in sugar in the Community is important for two reasons.

In the first place, it is an attempt to improve the common organization of the sugar market in its own right, and secondly, the Commission has said that it sees its proposals as a starting point for the reform of the common agricultural policy. This statement on the part of the Commission is not purely cosmetic, as can be seen from the same Commission's proposals on agricultural prices. Another point — and a potentially explosive one, to some degree at least — is that we are now beginning to see the outlines of a compromise settlement in the Council which is diametrically opposed to the positions adopted by this House's Committee on Agriculture and Committee on Budgets as regards the common organization of the sugar market. That is why this House's opinion is particularly important at this precise moment. However, given the background to the Commission's proposals, we must consider not only whether they are best suited for the organization of the sugar market, but also whether the principles put forward by the Commission can be accepted as general principles for improving the Committee on Agriculture and Committee on Budgets Common agricultural policy. The most important task facing the Commission is to reduce the cost of the common agricultural policy so as to take the strain off the Community budget. The Commission refers here to the need for cost neutrality in the common agricultural policy and bases all its subsequent arguments and proposals on this.

For this reason, I should like, first of all, to discuss this aim of cost neutrality; given the Community's financial situation and the need to ensure the rational organization of agricultural markets, it is a factor which cannot be disregarded. In other words, the European taxpayer must not be burdened unnecessarily with the costs of the common agricultural policy. This point is acknowledged and supported by the Committee on Agriculture. However, anyone who shares this view must also bear in mind that the Agricultural Fund includes a number of items, which, strictly speaking, have nothing to do with European agricultural policy — costs which are not occasioned by farmers and cannot therefore be charged to their account. Cost neutrality can therefore only be seen as a rule whereby, in an attempt to assess the cost of agricultural over-production, the resultant costs are actually borne by those producers who caused them in the first place. As regards the organization of the sugar market, then, the first point is that the producers must not be burdened with the cost of imports of sugar from the ACP countries and India, and this point is acknowledged by the Commission.

Secondly, there are the costs of storage to guarantee the Community's supplies, an item which has to be defined and quantified by the Commission. I would make this point with special reference to the other agricultural market organizations, which the Commission's paper on agricultural prices is now expecting to supply the necessary finance without any apparent justification.

Thirdly, there are the costs — or rather the revenue shortfall caused by the same factors — of development in certain areas which will have to be met from Community resources. It is also part and parcel of the principle of budgetary honesty and clarity that, in calculating the costs of the common organization of the sugar market, we should take into account the revenue arising in connection with the common organization of the markets in both sugar and isoglucose. More specifically, this means that, in calculating cost neutrality, we should take into account not only the sugar levy and the price-adjustment levy, but also the proceeds of the price-adjustment levy on the maize used to produce isoglucose. Finally, in view of natural fluctuations in production levels and the unusually speculative nature of the world sugar market, cost neutrality cannot be calculated by reference to a single budget year. The basis for any such calculation must be a longer period of time, within which a cycle can develop. It is, after all, a primary aim of market organizations within the common agricultural policy to make special arrangements for specific products. By its very nature, the common organization of the sugar market bears all the hallmarks of a product-specific cost configuration within which a balance between revenue and expenditure emerges over one or more cyclical periods. This is more realistic than a fragmentary and isolated year-by-year approach.

¹ OJ C 77 of 6. 4. 1981.

Bocklet

The Commission's plans for the common organization of the sugar market and for other agricultural products — as set out in its price package — amount to nothing less than an attempt to make the producers once again bear the full brunt of the risks and fluctuations in certain agricultural markets and thus to destroy some of the achievements of the market organizations at the cost of the farmers. What we have here in effect is an insidious attack on the common agricultural market, and the Council is taking this line to the detriment of the only integrated policy we have at European level simply because it thinks it has found an easy way of replenishing the Community coffers.

Let us take a look — in the light of these conditions — at the cost so far of the common organization of the sugar market. On the basis of the figures the Commission has used itself in its examination of the common agricultural policy under the heading 'co-responsibility in the sugar sector', the picture is as follows.

Firstly, the cumulative balance of storage costs for Community sugar over the last 12 years amounts to not a single ECU; in other words, storage of Community sugar has cost the people of Europe nothing at all, which means — to be more precise — that guaranteed supplies of sugar have cost us nothing.

Secondly, the cumulative balance on net exports of sugar over the last seven years is a mere 115.7 million ECU, which does not even amount to half an ECU per person in the Community over a period of seven years. If we were to take into account revenue from the levy on maize imported for the production of isoglucose, we should have a zero balance for net exports too. That would mean that we have already achieved our aim of cost neutrality under the conditions I mentioned earlier, and that no further levies are therefore needed. For this reason, the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Budgets have — in a rare display of unanimity — come out against the Commission's proposed basic production levy of 2.5 % on the A quota and possibly also the B quota, which the Council now seems prepared to accept at a level of 2 %. We in the Committee on Agriculture base our objections not on the high prices currently obtaining on the world market but — as I said earlier — on the cost neutrality already evident in the sugar sector if you view the situation over a number of years.

Nor have we taken into account the changes which are now becoming evident on the world market and which tend to confirm the view taken by the Committee on Agriculture. It is worthy of note that, in the explanatory notes to its sugar proposal, the Commission ignores these developments entirely, whereas in its paper on agricultural prices, it admits that the situation will be affected in the medium term by the alternative use of cane sugar for the production of alcohol fuel. This can only mean that the amount of sugar available on the world market will decline rather than increase over the coming years.

Finally, doubt can legitimately be cast on the introduction of the basic production levy as an important factor in the new common organization of the sugar market for the simple reason that, as everyone knows, the possibility of the Community acceding to the International Sugar Agreement or being involved in the renegotiation of that agreement either next year or the year after that will mean that the most important provisions in the new sugar market organization will once more be open to discussion and will require modification. In this respect, the extent of the enabling provisions in the Articles 26 and 27 of the new market organization are self-explanatory.

Notwithstanding our rejection of the basic production levy, I feel bound at this point to comment on the co-responsibility philosophy espoused by the Commission because, as we can see from the price proposals, this philosophy is of fundamental importance. After all, the fact is that the Commission regards the basic production levy proposed under the heading 'co-responsibility' as a first step towards establishing co-responsibility as a fourth general principle underpinning the common agricultural policy. Disregarding the fact that co-responsibility is no more than a means of controlling markets and can never be a universally valid principle for the common agricultural policy, closer inspection reveals that co-responsibility as interpreted by the Commission is, as the European consumers' organization says, nothing more than a means of finance for the Community budget.

Allow me to draw your attention to the fact that the two co-responsibility instruments we already have — the quota system in the common organization of the sugar market and the B quota production levy — are quite adequate for controlling the sugar market so long as — and this is the important point — there is the political muscle and the necessary courage to apply them properly. It would therefore be logical to start with these two instruments should the need arise, rather than introducing an additional levy — the 'basic production levy' — and thus adding to the complications and red-tape of the market organization system. For that reason, the Committee on Agriculture welcomes the fact that the Commission has at least managed to bring about a cut in the B quotas after the Council had vetoed any cuts in the A quotas in 1980. There is now a danger of this second attempt to improve the sugar market organization coming to grief at the hands of the Council which, instead of reducing the quotas when it feels that the surplus is generating excessive costs, actually wants to increase the quotas for certain Member States and, not content with that, also wants to take the Commission's line in introducing a 2 % basic production levy to bring the money in. This is a perfect example of what happens to agricultural market organizations when a political body decides to adopt a policy of 'you scratch my back and I'll scratch yours' so as to conform to the unanimity principle.

Bocklet

We would urge the Council to seriously rethink its intentions in the light of Parliament's opinion. One point I should like to make is that, in view of the situation I have described, the Committee on Agriculture takes the view that a 35 % production levy on the B quotas is quite adequate. Bearing in mind that the important thing is to restrict the quotas, we believe that a minimum levy on the B quota of 5 % of the A quota is quite reasonable. Indeed, a margin of 5 % is quite enough if, as the Committee on Agriculture would like to see happen, we were to stick to national quotas to make things more manageable. Because the sugar market organization may establish a precedent for the reform of other market organizations, we must insist on the retention of a guide price. The European Court of Justice has ordered us to accord equal treatment to isoglucose and sugar, but there is nothing to make us introduce a B quota for isoglucose. That point was made in the first draft, which the Committee on Agriculture modified on the strength of advice received from the Commission to the effect that the judgment passed by the European Court of Justice necessitated the introduction of a B quota for isoglucose. However, neither the rapporteur for the Committee on Budgets, Mr Arndt, nor I have been able to find any such reference in the text of the judgment, and for that reason I would ask you to reject the introduction of a B quota for isoglucose. An amendment to that effect has been tabled.

The Committee on Agriculture also feels that fair consideration should be given to Greek interests in the new sugar market organization.

Finally, the Committee on Agriculture takes the view that the Community should accede to the International Sugar Agreement, but only on the proviso that the present agreement's shortcomings are eliminated and that guarantees are given to the Community as regards the current level of exports and conditions which take account of the Community's position on the world market and its specific role and function. For this reason, we are also opposed to the acknowledgement of any obligation to store C sugar before conclusion of a new International Sugar Agreement.

There must also be some guarantee that the basic structures of the new market organization are only modified with the full participation of this House, should this prove necessary as a result of accession to the International Sugar Agreement.

Allow me to make one final point in conclusion. It is significant that the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Budgets are to a large extent unanimous on such an important matter of agricultural policy as reforming the common organization of the sugar market. I would ask you to support this consensus by voting for the motion for a resolution to make this a promising start to the reform of the common agricultural policy, and at the same time a clear and

unmistakable warning to the Commission and the Council.

IN THE CHAIR: MR MØLLER

Vice-President

President. — I call the Committee on Budgets.

Mr Arndt, draftsman of an opinion. — (D) Mr President, the Committee on Budgets and the Committee on Agriculture do not, in principle, proceed from the same assumptions; indeed, in many respects, our views differ widely, although they may in the final analysis yield very largely the same results. The main difference in our basic attitudes is that the Committee on Budgets regards the proposed regulation on the common organization of the sugar market as nothing more than a transitional measure because the old system showed that, in 1980/81 and subsequent years, it will simply no longer be possible to make arrangements within the common agricultural market by way of the intervention price alone. In this respect, the Committee on Budgets tends much more to the view of the Commission, which would prefer to see the sugar market organized by way of the price — in other words, by the reintroduction of genuine market conditions in this sector. That is why we should regard this regulation as nothing more than a transitional measure. Let me stress here that the Committee on Budgets has, in principle, only been asked to give its opinion on the financial aspects of these proposals.

However — and this is a point which needs making — the price guarantees on the sugar market and the entire organization of the sugar market apply far more to the sugar industry and only to a very limited extent to the producers. It is a fact that, of the price guarantee for white sugar, only 7 % goes to the producers and 93 % to the sugar industry. The fact is, then, that the entire sugar market organization is orientated far more to the sugar industry than to agriculture.

I should now like to move on to deal with the question which the Commission has brought up here, namely the principle of introducing a co-responsibility levy on the A quota too. As Mr Bocklet pointed out, the Commission uses the co-responsibility levy as a means of regulating markets, but the way in which the levy is described in the Commission's new proposals on agricultural prices is not the way the Commission is proposing to use it in this regulation on the sugar sector. In the view of the Committee on Budgets, the co-responsibility levy should be a genuine charge levied on unwanted additional production, the aim being slowly but surely to restrict surplus production. If, however, the levy is applied to the full range of production, it ceases to be a levy on the producer and is passed on to the consumer in the form of increased prices; in other words, it becomes a levy on the

Arndt

consumer. That is why the Committee on Budgets has come out clearly in favour of making this co-responsibility levy a genuine levy and applying it only to the B quota. That is one of the few points on which the proposal put forward by the Committee on Budgets differs from that of the Committee on Agriculture.

The Committee on Agriculture would be satisfied with a 35 % co-responsibility levy on the B quota. The Committee on Budgets, on the other hand, feels that only a 40 % levy on the B quota would really cover the Community's outlay on utilizing the surplus sugar, and for that reason, the Committee on Budgets has tabled an amendment proposing to apply the co-responsibility levy only to the B quota, but to set the levy at 40 rather than 35 % on the grounds that only then would it be possible to achieve a balance within the sugar market.

We in the Committee on Budgets take the view — and this is to some extent also the view taken by the Commission — that a co-responsibility levy of this magnitude would lead to a cut in production over a wide range, that a sufficiently high production levy will lead to a reduction in surplus production over the period in question and that we should then probably be getting closer to consumption of the order of 9.5 million tonnes of sugar per year in the Community.

We in the Committee on Budgets also go along with what the rapporteur had to say about production in Greece. We believe that everything possible should be done to ensure that the Greeks are allocated an A quota roughly equivalent to their production in 1979 and 1980.

I should like to thank the rapporteur for the Committee on Agriculture for agreeing to adopt the proposal put forward by the Committee on Budgets to dispense with a B quota for isoglucose. That, I think, is a sensible step because the whole point of having a B quota for sugar is to balance out the fluctuating results of successive harvests. Isoglucose, however, is an industrial sweetener which is not subject to fluctuating harvests and which does not therefore need a B quota.

To sum up: the Committee on Budgets is proposing that the Commission proposal for a production levy on A and B quotas be rejected, that a production levy of 40 % of the intervention price be imposed on *only* a B quota and that the B quota for isoglucose be abolished. We also take the view that this market organization will of course not in itself impose orderly conditions on the sugar market in the long term. Wherever necessary the review facilities incorporated by the Commission itself should be used, should it become apparent that even these measures do not bring about a reduction in sugar production as a whole.

President. — I call the Socialist Group.

Mr Woltjer. — (NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Community has for a number of years now been pursuing an old policy on sugar. The fact is that consumption has stabilized at 9½ million tonnes, while the level of production for which a guaranteed price is paid — the A and B quotas — has been set at 11.6 million tonnes. As the world market price has, in eight out of ten years, been much lower than the Community guarantee price, it has been an expensive business to export the surplus sugar. In other words, the cost of the Community's sugar policy has been pushed unnecessarily high by the adoption of excessively high quotas.

Anyone who is prepared to dig a little deeper will find a second odd twist to the story. On the one hand, the Community recognizes that sugar exports are very important to the ACP countries and has consequently given them a guaranteed right to export 1.4 million tonnes of sugar to the Community. On the other hand, all this sugar is subsequently likewise dumped on the world market by the Community.

Europe's total exports therefore amount to 3½ million tonnes, and partly as a result of this, the world market price has been much too low in eight out of ten years, one of the consequences being that enormous disadvantages have accrued to the ACP countries themselves. As these countries are not in a position to pay such huge export refunds to protect their farmers, sugar production in the said countries is seriously jeopardized. The admirable principle of guaranteed Community imports is therefore being undermined by the EEC's own policy and by its refusal to modify its own production levels and accede to the International Sugar Agreement. Clearly, the Commission is not prepared to try to cut production following last year's experience, and now thinks it has found a solution to the financial problem by the simple but brilliant expedient of introducing a 2.5 % basic production levy.

There is yet a third twist to this. The fact is that, by dint of this levy, the European farmers will be forced to finance the demise of their fellow farmers outside Europe by way of the high guaranteed prices in the Community itself.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I think we have every reason to highlight the bitterness of this policy. My group is by no means against European farmers. We believe that farmers should be paid a fair price for their produce to give them an assured income. Nor are we opposed to the system of price guarantees. What we do take issue with is a guaranteed level of production, an excessively high quota, which works to the disadvantage of farmers in the developing countries who are entirely dependent on the situation on the world market. The Community's refusal to accede to the International Sugar Agreement is symptomatic of the selfish attitude behind this policy. The fig-leaf of 1.4 million tonnes' worth of guaranteed imports from the developing countries cannot conceal the truth. A

Woltjer

number of members of the Committee on Agriculture said that they expect the current high prices paid on the world market to continue, and that it would be in the interests of the sugar-importing countries for us not to cut our production levels.

The statistics showing that what we have here is a recurring price cycle in which the world market price is too high for only two out of every ten years are conveniently ignored. The fact that certain colleagues in the Committee on Agriculture themselves acknowledge the inaccuracy of their forecasts, but at the same time call for higher production levels at a guaranteed price, is scandalous. Of course, if the world market price remains high — as is their contention — then there is no further need for guaranteed prices, as quota-free sugar would then fetch much higher prices. My group therefore feels that the volume of production for the A and B quotas must be cut. In advocating a reduction in the B quota from 27 % to 10 %, we are acting in the interests of European farmers. After all, what ordinary farmer can produce B sugar at a price which may be up to 37.5 % below that of A sugar? Only very large-scale farmers and very specialized businesses can still make a profit under such conditions. The other farmers are forced by the sugar companies to produce B sugar, not because they can make a profit on it, but because that is in the interests of the sugar companies themselves. And this element of compulsion is applied either by the companies concerned imposing a mixed price — whereby the farmer can no longer react to the B price — or by imposing sanctions whereby the non-production of B sugar is punished by the loss of the A sugar. This category of farmers is well served by protecting agriculture against such malpractices on the part of the sugar-processing industry. By advocating a B quota of 10 %, my group thinks it is doing enough to meet the argument advanced in favour of B sugar production, namely the need to balance out fluctuating harvest results caused by the vagaries of the weather. 40 or 30 or even 27 % of production is far too much.

Should our proposal for a reduction in the B quota be adopted, we can justifiably — and I repeat, justifiably — reject the proposed 2.5 % basic production levy. After all, if production were cut, there would be an automatic reduction in the amount of sugar exported and consequently less export refunds.

The amendments tabled by the Committee on Budgets underline the views of my group. By rejecting this levy, we shall be serving the interests not only of the farmers, but also of the consumer. After all, there is more than a chance that part of this proposed levy would be passed on to the consumer in the form of higher prices, effectively forcing the consumer to pay more for exports of surplus sugar.

The fact that no financial alternatives are offered to the simple rejection of the basic production levy makes the Bocklet Report extremely weak. What makes it

unacceptable, though, is its rejection of the obligation to store C sugar as proposed by the Commission. The fact is that, by rejecting this obligation, we are arrogantly rejecting the developing countries' justified demand that the Community do something to stabilize the world market. Mr Bocklet's proposal that negotiations be held to secure a high export quota for Europe is unacceptable. By those rules, the rich will always come out on top. We wish to protest emphatically against the spirit in which it is proposed that we negotiate with the poorer nations. Our attitude to this report will be determined very largely by whether or not our amendment is adopted.

The Bocklet Report is much less biased in its treatment of Community sugar policy than the Delatte Report was last year. In our opinion, though, the conclusions drawn by the rapporteur would be improved by reducing the B quota to 10 % instead of going along with the Commission proposal to cut it from 27 % to 23 %. Such a reduction in the B quota would provide a genuine financial basis for the proposal to reject the 2.5 % basic levy.

Mr President, the spirit behind this proposal to oppose any obligation to store C sugar is unacceptable — I repeat: unacceptable. The developing countries' justified demand that Europe should accede to the International Sugar Agreement is thus being disregarded in a totally unacceptable manner. We hope that this House will adopt our amendments, which we think are in the interests of the developing countries by giving some value to the guaranteed export market, in the interests of the farmers by giving them protection against malpractices on the part of the processing industries, and in the interests of the consumers by ensuring that the 2.5 % levy is not passed on to them in the form of higher prices. By dint of these proposals, this House can force the Commission and the Council to act in a more European spirit. If a fresh look is taken at the distribution of the remaining production, the burdens inherent in a reduction in the B quota can be spread fairly over the Member States.

(Applause)

President. — I call the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

Mr De Keersmaeker. — *(NL)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to begin by addressing a word of thanks and congratulations to Mr Bocklet, who has shown great skill in producing this report on what is a very complex subject. The motion for a resolution very largely reflects the opinion of my group on the Commission proposal for a regulation on the common organization of the market in sugar. We too take the view that it would be preferable in principle to make the sugar sector subject to a system in which the price is the real regulating element, as is the case in the

De Keersmaecker

cereals and the milk sector. But each sector has its own character and its own structure, both within the Community and in relation to the world market. In both these respects, the long-standing quota system has proved its worth, especially as regards the twin aims of the common agricultural policy — guaranteed incomes and self-sufficiency. It is therefore right that the Commission should continue to apply this system, as long as certain modifications are made. Having said that, though, I must say that these particular proposals for modifying the system do not meet with our approval.

First of all, we are against a system of direct allocation by the Community of quotas to each undertaking. We would prefer to see the retention of national production quotas, which have proved their worth and are sufficiently flexible. A policy of decentralization makes it easier to take selective action and gives a better overall view of regional needs. As a logical consequence of this, and as the rapporteur argued at some length, we should reduce the margin for manoeuvre from the Commission's figure of 10 % to 5 % on the grounds that the system of national production quotas leaves us a perfectly adequate margin. Thirdly, we believe that a production levy on B sugar of 35 % of the intervention price is sufficient, but in principle, we reject any higher production levy on the B quota even if the costs were to be higher — in contrast to the view taken by the Committee on Budgets — because we feel that, in that case, the quota itself should be adjusted rather than the levy increased, because production as a whole would then cease to be viable. Furthermore, the cost problem in the sugar sector should be looked at over a period of several years, and we should like to see paragraph 59 amended to this effect.

Fourthly, we totally reject the proposed basic production levy of 2.5 % of the intervention price on A and B quotas. I must say here that the Commission's attempts to defend its proposal by arguing the case for equity and above all comparability with the dairy sector are just not on — for one thing because the sugar sector is not over-producing and causing any additional cost to the Community. This proposal therefore meets neither a budgetary nor an economic need. Secondly, the system of A and B quotas in the sugar sector effectively limits production potential, unlike the situation in the dairy sector, where, thanks to the price guarantee system, production potential is unlimited. Here again, then, there is no comparison between the two. Thirdly, the B and C quotas in the sugar sector act as a kind of super-levy, which is now supposed to be introduced into the milk sector wherever there is some doubt as to the production-regulating effect of the basic co-responsibility levy. The plan is to introduce this levy into the sugar sector, but without drawing the necessary budgetary conclusions. For all these reasons, we emphatically reject the proposal for a 2.5 % basic production levy on the A and B quotas. The Committee on Budgets is quite right to point out that corresponding price increases could

easily deprive such a levy of any effect and soon provoke further production surpluses.

The motion for a resolution also reflects our own views regarding the International Sugar Agreement, from the point of view both of the prerequisites for accession and the line of the negotiations. Finally, we should also like to express our satisfaction at the fact that the arrangements for isoglucose will in future form part of overall regulations covering the sugar sector, with isoglucose being accorded the same treatment as sugar. All these points, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, are brought out clearly in the motion for a resolution, which my group will be supporting.

(Applause)

President. — I call the European Democratic Group.

Mr Hord. — Mr President, I would first of all like to pay a tribute to the rapporteur. It is not often that we see such an excellent job being done with such a degree of conscientiousness as has been shown by Mr Bocklet. I think it is fair to say that the sugar regulation is a better example of the common agricultural policy working reasonably well. We are all familiar with the quotas that prevail in the sugar sector: these have quite clearly served to restrict production and thus consequential taxpayers' support. In fact, the sugar régime, because of this high incidence of discipline, provides a useful example for reforming other sectors in the common agricultural policy.

On the whole, my group welcomes the proposals for the sugar sector put forward by the Commission. Their main characteristic is that they serve to stabilize sugar production in the Community.

My group has put down a series of amendments, because we do have some reservations on the proposals, and I would like now formally to move these amendments in both the group's name and my own. My group is very concerned at the overall level of sugar production. At the present time, of a total sugar production of 11 million tonnes, 2.8 million tonnes are sold on world markets by the EEC, so that one can say that a very substantial proportion of Community production finds its way into world markets. The European Democratic Group accepts the proposal for a higher level on the B quota but considers that the suggestion of a levy on the A quota is unrealistic and serves to undermine the very point of an A quota. The proposed revisions of the B quotas are considered to be unscientific and pay no regard to the specific needs of various Member States: consequently my group has put down some amendments to produce a more realistic attitude, particularly so far as the United Kingdom's proposed B quota is concerned. With a

Hord

Community sugar surplus of the order of 1.5 million tonnes together with the preferential sugar imports of 1.3 million tonnes from the ACP countries, there is a strong case for allowing the leading producers to reduce their B quotas substantially and consider alternative commodities. What we should understand here in the Community is that the ACP sugar commitment of 1.3 million tonnes is inviolable and that we should not accept any suggestion to reduce it. The developing countries concerned are wholly reliant on their sugar exports. For many of them, sugar is their very lifeblood, and I think it would be wrong for anybody to talk of reducing that vital commitment to those developing countries.

In conclusion, Mr President, my group generally welcomes the Commission proposals. There may be appreciable changes in the demand for sugar in the next five years, resulting in very large surpluses, and so we should be looking in the forthcoming period for ways and means of reducing sugar production, particularly in France and Germany, because there may well be a vast increase in the budget for sugar in the near future if we are not careful. In this way we should be adopting an attitude which would enjoy much greater respect on the world sugar markets. In this connection, I should like to echo the sentiment that has already been expressed in this debate, that the EEC should adhere to a revised international sugar agreement. Then I believe we could really join with the other sugar-producing countries in establishing full order in sugar production throughout the world.

As I say, Mr President, my group believes that the Commission's proposals are a move in the right direction. Serious consideration must be given to reducing Community sugar production if realism is to be in the forefront of the Community's sugar policy.

(The President closed the list of speakers)

President. — I call the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Vergès. — (F) Mr President, the new draft Regulation on the common organization of the market in sugar has the merit, at least, of being frank. In its explanatory statement, the Commission points out in fact that, first of all, those systems which regulate production essentially by means of prices are preferable in its view to those which regulate it by means of quotas. Secondly, however, it states that such systems require a considerable reduction in Community prices in order to influence production and for this reason will have serious consequences for producers' earnings and production in the poorer regions of the Community. Thirdly, because of these political difficulties, the Commission and the Council propose this new system of quotas, but also state that this will be a provisional system valid for a strictly limited period of, at most, the next five marketing years. Fourthly, it sets out the

essential provisions of this draft Regulation, in particular: the retention of A quotas, the redistribution of B quotas after three years, the creation of a basic production tax of 2.5 % of the intervention price on A and B quotas, the progressive reduction of approved national aids to the poorer regions of Italy and French Overseas *Départements*. All these provisions will tend to lead to regional specialization in the Community. Thus, everything has been so arranged that, in five years' time, sugar production will be concentrated in the most competitive regions. Everything will then be ready for setting up this proposed price system in place of the quota system in order to regulate Community sugar production. This single price will be a declining price for the producers, but it will be in fact an economic price for regions which from now on produce not only A quota sugar, but also B quota sugar as well as C quota sugar. The consequences of such a system are obvious. First of all in the Community, this single price, which is indeed economic for specialized regions, will on the other hand be inadequate for large poorer areas of the Community and for the French Overseas *Départements*. Thus tens of thousands of farms out of the 325 000 currently being worked will be ruined in this short time. In the same way, the closure of sugar refineries will occur more rapidly under what is referred to as the 'restructuring' of an already highly concentrated production sector. And finally, countries which today are self-sufficient in an essential commodity will no longer be so.

But the consequences of such a system appear even more serious for countries with which the Community has contractual agreements guaranteeing prices and sales for 1 304 000 tonnes of cane sugar, that is to say, for the ACP countries of Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific, the French Overseas Countries and Territories (the OCT) and India. This contractual commitment which dates back to 1975 is valid for an indefinite period. Up until now, it has not posed any financial problem to the Community, since this sugar was consumed in Europe, particularly in Great Britain. But since 1974, this system has been called into question by the increase in beer production in Great Britain. This has doubled in five years and amounts today to 46.4 % of consumption. This means that the production of sugar beet and the importation of ACP cane sugar today exceed consumption in Great Britain. This is a development which challenges the very basis of the contractual commitment of the sugar protocol between the Community and the ACP countries. The closure of the Tate and Lyle refinery in Liverpool is an indication of what we can expect in the future.

There is considerable concern among the ACP countries and the OCT because, if it does not seem possible to call the preferential sugar sales guarantee into question, it is nevertheless obvious that, if this brown cane sugar is no longer bought commercially or can no longer be refined, Community intervention agencies will have to buy it, and as the sugar will no longer be put on the English market, it will have to be stocked

Vergès

and re-exported to the world market, which is not the case today. It is not difficult to imagine then the campaigns conducted by interested parties against the burden incurred by the Community in buying, stocking and re-exporting cane sugar from the ACP countries, the OCT and India. It should also be stressed that these ACP countries are facing considerable difficulties in maintaining their level of income, since the price paid for preferential sugar is in principle the intervention price, but at the delivery stage to the Community, that is, the cif price, as transportation is at the producing countries' expense.

However, since the implementation of the ACP-EEC sugar protocol, the average freight cost borne by the ACP countries has increased by 95 %, whereas the guaranteed cif price has increased by only 32 %. For this reason, the fob (or quayside) revenue from ACP sugar delivered to the Community is constantly decreasing: last year alone it fell by 15 %. What about the situation expected five years hence when freight costs will have increased, but intervention prices fallen? We claim that the ACP sugar sales guarantee may then be an empty guarantee and the sugar protocol meaningless. It would be extremely serious to underestimate the economic, social and political consequences of any such failure to respect our obligations to the ACP countries. The very credibility of Community obligations to developing countries would be called into question as a result.

As far as the Overseas *Départements* are concerned — the underdeveloped tropical regions which are integrated with the Community — the draft Regulation includes a number of unjust and discriminatory aspects. The French Overseas *Départements* (FOD), which only produce A quota sugar, are to be made to pay a tax to finance the sale of B quota surpluses in Europe. National aids to the FOD are to be reduced, while the Parliament, the Commission, the Council and national governments have made these national aids a major element in stimulating the FOD sugar sector, which is a crucial part of their economies. No mention is made of pricing, marketing guarantees or payment guarantees to cane producers in relation to beet producers.

We believe that all this is extremely serious, but our concern has been further heightened and justified by the fact that on 23 February last, at the opening of the ACP-EEC Joint Committee session, the Council of Ministers for Agriculture made the situation considerably worse by coming to a general compromise and ignoring the conclusions in the Bocklet report. Thus the A and B quotas have been increased for Great Britain and for other countries, the levy on A and B quotas has been retained and even increased to 2 %, the reduction of national aids has been approved and the retention of a regionalized price for FOD sugar has been agreed at a level below the intervention price in the EEC. All this throws into very considerable doubt the suggestions of the Bocklet report. We have

noted that the Bocklet report has changed the Commission's proposal for the better on a certain number of points. But the action of the Council of Ministers in ignoring these proposals and in adopting the measures of 23 February was, in our view, a very serious development. This is why we say that there are still too many important points on which this report is silent, as, for example, food aid and real guarantees for ACP and other countries. However, we hope that these points will be clarified in the discussion on the amendments, which will determine our vote.

President. — I call the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Louwes. — (NL) Mr President, I too should like to begin by presenting my compliments to Mr Bocklet, who has produced an excellent and well-documented report. His conclusions present a balanced view of all the aspects of this product and the wide range of interests with a bearing on the problem. I shall try not to go over all the points he has already touched on, but I should like to address a number of questions directly to the Commission. Now that the compromise has been blocked in the Council by Italy, I think I can address the Commission directly and ask its representative why the Commission is so insistent on changing a number of points which this House would like to see retained.

I should like to ask the Commission why it has omitted the guide price from its proposal. Why is it obstinately insisting on a levy on A sugar when this morning's debate clearly showed that there is no majority in this House in favour of the proposal? I go along with what Mr Hord said just now to the effect that this regulation on the sugar sector has worked well so far and could be used as an example of how to go about dealing with many other products which are subject to a market organization regime. In that case, though, the Commission would have to be more subtle and not insist at all costs on the application of the co-responsibility principle which has always applied to sugar, as if there was always enough money to pay for any exports. The Commission must adopt a more subtle approach and show a greater sense of balance. The fact is, after all, that, ever since it was introduced in 1968, this regulation on the sugar sector has cost the taxpayer nothing whatsoever, and whenever produce was exported at a loss, the bill was always picked up in its entirety by the industry. What is the point of trying now to impose this 2.5 % levy on A sugar? I hope the Commission will be giving us prompt answers to these questions.

Sugar is often an emotional subject and is often in the news. This year alone, we have discussed problems to do with sugar on three or four occasions in this House. Once there was the isoglucose business; then there was the problem of the closure of the Tate &

Louwes

Lyle refinery in Liverpool; and the subject cropped up again in the discussions on the Lomé Convention. On every occasion, the discussions were highly charged, and many people tend to brand the producers of sugar beet as the accused, as it were.

I shall not go into this aspect in any more detail. I am simply making the point that this is in fact the attitude taken by many people. I should like to place this discussion on sugar in the context of the dialogue between the industrialized and the developing countries, and among the industrialized countries themselves. I am thinking here of Australia's complaint about the sugar policy pursued by the Community. Let me define my terms to begin with. Firstly, cane sugar and beet sugar are in fact one and the same product. There is no difference between the two. The only difference is that many cane sugar factories deliver their product in unrefined form. In other words, the sugar must be refined at a later stage, which is a somewhat outmoded procedure. It also consumes more energy and is gradually being phased out. However, the final product, as bought by the consumer, is identical in both cases.

Sugar is a universally valued, high-quality foodstuff, world supplies of which are anything but automatically guaranteed. We must therefore approach the problem with some understanding of the production process, and in this respect, I must reject the approach adopted by the Socialist Group, as expounded by Mr Woltjer. I must also dissociate myself from his views, which seem to me to be rather biased and not in line with the facts. I shall say no more on this point.

I should also like to ask the Commission what it intends doing about the complaint lodged by the Australian Government regarding the Community's sugar policy. I have already raised this matter in the Committee on External Economic Relations, but I should like to point out to this House and the Commission that in both Australia and Europe, sugar is produced in an industrialized society. There is no difference between Australia and Europe as regards the production process, which is in both cases based on modern agriculture and modern industries. Even the hectare production is the same. The only difference lies in the marketing method, which in Australia is far more *dirigiste* in character in that sales are entirely the responsibility of the State. Consumer prices are virtually identical in Australia and the Community — slightly higher in Australia — and both sell roughly the same amount of sugar on the world market at the same price. I should like to ask the Commission whether it agrees with me that the Australian complaint regarding the Community's sugar policy is groundless.

There is one point I should like to make on the question on isoglucose and starch. Some people seem to think that, with the advent of isoglucose, which of course is made from starch, an entirely new product, a

modern type of sugar, has made its appearance on the sweetener market. I do not believe this to be true. I certainly do not mean to underestimate the research effort and the successes achieved by the starch industry, which is unfortunately going through a bad time right now. But I do not believe that isoglucose can be regarded as a genuinely new product. Let us take an impartial look at the quantities involved. The total world production of sugar is 90 million tonnes, compared with only 12 million tonnes of starch produced throughout the world. There is therefore no way, in volume terms, that isoglucose can make real inroads into the sugar market. It is a fact, moreover, that wherever isoglucose is produced under identical conditions, it has only managed to capture a very modest share of the market, and then usually only by dint of its excise advantage. In short, there are no real grounds for the belief that the advent of isoglucose has ushered in a new era on the sweetener market.

Another point which I should like to make here is that we must not forget that both cane sugar and beet sugar are record-breakers in the utilization of solar energy per hectare. No other crop utilizes as much solar energy per hectare as cane sugar and beet sugar. I think we should bear this point in mind at a time when there is worldwide concern about energy supplies.

Mr President, I should like to conclude by pointing out that I would approach this problem from the point of view of concern for world food supplies. There is after all a shortage of food, certainly of sugar, and the scarcity is made all the more acute if you take into account the potential of sugar — both cane and beet — as a source of energy. It therefore makes no sense at all to regard the two as competing products. Both are needed. The one complements the other. I hope that the conference to be held by IFAD in Mexico in May of this year will enable the producers of cane and beet sugar to make progress in this respect.

With this thought in mind, I would call on this House to adopt Mr Bocklet's balanced and reasonable report, and I should like to ask the Commission and the Council to take a fresh, objective look at sugar in the light of world food supplies and to abandon the mistaken argument that there is too much sugar and that it is too expensive. That is just not so, and the Community, as the world's largest single sugar producer, bears some of the responsibility for supplying the world's food requirements.

President. — I call the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

Mr Nyborg. — (DK) Mr President, I shall limit myself to a few personal remarks. The previous speaker raised the point just now that the quality of the soil differs in the various countries and in the

Nyborg

various regions and that it would almost certainly make sense to cultivate those crops which were best suited to the quality of the soil throughout the Community. It is an attractive idea because it is a fact that something like sugar beet grows best in the Po Valley, in certain parts of France and in certain parts of Denmark. It would probably be an impossible undertaking to apply such a policy across the board, but when assigning quotas one could perhaps bear such points in mind.

As regards isoglucose, it must be said that this is not a product which sugar producers can regard in a friendly light, because it is a product which competes directly with sugar and must be dealt with accordingly.

Finally, let me say that this levy of 2.5 % is a tax and we all know — in any event those of us who have taken an interest in politics for some years — that a tax usually begins as an interim measure which later becomes permanent. Initially there is a small levy and this is gradually increased. But we all know also that just now there is no advantage in looking for monies from public funds because this will reduce these funds even further. For this reason we are totally opposed to this levy of 2.5 %.

Finally, I would point out that agricultural policy is being used as a means of implementing development policy, particularly in the case of sugar, because it is proposed here to import raw sugar from the developing countries. Wherever possible, of course we must help the developing countries and it probably makes sense to do so in the case of sugar, but in any event it is wrong to enter it under agricultural expenditure in the budget. It should be entered where it really belongs, namely under development aid, aid to third countries.

President. — I call Mr Papaefstratiou.

Mr Papaefstratiou. — (EL) Mr President, Mr Bocklet's report is undoubtedly a valuable contribution in the search for a solution to this difficult problem, and I am sorry that we are discussing it so late, since we have been informed that, about ten days ago, the Council of Agriculture had already laid down certain basic guidelines on this matter.

Mr President, many people maintain that the introduction of quotas and of the principle of co-responsibility is a clever Community device to obtain resources. There are fundamental objections to introducing such principles, since there is another point of view — that the Community budget should be drawn up according to the needs of the Community, and not vice versa. At any rate, what we cannot accept is that the countries of the Community should be subject to double standards. I am of course referring to paragraph 71 of the report, which quite rightly calls for due account to be taken of Greek interests in the new sugar market

organization. I therefore hope that Amendments Nos 26 and 27, which Mr Bocklet accepts, will be approved. These call specifically for quota A to be laid down for Greece in accordance with the same criteria which applied for the other Member States, and this means that the A quota for Greece must on no account be less than the quantity at present consumed in Greece, i.e. approximately 330 000 tonnes.

(Applause)

President. — I call the Commission.

Mr Dalsager, Member of the Commission. — (DK) Mr President, I too should like to begin by thanking Mr Bocklet for his report, which gives a brilliant analysis of the complicated situation facing the Community. Today's debate on sugar is a difficult one, the subject being not only extremely technical but also very important from a political point of view.

Since the Commission presented its proposal in September, there have been discussions in the Council, and progress has been made to the extent that, on 24 February and on the strength of an oral proposal from the Commission, the Council managed to reach a compromise which is acceptable to all ten Member States, a point which has already been mentioned here today by one of the previous speakers. It is of course a pity that the Council was not in a position to formulate its views on the matter earlier, but I am pleased that we can now get down to dealing with this subject at this part-session, rather than having to wait until the next one. I shall try to cover the most important points in the report and in today's debate, and I shall try to avoid the technicalities as far as possible.

First of all, I should like to draw your attention to the major differences between our original proposal and the latest version, which was discussed in the Council on 24 February. In this latest version, we disregarded our more detailed proposal and concentrated instead on two basic elements: quotas and the principle of co-responsibility.

As regards the quotas, I think it is generally accepted that the quota system must be retained in the new regulation. However, the Commission continues to regard the quota system as no more than an interim measure. In reply to the question asked by certain Members on the Greek quota, I would say that, in the Commission proposal, the level fixed for the Greek quota gives Greece a considerably larger A quota than the calculations would indicate it is entitled to.

Our latest proposal increases certain Member States' quotas in such a way that the reduction in the combined A and B quotas in relation to the present combined amounts is rather less than the 400 000 tonnes proposed in the September 1980 proposal and a

Dalsager

lot less than the reduction in the November 1979 proposal.

I should also like to say a few words on the second of the two basic elements I mentioned earlier, i. e. the co-responsibility levy. As the honourable Members know, the Member States have already accepted the principle that any expenses involved in the sale of sugar over and above the quota should be borne by the producers themselves, with the important exception that expenditure on a volume of sugar equivalent to the Community's imports of sugar under the preferential scheme should be defrayed by the Community. The co-responsibility levies we are talking about relate to sales of those amounts of sugar equivalent to the combined production of quota sugar less the amount of sugar consumed in the Community.

Our proposal here is based on what we regard as two essential requirements. The first of these is that all quota sugar and all isoglucose — both A and B quotas — should be covered by the production levy system, and that there should continue to be limits to the levies imposed every year. The second requirement is that plus and minus balances at the end of a production year should be carried forward, so that the cumulative levy revenue taken over a number of years balances the cumulative cost of selling surplus production.

I believe that the co-responsibility system worked out on the basis of these principles will be both fair and feasible, and will go a long way towards enabling us to achieve our target of creating a financially sound system. No matter what the mechanics of a co-responsibility system, the main thing is that we should, as far as possible, try to prevent the carrying-forward of sizeable negative balances from one year to another. The maximum levy must be fixed at a realistic level to take account of the fact that there have been periods over recent years in which the world market price was so low compared with the Community's internal price that a great deal of money was spent on exporting surplus production.

In our latest proposal to the Council, we suggested a 2 % maximum levy on the combined A and B quota production, and thereafter a 30 % maximum levy on B quota production, although the Council could, in exceptional circumstances, approve a further levy of up to 7.5 % on B quota production. We regard these proposals as a minimum condition for the application of the co-responsibility levy. Should they be watered down further, there is a danger of the Community's finances coming to grief at some point over the next five years.

As regards price structures, the process of regionalization should continue, but we have now proposed that this should be done by way of the gradual abolition of regional prices by the start of the 1984/85 production year.

As regards national support measures for the sugar sector, I would remind Members that the Commission's standpoint has always been — and will continue to be — that support of this kind should not be made available within the common agricultural policy for this sector, on the grounds that it prevents the application of the specialization principle. This support should be withdrawn gradually over the next five years, and we have proposed that support accorded in 1981/82 should be pegged at the 1980/81 level, and that from 1982/83, it should be reduced in instalments of 25 % of the 1981/82 level, so that national support would disappear entirely in 1985/86.

I should like to draw this House's attention to the fact that the Commission has presented the Council with a proposal regarding a mandate for negotiating conditions for the Community's accession to the International Sugar Agreement. If, as we hope, it will be possible for the Community to accede to this agreement at some future time, we should at this stage incorporate into the new regulation on the sugar sector whatever provisions are needed to enable the Council to make any arrangements it may be committed to under the agreement. That is the point of Article 47 of the proposed regulation. I should like to emphasize that this article does not seek to give the Council *carte blanche*, nor does it open the door for fundamental structural changes to be made to the new regulation. The point of the article is quite simply to give the Council the chance to depart from certain provisions in the regulation, but only to the extent to which this is absolutely necessary in view of the commitments the Community will enter into in acceding to the International Sugar Agreement.

I should like to deal now with a few important points from Mr Bocklet's report and the amendments which have been tabled. The Commission is pleased to note the wide measure of agreement in this House on the main aspects of our proposal. There is clear agreement as to the following points: firstly, a quota system for the next five years; secondly, a reasonably balanced distribution of A and B quotas, bearing in mind the fact that there must be sufficient room for manoeuvre within the B quota for special production; thirdly, the aim of budgetary neutrality, to be achieved by extending the co-responsibility system; fourthly, the desirability of the Community's acceding to the International Sugar Agreement.

There are, of course, bound to be differences of opinion on the procedure to be adopted, but we agree that the A quotas should not be cut to less than the present level, and I may add that we have proposed that Greece's present A quota of 249 000 tonnes be increased to 290 000 tonnes. We believe this to be extremely reasonable, and for that reason we oppose the amendments to this proposal.

As regards the effects of EEC quotas on preferential sugar, I must emphasize that the Community's

Dalsager

contractual obligations *vis-à-vis* the ACP countries remain unchanged, and cannot be affected by changes to the regulations governing the internal sugar market. I should therefore like to point out that any amendments aimed at upholding the Community's obligations are quite unnecessary.

Because specialization must also be taken into account in the B quotas, the latter must be based to a large extent on earlier production figures. We were therefore pleased to note what the Bocklet report had to say in this respect, but we must advise rejection of the amendments which aim to increase the minimum B quota to more than the 10 % of the A quota which is now under discussion in the Council.

As regards the administration of the quotas, we are prepared to accept that the quotas be assigned by the Member States and that the Member States themselves should also be held responsible for implementing any subsequent changes in Community regulations.

As regards the margin for manoeuvre, experience has shown that a margin of less than 10 % means that, in certain regions, it is impossible to meet requirements. We are therefore against point 28 in the report, nor can we accept point 30 on the grounds that Member States cannot be expected to have to apply for an amendment to the basic regulation if they are to have the necessary flexibility to deal with such things as takeovers.

We can accept that both the A and B quotas be subject to review in line with the demand expressed in point 31 of the motion for a resolution. Any such review should, of course, take account of all relevant factors, and not only those covered by Amendment No 6.

I should like now to move on to other elements in the regulation, and I should like to comment briefly on some of the amendments which have been tabled. Amendment No 18 claims that the Community's export refunds do serious damage to the economies of the sugar-exporting developing countries. This cannot be regarded as a sound argument, and should therefore, in our opinion, be rejected. For the same reasons, we oppose Amendment No 44. As several speakers have mentioned, it is true that this matter is under discussion. We have also heard reference to the fact that the Australian Government has protested against the Community's sugar policy in the GATT Council. It is indeed true that a protest was lodged by the Australian Government, but this has been rejected by the Commission, and the matter is still under discussion in the GATT Council.

As regards C sugar, I should like to point out that we have now proposed to the Council that the proposed obligation to store C sugar be dropped, and in this respect our views are in line with the thinking behind point 35 of the motion for a resolution. We regard Article 47 as an essential basis for accession to the

International Sugar Agreement, which is why we must oppose Amendment No 45.

Point 37 concerns the retention of the guide price. We are agreed on this point, and this is accepted by the Member States.

Regarding the introduction of quotas and production levy systems for isoglucose, I welcome points 42 and 43 of the motion for a resolution and oppose any amendment seeking to modify these points. Let us not forget that the Court of Justice has confirmed the basic legality of the systems now in operation. In the light of this judgement, we cannot accept the thinking behind point 45, and we therefore support Amendment No 24.

Moving on to the points concerning co-responsibility, I said earlier that we must build on the experience gained over the last few years with respect to price levels on the world market compared with Community prices. There is simply no point in allowing the Community's co-responsibility system to rest on the assumption that world market prices will never again fall to their earlier low level. It is true that, since May 1980, world market prices have been higher than Community prices, but world market prices are now falling and are currently at roughly the same level as our internal prices. We take the view that we must try to make the Community's co-responsibility system functional if and when world market prices once again fall to a very low level. For that reason, we welcome points 46 and 56 of the motion for a resolution, and I am pleased that no amendment has been tabled to these points. This clearly brings out what has been the main point under discussion — the mechanics of the system and not the principle itself. We have some problems with point 57 inasmuch as the present system will not accord with the principle of budgetary neutrality. We therefore support Amendment No 20, and for the same reason we must oppose points 58 and 59. I can assure this House that a single levy of up to 35 % on B sugar and B isoglucose will not necessarily suffice. If you want to avoid the imposition of a levy on A production, you must be prepared to accept that what we need is a greatly increased maximum levy on B production — large enough to prevent B production even under optimum conditions.

The same argument applies to Amendments Nos 25 and 47 and the modified version of Amendment No 4, all of which we oppose.

Of course, we welcome point 61, as well as the fact that no amendment has been tabled to this point. We can also go along with point 62, but we prefer the alternative proposal set out in Amendment No 49. We cannot give our support to Amendment No 36, because what it has to say is not in line with the facts. Amendment No 37 is unnecessary because the Community's commitments with regard to preferential sugar apply for an unlimited period. Amendments

Nos 38 and 39 relate to matters which do not come within the terms of the basic regulation on sugar.

As regards the question of the Community's accession to the International Sugar Agreement, we welcome point 66, generally speaking, but we would draw this House's attention to the fact that, under a quota-based system, major exporters must be prepared, under certain circumstances, to accept export restrictions.

I should also like to point out that the Commission is well aware of Parliament's reservations regarding Article 47, but I should like to give this House reassurances on two points. Firstly, as I said earlier, this article does not amount to *carte blanche*. It will be used only to make the minimum amount of changes needed to harmonize our commitments arising from accession to the International Sugar Agreement with the provisions of the basic regulations on sugar. Secondly, I can assure Parliament that, in proposing changes to the general provisions of Article 47, the Commission will always urge the Council to consult Parliament. In view of this assurance, I very much hope — in the light of the broad measure of support for Community accession to the International Sugar Agreement — that this House will give its approval to the retention of Article 47.

As regards prices, I can accept that regional prices should not be abolished at a stroke, but should be done away with gradually in phases. At any rate, we take the view that Amendment No 3 exaggerates the problem.

On the question of national support measures, we do not believe that the system proposed in point 70 offers a practical solution, because the extent of any such support will not be known beforehand, and the upshot will be uncertainty among producers receiving support of this kind. We feel that the best solution would be to abolish such support gradually by way of a timetable fixed in advance. For the same reason, we cannot accept Amendment No 41, and Amendment No 2 is at variance with the Commission's views on national support measures, as I explained earlier.

Mr President, I apologize for having had to go on at some length, although I have tried to confine myself to comments on Mr Bocklet's report and the amendments which have been tabled, and to concentrate on those aspects which seem to us to be the most important. I hope that Parliament will be able to give a broad measure of support not only to our aims, but also to the ways we have proposed of achieving those aims.

President. — The proceedings will now be suspended until 3.00 p.m.

The House will rise.

(The sitting was suspended at 1.10 p.m. and resumed at 3.00 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR: MR DE FERRANTI

Vice-President

President. — The sitting is resumed.

I call Mr Vitale.

Mr Vitale. — *(I)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, these proposals on sugar are totally unacceptable to us Italian Communists for two fundamental reasons which I will attempt to explain briefly in the four minutes which I have at my disposal. The first is that, within the Community, these proposals aggravate imbalances already sanctioned by the earlier regulation of 1974. Maintaining the quotas at the old levels, with a linear reduction in the percentage of quota B sugar, amounts to the retention of a distribution key which has produced the results which Mr Bocklet has in any case described in his report.

In three regions of the Community more than double the internal consumption is being produced, and there are ample margins for export even to third countries, with Community aid sometimes amounting to 70 % of the price. In two countries however, one of them Italy, there has been a chronic deficit which is difficult to eliminate, precisely because of the abnormal and artificially maintained sugar beet production in the more-favoured areas.

Despite all the talk in the debate on the common agricultural policy about restructuring, especially with regard to the Mediterranean regions, this regulation aggravates the existing imbalances. But this is not all. Despite the talk about adapting the agricultural policy so that it takes more account of the different regional situations, the new proposals are aimed primarily at abolishing the national aids which we have been forced to introduce — much against our will — as, for example, in Italy, in order to keep up a minimum level of production. Now it is proposed that his system be abolished forthwith, without anything to compensate for the prohibition of national aid.

We are also being asked to do away with the system of regionally-differentiated prices, which to some extent took into account the differences in the situations of the richer and poorer regions. The retention of the present distribution of quotas, the 'deregionalization' of prices — i.e. the trend towards unified prices — and the abolition of State aids, are the very opposite of a policy of restructuring. What sort of credibility can we give to Parliament's current discussions on the review

Vitale

of the common agricultural policy in the light of what is being proposed with this regulation?

Returning to what has already been said by other Members, we regard the proposals as unacceptable because they take no account at all of the major dispute between the European Community and the developing countries, particularly those which are signatories to the Lomé Convention — a dispute reflected even in the Final Act of the recent Freetown meeting. A refusal to give any undertaking with regard to compulsory storage means, in fact, a refusal by the Community to create the conditions under which it could accede to the International Sugar Agreement.

In other aspects concerning developing countries, I do not wish at this juncture to repeat what has already been said. I only wish to point out that there is a significant convergence of interests in this, as indeed in other sectors — which we will be speaking about again when we come to discuss prices — among the less favoured regions of the European Community, in the first instance the Mezzogiorno of Italy and those who are exerting pressure from outside for a change in the sugar policy. For these two reasons, Mr President, our Group will vote against the proposal.

President. — I call Mr Howell.

Mr Howell. — Mr President, this is a debate which is very important indeed. It concerns the first regime that the Commission has come forward with — which the Council has debated — and a new type of system following the agreement of 30 May last year to come forward with a new mechanism — or let us call it a reform — of the common agricultural policy. Its main proposal is co-responsibility and it is to that, Mr President, which I wish to address myself for a few moments.

I had to dissociate myself completely from the Commission's proposals for a 2½ % co-responsibility levy on the A quota. Of course I recognize that the Council itself has brought down that 2½ co-responsibility levy to 2 % but I am also aware that the Italians have so far refused to ratify the agreement. It therefore leaves this Assembly in a nice position, Mr President, to continue to influence the debate which is taking place at Commission and Council level.

Mr President, I was one of those who was instrumental in increasing in the Committee on Budget's opinion the 37 ½ % levy on the B quota to a 40 % levy — Mr President, I did this and the Committee on Budgets approved my recommendation — in order to take away the possibility of a co-responsibility levy on the A quota, which appears to me to be another utterly irresponsible act on the part of the Commission. It seems to me nonsensical that a co-responsibility levy should be applied to the particular quota which is designed to

achieve self-reliance in the Community and it seems to me altogether nonsensical that the Commission should propose it. Of course it does propose this on the basis of political reality rather than economic reality. But I would have preferred to go further in dealing with the Bocklet report and abolish the B quota completely so that the Community might operate on an A quota which represented the needs of the Community as a whole. Any production beyond that would have gone to the C quota and be exported outside the Community at whatever the world price was.

Mr President, it is relevant at this point to refer to the Spinelli report, which is coming up on the agenda next, and to draw Members' attention to the paragraph in that report dealing with co-responsibility where Mr Spinelli — and I see he is sitting opposite — draws attention to the co-responsibility levy and looks at it as a para-fiscal tax which is to be discouraged in the Community, recognizing that it is not the right way to increase own resources and recognizing it as a false way for the Commission to look for ways of increasing revenue in order to pay for the agricultural policy as a whole.

I would hope that the Commissioner today will be able to accept what Mr Spinelli has to say in his next report, on co-responsibility levies. We have seen over the years that the co-responsibility tax has signally failed to control the surplus in the milk sector. How then — and this is a direct question to the Commission — does it expect to have any better results in the sugar sector? And, Mr President, if I link the present co-responsibility tax proposal on the A and B quotas in the present Commission proposals to the award which the Commission is proposing on agricultural prices, and link that in turn to the proposal to reduce the British monetary compensatory amounts by 5 %, United Kingdom industry is left in an altogether impossible situation, which, for my part — and I recognize here that I am not necessarily speaking on behalf of my Group — is totally impossible to accept. The area I represent — Norfolk — supplies no less than 20 % of the total United Kingdom crop. At a time when inflation rates in the United Kingdom are amongst the highest in the Community, it is quite impossible for me to accept these proposals.

Mr President, finally I congratulate Mr Bocklet on a thoroughly worthwhile report but I hope that the comments I have made today will be taken into account by the Commission and that they will be able to influence the Council of Ministers accordingly.

President. — I call Mr Pasmazoglou.

Mr Pasmazoglou. — (EL) Mr President, the report puts forward many interesting ideas, and I think that the principle of co-responsibility is a sound one, but great care is needed in its application so that we do not

Pesmazoglou

come up against another kind of dead end. However, I would stress that we disapprove of and oppose the decision by which it seems that the Commission intends to submit a proposal concerning the sugar quota for Greece. The matter is very serious, and I would stress that any quota below 330 000 tonnes would be out of keeping with the facts, conditions and criteria on the basis of which the Greek sugar industry was built up. It will be a serious anomaly in the first year of Greece's membership of the European Community if it is faced with an acute problem in the sugar sector as a result of a quota being fixed which is considerably lower than not only the production potential of our factories but also of the consumption and the levels of production of recent years.

President. — I call Mr Vernimmen.

Mr Vernimmen. — (NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to begin by saying that I shall be voting for the Bocklet report, possibly in opposition to certain members of my own Group. After all, the rapporteur has endeavoured to reflect as faithfully as possible the discussions which took place in the Committee on Agriculture. My own comments relate more to matters of principle. To begin with, I feel that the Bocklet report paints an over-optimistic picture of our commitments in the field of development aid. To comply with our undertaking to import 1 300 000 tonnes of ACP sugar seems to me rather a back-handed form of development aid. Virtually all this cane sugar is refined in the United Kingdom and then sold at world market prices. One is bound to ask oneself what benefit the people as such derive from this kind of aid. It seems to me that all these agreements should not be viewed merely from a political or economic angle, but should also incorporate certain minimum social guarantees to the people and the workers in the developing countries.

The second point I want to make is of a totally different nature. It seems to me that, yet again, this regulation is consolidating the monopoly position of the sugar industry under the pretext that this will afford protection to sugar beet producers and consequently — or so it is claimed — protect farmers' incomes. This argument loses a great deal, though, if you take a look at what the Committee on Budgets has to say about the price per hectare received by the farmer compared with the target price for processed sugar. For most people, the argument regarding farmers' incomes is probably of only secondary importance. The farmer is merely being used as a shield to hide behind while other industrial products are simply being scuppered. I shall not repeat the argument I advanced here in this House a month ago, but I am thinking particularly of isoglucose, which seems set once again to fall victim to this regulation, despite some people's claim that isoglucose has no future. If that is so, I wonder why there is all this fuss and all these restrictions. Mono-

poly positions, like those in the sugar industry, unfortunately tend to ossify; scientific research is neglected and they tend, in the end, to undermine their own position. The present happy position will, in all probability, be only a passing phenomenon. For that reason, it seems to me that a five-year period is rather too long for an accurate and definitive analysis of what procedure should be followed.

Mr President, those were the two points I wished to make. Today's debate is probably of academic interest only, as the Council of Agriculture Ministers probably took a decision at their last meeting and simply kept this directly-elected Parliament in the dark for the umpteenth time.

President. — I call Mr McCartin.

Mr McCartin. — Mr President, I welcome this report and congratulate the rapporteur, Mr Bocklet, not only on the report but on his most comprehensive and informed statement on the subject — I think his balance and his recitation of the facts and implications of this policy are a model of what can be done in this Parliament.

Where I particularly agree with him is on the co-responsibility levy. I would like to associate myself with the view of the Committee on Agriculture, which believes that this is in no way the ideal solution to our problems with the common agricultural policy. Nevertheless I recognize that the Irish representative on the Council accepted this as a solution but I would like to dissociate myself from his views on this, and to say that he certainly does not speak for the interests of agriculture in Ireland in accepting this as a solution. First of all, I think it makes no economic sense to levy a tax on the basic minimum production of sugar required for consumption within this Community. It can serve no purpose, either from the consumers' point of view or that of the producer. I do not accept that it will be borne by the consumer. In the end the producer will pay for it as in the case of milk.

It was intended to be a disincentive to production, and it will be a disincentive to production of sugar beet in the beet sector also. To offer a disincentive on the quota and amount necessary to provide for the consumers' needs in this Community does not seem to make any sense at all. It does not seem to be complementary in any way to what the common agricultural policy is trying to do.

We first have to recognize the importance of this industry to farmers who are entirely dependent on it for their living, and I think insofar as the farmer is dependent on the production of sugar beet for his income, at least a certain quota which will give him a basic income should be left without a levy. I think the idea of a levy at any time should only be introduced in

McCartin

a situation where the cost of disposing of these becomes prohibitive, and where the amount of produce to be levied is not being consumed within the Community or being exported at a loss. Only in these circumstances, should a levy, or can a levy ever be considered with regard to the common agricultural policy.

The last point that I would like to make concerns the concessions that are being made to third countries. I think it has been said in this Parliament occasionally that it should not fall to the common agricultural policy or to the farmers of Europe to bear the cost. The cost should be borne by the Community because it has a social conscience where underdeveloped countries are concerned. It is not a cost which a small, underpaid, under-remunerated section of the Community like food-producers should be asked to carry on behalf of the Community. If the Community has a conscience about the social problems in the world, it should not be imposed upon 6 % of our population whose income has been reduced over the last three years.

I would like to congratulate the rapporteur and to say that most of the other points which I would like to make have already been dealt with.

President. — I call Mr Blaney.

Mr Blaney. — Mr President, I have followed this report in the Committee on Agriculture and I congratulate the rapporteur for the great amount of work that he has put into it in a very meaningful and knowledgeable way.

However I do take issue with two points. The two points concern co-responsibility in regard to sugar and sugar production and co-responsibility for the costs of disposing of surpluses. Since the surpluses do not arise from the activities of the farmers in the Community, why on earth should there be any question of responsibility or co-responsibility as far as those producers are concerned?

Secondly — and I agree entirely with Mr Howell who has already spoken — co-responsibility as applied to milk has not lived up to expectations. It was put into operation against the vehemently expressed wishes of many of us. It has failed to have any impact on the surpluses being created, and I want to put it to the House that, in the case of milk, as in the case of sugar, a further and more vital argument against the whole concept of co-responsibility levies in regard to agricultural surpluses is the inbuilt and dangerous fallacy that it is an across-the-board levy, hitting all the production units equally whether they are large farming complexes or small farmers in the peripheral areas. Unfortunately, they hurt the small farmers more severely and help to wipe them out.

I will conclude by saying that I agree with my colleague, Mr McCartin, in condemning outright the whole concept of the 2½ % levy being applied to the A quotas. It has no standing, it has no sense, it has no reason and it is totally unjust, discriminatory, and unfair. Even if nine ministers out of ten have apparently already agreed to it, I still take issue and say that they — including my own minister from my government — are entirely wrong.

President. — I call Mr Dimopoulos.

Mr Dimopoulos. — (EL) Mr President, there is no question of Greek sugar swamping the Community markets. The amount of sugar we produce and the production capacity of our factories, which are under State control, are approximately equivalent to consumption. Would it not be unfair, therefore, while this House is discussing today certain Member States' A quota which is to include an additional part of consumption, for Parliament to approve an A quota for Greece which is smaller than its consumption? It would be very unfair to Greek producers and Greek consumers to impose on Greece a co-responsibility levy on the sugar it produces for its own consumption. I have tabled an amendment to paragraph 27 and would ask Parliament to adopt it.

President. — I call Mr Georgiadis.

Mr Georgiadis. — (EL) Mr President, we are aware that the subject we are debating today constitutes an effort to arrive at an overall solution of a complicated and delicate problem which concerns not only the Community but also its relations with third countries. We are also aware that serious efforts will have to be made to limit the structural surpluses of certain products, especially products, including sugar, from the northern European countries, so that Community funds are released both to support other Community policies and to support the agricultural products of the southern European countries of Greece, Italy and later perhaps Spain and Portugal.

As a member of the Socialist Group, I should like to state that we welcome the position adopted by our Group spokesman, Mr Arndt, on how to deal with the more general problem.

Furthermore, as a Greek member of PASOK and on behalf of my colleagues from that party, I should like to state that we are pleased that Mr Arndt supported the Greek views in his speech, and we are also pleased at the paragraph supporting the Greek position in the opinion which he drafted on behalf of the Committee on Budgets. However, I should like to say that we are not satisfied with paragraph 11 of Mr Bocklet's report, which states that the present A quota must be incorporated into the more general future common organi-

Georgiadis

zation of the market in sugar, because the present quota was set by Regulation 3455 of 22 December 1980 at 250 000 tonnes, which would have a very harmful effect on Greek sugar production.

Annual consumption and production of Greek sugar are around 320 000 tonnes, and so as Greek Members of Parliament we ask Parliament and the Commission to fix this amount as the A quota for Greece. A contrary decision would have extremely negative consequences both for the incomes of Greek sugar-beet growers, given that the high production cost of Greek sugar cannot be covered simply by the prices provided by the A quota, and also for potential and employment in the Greek State-run sugar factories. I shall not go into the political consequences which would follow from any such decision detrimental to our country, since PASOK informed the Greek people in good time of the consequences which EEC entry might have for certain sectors of Greek industry.

In conclusion, Mr President, I should like to urge both Parliament and the Commission to take the Greek points of view seriously into consideration and not to deliver a most violent blow to a successful sector of agricultural and industrial production in Greece.

President. — I call Mrs Rabbethge.

Mrs Rabbethge. — (*D*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I hope you will not think that, just because I am the last to speak in this important debate, that development policy will come last in this House in future.

The Committee on Development and Cooperation is interested in the common organization of the market in sugar firstly because, if the Commission, as it proposes, replaces the quota system in the long term by a price system in which prices might be below the present level, then there is a danger that the ACP countries would get less for their sugar exports to the Community, to which the Community would still be committed. Secondly, these proposals still offer no solution to the Community's surplus production. Therefore, exports could frequently cause such a decrease in world prices that a reasonable and stable income for sugar-producing developing countries could no longer be guaranteed. Thirdly, as production in the Community increases so, too, could the tendency to question our obligations towards the developing countries.

I would, however, like to emphasize that these fears are unfounded. Our obligations towards the ACP countries must not be viewed in relation to the level of production in the Community. We have entered into an association with these countries and cannot simply forget our promises for economic reasons.

The new sugar market organization in no way affects the scope of the Sugar Protocol. It merely provides for sugar-processing aids. Furthermore the favourable provisions for export subsidies are still fully applicable. I would like to emphasize how important it is for all concerned to know and stress the fact that we are fully aware that we are all in the same boat, although it contains both luxurious seats and uncomfortable, cramped standing room. But if the boat capsizes all the passengers go down together. Only together can we keep the boat afloat in future.

President. — I call Mr Turner to speak on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation.

Mr Turner, draftsman of an opinion. — Mr President at a meeting two days before the last plenary session, the Committee on Development and Cooperation decided that the second report before them on the Bocklet report was not appropriate, and therefore rejected it. They had no time to do more than to make a gesture against a certain aspect of the Bocklet report by proposing Amendments Nos 53, 57, 58 and 59 seeking to delete four paragraphs from the Bocklet report. I must say Mr President, that this report is now useless. It was withdrawn last month by the rapporteur without good reason on the grounds that he had not got prime time in Parliament to have it considered. As a consequence the Council has now gone ahead and acted without our advice. The rapporteur said that this report was timely. It is not. It is completely out of time. Mr Vergeer said that the Council has ignored the rapporteur's report. Well, they have not, because they have not received it yet, because the rapporteur withdrew it last time.

Mr President, I will explain very quickly what these four amendments by the relevant committee propose. They cut out original Article 12, because it refers only to the B quota and not to the A quota. They cut out Article 13 because it says that the quotas shall be set regardless of ACP needs instead of taking them into account. So it says precisely the opposite of what is the obligation of the EEC to the ACP countries. They cut out Article No 33 because it is economic nonsense, referring to years of deficit when eight years out of ten are years of surplus. And they cut out Article No 51 because it says that when one can use sugar, cane sugar, for making petrol and gas and other things like that, the need will no longer exist for ACP sugar to be exported to the EEC, quite regardless of the fact that ACP sugar is entitled to come to the EEC whether or not there are other uses for sugar such as making petrol and so on. Those four amendments, Mr President, were merely put forward as a gesture by the Committee on Development and Cooperation to show that the report by Mr Bocklet was biased against our obligations to the ACP countries.

Turner

I would like to end by saying that it is quite wrong for Members of the House to talk about sugar as if there was an antagonism between beet sugar and cane sugar. That is quite unnecessary. If we have a healthy market with proper supplies, attuned to the needs of the world and of the EEC, there is no reason why both types of farming should not flourish together. This report gives the impression to the ACP countries that they are being done down — or that it is the object of the rapporteur to do them down — and therefore the Committee on Development and Cooperation did not like what it saw.

President. — I call Mr Kappos.

Mr Kappos. — (*EL*) Mr President, we are broadly against the production limits for agricultural products because, at a time when millions of people are starving in the Third World, it is unacceptable that there should be any such limits or that agricultural products should be destroyed. What is more, Mr President, I should like to state that we are totally opposed to any restriction on sugar production for Greece. If the soil and climate are favourable and if the capacity of the factories is sufficient not only to cover internal consumption but also for exports, it is unacceptable that Greece should be condemned by the Common Market, as well as by the Greek Government, to import sugar from abroad and to pay enormous amounts of foreign currency, and that sugar-beet growers should be condemned with regard to their incomes. This, Mr President, is precisely why we are against the wording of paragraph 11.

President. — The Commission has the floor.

Mr Dalsager, Member of the Commission. — (*DK*) Mr President, perhaps I may be allowed to use the time remaining to reply to all those who — like the last speaker — raised the question of the Greek quota. I should like to say that there can be no question whatsoever of discrimination. If anything, Greece has enjoyed positive discrimination in the allocation of a sugar quota. The Greek A quota was set in the most recent proposal at 290 000 tonnes, which amounts to an extremely fair deal for Greece compared with other countries. For that reason, I should like to say to all the Members who have referred to the Greek situation that Greece has in actual fact received very favourable treatment with regard to its A quota, more favourable than the treatment accorded to other Member States. Clearly, not every country can be allocated precisely the quota it thinks covers its own needs or consumption. This is after all a Community, which means that we in fact have a system of free trade between the Member States, and there are also certain countries in the Community which do not produce enough wine for their own consumption, and therefore have to import wine from other Member States. The Community system works the same with regard to sugar and

other agricultural products. I therefore believe that, if you study the figures correctly, you will see that Greece has been allocated a very fair sugar quota.

On the question of ACP sugar, I have already explained the Commission's view, which is that nothing whatsoever will be done which might affect the ACP countries' rights under the preferential arrangements, which are not subject to any time limitation.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting-time.¹
I call Mr Enright on a point of order.

Mr Enright. — I wish simply, Mr President, to apologize to the House because I was not here when I should have been called. The reason was that I was meeting two teachers who had set off rather late.

President. — Your apology is accepted, but it was not a point of order.

7. *Financial and budgetary policy of the Communities for 1982*

President. — The next item is the report by Mr Spinelli, on behalf of the Committee on Budgets, on the European Parliament's guidelines for the financial and budgetary policy of the European Communities for 1982 (Doc. 1-936/80).

I call the rapporteur.

Mr Spinelli, rapporteur. — (*I*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Committee on Budgets proposes that Parliament adopt these guidelines for the 1982 budget at this part-session, before the Commission completes its preparation of the preliminary draft and before the Council begins work on it.

This does not just involve returning to a working method which was adopted in the past, in particular when Mr Shaw and Mr Bangemann were rapporteurs, a method which proved its worth at the time and which was subsequently dropped only because of the exceptional circumstances in which the budgets have been debated in the last two years.

¹ Withdrawal of a motion for a resolution: see minutes of proceedings.

Spinelli

Above all, it is a question of ensuring that the Commission and the Council know the positions of this branch of the budgetary authority in good time and give them due attention, regardless of whether they intend to accept them. The position or whether they feel that they cannot accept it — in which case, however, they will know that they will have to make a special effort to persuade Parliament.

The requests to be found in this document aim to avoid, as far as possible, the seemingly inevitable last-minute clash, full of ill-feeling, irritation and sometimes mutual incomprehension, which has been a feature of the last three years.

Perhaps there will still be a clash, but at least we will have made a serious effort to avoid it, reminding the Commission and the Council right from the beginning that, with regard to the budget, Parliament is not an almost superfluous consulting body, but an equal partner in the decision-making process, that therefore its requests must not be treated lightly.

We therefore intend to say from now on to the Commission especially that its next preliminary draft budget will be a genuine basis for discussion in Parliament and the Council only if it has been preceded by, and based on, four fundamental moves by the Commission itself.

The first move must be the presentation of draft Council decisions intended to regulate the agricultural markets, decisions which safeguard the obligation which the Community will be assuming, with regard to these markets in 1982, and the assurance of multiannual commitments aimed at progressively reducing the structural agricultural surpluses and the relative intervention and refund expenditure.

On this point the Commission has already presented its proposals, and we assume that it is basing its own preliminary draft on these.

It is not our present task to discuss whether the Commission proposals could be accepted as they are or should be modified, but it is our duty here as a Parliament to say that they must, however, include a firm commitment with regard to their amount in 1982 and in the following years.

Turning at this juncture to Parliament itself, I wish to say that when, in a few weeks' time, we come to give our opinion on agricultural prices we must not become schizophrenic. We must be consistent with what we have decided concerning the budget. Only if the Commission and Parliament act in this way will we be able to make the Council of Agricultural Ministers appreciate the determination of Parliament, as a branch of the budgetary authority, and be able to back up our call for the conciliation procedure to be initiated were the Council to depart substantially from our requests. The second move which we expect from

the Commission consists in presenting, without further delay, the formal proposal for a decision concerning the raising or the abolition of the ceiling on the amount of VAT income set aside for Community finances, in order to allow the Member States to ratify this as soon as possible. As a result of the culpable failure of the Jenkins Commission to keep its promise to present such a proposal, we will have to restrict payment appropriations in 1982 in order not to exceed the 'ceiling' of 1%. But we cannot accept that commitment appropriations for the same year 1982, let alone those which will have to be entered in the 1982 budget for the following years, should depend on the absurd technicality that the 1% VAT ceiling cannot be exceeded, rather than on a financial strategy.

Mr Thorn declared a month ago that, independently of the level which we will reach in 1982, a '1% Community' rate is unacceptable. Well, gentlemen of the Commission, the moment of truth has come! No more than a week is needed to prepare a draft agreement quite simply amending or deleting the words 'one per cent' in the text of the present treaty on VAT revenue. After which, it will be for us to try and convince the Member States to accept this proposal. But up until now this has not been done.

The third move which we should like to be made in time for our debates is the production of a document indicating how the Community budget affects the national budgets, by how much it reduces them, and explaining why a possible increase in the Community budget greater than that in the national budgets is a stabilizing factor rather than an inflationary factor. You can have this document ready by the end of May, because for years you have been involved in an annual exercise on the coordination of national budgets, thanks to which you have data relating to the budgets of the Member States ready as early as the middle of April.

We are not asking for the publication of the document you submit to the Council, even though we would have the right to do so, but we ask you to extract from this information some leads for our own budget — leads which will silence once and for all the accusations constantly being directed at the Commission and Parliament that we spend public money without taking into account the austerity being imposed elsewhere in these difficult times.

The fourth move which we expect the Commission to make consists in making available to Parliament in good time not only the list of major priorities but also an indication of the order of magnitude of the sums involved in these priorities is little more than empty words, if these are not accompanied by an indication of how much expenditure for such and such a policy is to go up or down in comparison to the previous year.

To enable the Parliamentary committees to examine them seriously, so that Parliament can then give its

Spinelli

opinion in plenary session without last-minute improvisation in the July debate on the preliminary draft, and to ensure that the Council knows that it will have to take them into account in preparing the draft budget, these figures will have to be available to us by the first half of April at the latest.

I have been told that this request has somewhat annoyed the Commission, which seems to be afraid of seeing its own right of initiative thereby diminished. I would like, first of all, to remind everyone that the report of the group of Commissioners presided over by Vice-President Ortoli and approved by the Commission a year ago states:

The paper on the assessment of budgetary problems will continue to be sent in March to the Joint Council of Foreign and Finance Ministers and the Parliament. The Commission will decide whether to include costed details in it, and if so, of what kind, when it adopts the paper. When the Commission draws up the preliminary draft budget following the usual timetable, it may take into account any remarks made by other institutions as a result of their discussion of the paper.

What we are asking of the Commission is that it finally decides to act in accordance with its own recommendations. Mr President, far from wishing to diminish the right of initiative of the Commission, we intend to reinforce it by placing at its disposal a Parliament which has had every possibility to consider the Commission's reasoning and to pass judgment on it.

Taken as a whole, these four moves to be made prior to the preliminary draft mean that the Commission must act before it has concluded its review of Community policies requested by the Council for the end of June. If this date were to be kept to, it is clear that the findings could not be incorporated into the preliminary draft which will be ready at the end of May. Parliament would therefore have to work until October on a document which did not even have a tentative value.

It is in fact only in October that the Joint Council of Foreign and Finance Ministers could see the results of a Commission report produced at the end of June under the mandate of 30 May 1980.

Before concluding, I must emphasize that we are asking the Council in particular to decide to finally put an end, after years of delay, to its obstinate and unjustifiable opposition to the budgetization of loans taken up and granted, and to do this in such a way as not to affect Parliament's rights.

Finally, we consider that the time has come to put an end also to the liberty of the Council and the Commission to decide which expenditure is compulsory and which non-compulsory. This can only be decided through agreement between the three institutions, and if agreement is not reached between them, the only

solution is to appeal to the Court which, on the basis of Article 177 of the EEC Treaty, 'shall have jurisdiction to give preliminary rulings concerning the interpretation' of Community law.

Mr President, on behalf of the Committee on Budgets, I ask Parliament to approve these guidelines. In this way we will have shown, I repeat, our determination to give serious consideration to the preliminary draft budget for 1982, without bitterness, but in full awareness of our responsibilities.

(Applause from various quarters)

President. — I call Mr Arndt.

Mr Arndt. — *(D)* Mr President, I have the honour of putting forward the Socialist Group's point of view on Mr Spinelli's report and the decision of the Committee on Budgets. Allow me to begin with a minor — though for me a most important — experience which I had a few weeks ago. It was my job to talk to the Federal German Chancellor, a few Federal Ministers and some leading politicians and members of the Bundestag about the functions of the European Community. On this occasion, once again, I could not help but notice that in certain political circles there is a strong dislike for what is at present going on in the European Community.

It would appear that what is being said there is that the European Community is concerned first and foremost with financing the agricultural markets, chiefly in such a way as to produce surpluses; or else that the European Parliament is for the most part away on its travels and discussing a whole variety of other matters, without bringing Europe any further forward in the questions which matter. If you look round the European Community, this is an attitude which is widespread. But it is quite obvious that this does an injustice to one institution of the European Community, that is, the European Parliament.

(Applause)

If we now consider how the European Parliament can contribute to finding a way out of the present crisis, it soon becomes clear that under the Rome Treaties, we, as a European Parliament, have basically only one effective instrument with which to make any progress — the budget. As part of the budget authority and as a partner to the Council of Ministers with essentially the same rights, the European Parliament can, if it continues to pursue a firm line consistently, oblige the Council of Ministers to transform its much vaunted high principles into realities. All in all, therefore, we must welcome the fact that the European Parliament has stuck to its guns in both the 1980 and the 1981 budget, and we must also welcome the fact that the Committee on Budgets proposes that this Parliament deal promptly with certain questions.

Arndt

Now, the rapporteur has already frequently referred to the Commission and to the Council of Ministers with respect to the preparations for the 1982 budget. The honourable Members of this House must nevertheless be aware that the resolution of the Committee on Budgets refers to us also. In other words, it should discover in good time how and in what form budget debates take place and what budgetary guidelines exist. Our problem lies in the fact that many Members — convinced of their own task — demand budget funds in their own specialist committees, but the available money as a whole simply is not sufficient. As a result we, as a Parliament, adopt proposals at the first reading simply to do a favour to some delegate or other. In so doing, we know that these proposals which are approved at the first reading will be dropped at the second reading simply because there is only a certain margin available.

The proposal by the Committee on Budgets which we have before us is therefore so very important because it attempts to maintain a consistent Parliament policy in such a way that we do not constantly leave the rails in between individual budget debates. I think that here the Committee on Budgets — particularly in its paragraph 2, with its clear declaration in favour of the reduction of agricultural structural surpluses — has pointed the way clearly and concisely. I hope that we will also think about this at the special session in March and not once again totally reverse our budget decisions.

The Committee on Budgets has made it quite clear where the priorities must lie. In the opinion of my group, they must be found above all in a firmer commitment on the part of the European Community to fighting unemployment and to bringing about full employment. Its major task in the future is to reduce the gap between the richer and the poorer regions and to contribute in its own field to international détente. In other words, the budgetary guidelines proposed by the Committee on Budgets are an attempt to incorporate Community solidarity and an economic policy of convergence more directly into the work of the European Community. Naturally this will require a review of the work done to eliminate regional disparities. It will also require us to make considerably more funds available in this area than has previously been the case. It means, furthermore, that we should save the common agricultural markets through reforms which enable this surplus production to be kept in check.

We are faced with the enlargement of the Community in the Mediterranean area and the financial consequences this entails. When, for example, this report calls on the Commission to give a rough preliminary idea of the financial resources to be allocated, this is also of help to the specialist committees of our Parliament in clarifying our future room for manoeuvre. The rapporteur has indicated that our Parliament is constantly insisting on bringing borrowing and lending operations under Parliament's jurisdiction. In effect —

and this could also serve as a guideline for the Council — we do not want more decision-making opportunities than the Council in borrowing and lending operations, but we do want to participate in the decisions on equal terms as a part of the budgetary authority.

We also think that agreement is required over what can be classified as compulsory and what as non-compulsory expenditure. The game which has gone on over the past few years whereby Parliament says that this or that is non-compulsory expenditure while the Council of Ministers says the opposite cannot continue indefinitely. Instead of wasting our energies on irrelevant matters, the two halves of the budgetary authority should come to an agreement as to what is compulsory and non-compulsory expenditure. If however there is no agreement, we must then accept to go jointly to the European Court of Justice so that the latter can decide on the basis of the Treaties. This seems to me, moreover, to be a complaint which is more justified than that which the Federal German Government is in the process of raising against the European Community over the 1980 supplementary budget and the 1981 budget. These principles are contained in the budgetary guidelines, and Parliament would be very well advised to demand these indications from the other Community institutions promptly, for only in this way will it be able to put forward sensible proposals for the budget which agree with its own decisions. I believe this is the only way that it will be possible to take new initiatives for the further development of the European idea.

IN THE CHAIR: MR DANKERT

Vice-President

President. — I call the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

Mr Notenboom. — (NL) Mr President, Mr Spinelli has made a start in his own characteristic manner and I should like to begin by congratulating him on his boundless energy. Recently he drew up the report on own resources, and now here he is with another one. I will return to the report on own resources later. Generally speaking, the Committee on Budgets goes along with the rapporteur. Unlike other years, we are already debating the budget for next year in the plenary assembly in March. This may prove useful — we must wait and see — but it would certainly have been more useful if — I am sorry to have to say this — we in the Committee on Budgets had been able to conduct a more ample debate with the Commissioner, but that is not his fault. This fact has, however, cast a shadow over the resolution. I am therefore more than usually curious to hear what Mr Tugendhat has to say

Notenboom

today on certain subjects since this will also affect the attitude adopted by our Group regarding certain paragraphs. Thus, we are very curious to hear some of his reactions to the somewhat daring view put forward in this resolution. The aim of the resolution is in effect to request the Commission to bring forward to a much earlier date, i. e. mid-April, certain things which it had previously dealt with in mid-June, on the basis of the mandate from the European Council. It would be a very good thing if this were possible since the sooner we have this information the better. Thus I am looking forward to hearing what the Commissioner has to say on this point, but I would point out that, in my view, the Commission has already partly fallen in with this wish by making, in addition to the agricultural price proposals, a number of proposals for measures aimed at combating structural overproduction. Thus we are anticipating a little of the debate on this mandate and I think this is a good thing since otherwise the pressure on the mandate debate would be so great as to make it impossible to complete it in one session. Thus, Parliament will, I hope, deal with these proposals together with the price proposals at the second part-session this month. I hope that on this occasion the Assembly will take decisions in accordance with the resolutions which we have already adopted last year on the proposal of the Committee on Budgets.

We have no objections to the idea of the proposals for new own resources being submitted by mid-April as requested by Mr Spinelli, since we have been calling for these proposals to be submitted in good time for years now. However, it is a pity that Parliament itself has still not voted on Mr Spinelli's own resources resolution which was discussed in January. It is now March and we still have not voted. I wonder what is behind this? What secret forces are seeing to it that we have still not voted on the Spinelli report two months after it was debated? And then we are asking the Commission to produce proposals by mid-April! We must also exercise some self-criticism and if Mr Arndt says that he was not only addressing the Commission and Council but this Parliament too, I can go along with him in this case.

Mr President, I should now like to say a few words on paragraph 2 (a) of the resolution which states that, if possible, the preliminary draft budget should include the definite commitments for agriculture to a greater extent than in the past, in other words, we should try to avoid supplementary budgets as far as possible. We go along with this request. I am sure this will be possible this year as it was last year, thanks to world market price developments and better management of the market — not least as a result of pressure brought to bear by this House. We must try to achieve this, but I must also add that no one can predict how harvests or how world market prices will develop either as a result of the harvests or independently. Thus this cannot be a hard and fast rule. It is something we should always work towards but we will not always succeed, although I am sure we will this year.

We naturally go along with the spirit of paragraph 3 as I have already suggested. I am extremely curious to hear what the Commission has to say on this point. Submit for once a preliminary draft in which the own resources ceiling is disregarded. An excellent suggestion. I do not think it is right that the own resources ceiling should still be in force. Thus I go along with your suggestion, Mr Spinelli, but I should like to raise the question of whether it is in fact realistic. Naturally, it would be very nice if the Commissioner said 'you are right, Parliament, we should act as if the own resources ceiling did not exist'.

Paragraph 4, is in my view, extremely useful. I myself put a number of written questions on these lines a year or two ago both to the European Commission and to the Minister of Finance in my own country, Mr Andriessen, who is now a Commissioner. Let us specify what items of expenditure on the Community budget help lighten the burden on the national budgets and, on the other hand, what items on the national budgets should be replaced by European expenditure in the interests of increased efficiency. I wholeheartedly support this request. We will have to wait and see whether or not it can be fully met in practical terms, but this is an idea after my Group's own heart since we have always agreed with Mr Spinelli that what we need is to transfer some expenditure from national budgets to the Community budget and that we are not advocating simply increasing the total expenditure of the Community and the ten Member States. I fully realize that this does not always work, but generally speaking, what we are trying to do is to make the budget into an instrument whereby we can lend a European character to a number of areas of policy. This request tends in the same direction and can therefore receive our support.

We also intend to support paragraph 5 although I find it a little naive. It calls for figures regarding the amounts it is proposed to allocate to each policy by April or at least very soon. We support this request to the European Commission to provide indications of this kind more swiftly and thus ease the tensions which tend to arise towards the end of the procedure. However, actually to put an end to these tensions, Mr Spinelli will obviously not be possible, as you yourself, I am pleased to say, have incidentally already said when you spoke on your report. The Treaty is such that we have a first reading which is followed by a second reading, but we can only make progress by means of tensions. However, I should like to thank Mr Spinelli as he qualified this point to a certain extent in his speech and I should perhaps therefore withdraw the word 'naive'.

We wholeheartedly support the point made in paragraph 7, nor am I afraid, Mr President, of the matter going before the Court of Justice, Mr President of the Council, but let us try and make this unnecessary. Let us rather endeavour as reasonable people to solve this question and decide jointly in the spirit of the Treaty

Notenboom

what is and what is not compulsory. However, if it should get as far as the Court of Justice, which is inevitable if we cannot work something out, I am not afraid of what the Court might decide, since the Treaty is clear enough on this point. It would become apparent that a number of items which are currently included under compulsory expenditure have clearly been incorrectly classified. Let us hope, however, that we will be able to avoid the necessity of taking the matter to the Court in our forthcoming contacts.

Paragraph 8 concerns the Community contribution to convergence policy. It is of course patently obvious that the budget is far too small for this to be possible. This is unfortunately a fact and it is a great pity — let us be realistic — that the crisis has come upon us at a time when our budget is still too small to have any substantial economic influence on convergence. This is extremely depressing, but we should not give up yet. Naturally, in times of crisis it is much more difficult to increase the budget in leaps and bounds so that 'Europeanization' can take place in leaps and bounds, although common sense tells us that it should, for the simple reason that a large number of expenditure items could be managed more efficiently at European than at national level, but there is no getting away from the fact that the crisis prevents a great obstacle to this. However, the idea is topical.

I should like now, Mr President, to make a few personal remarks. I am not speaking on behalf of my Group — which is not to say that my Group does not necessarily share my views, but merely that I have not been able to discuss these ideas with them. Paragraph 8 lists the priorities. However, these are not priorities — they are all equally important. These are all policies which we would like to promote by means of the budget. I am in favour of this, but, in my personal view, these are not priorities. I hope, therefore, that we in the Committee on Budgets and the plenary assembly, will pass over things which will not be possible this year, and arrive at a specific list of priorities which will, for this reason, be shorter. I am afraid that otherwise we will once more end up with a knockout competition in the final phase of the procedure, which will not be satisfactory from anyone's point of view. However, these remarks were purely personal. It is naturally difficult for the group too to say what should and should not be given priority — let us be honest — but I nevertheless thought I was justified in making these personal remarks — indeed that it was my duty — and I have the good of the European budget at heart.

Mr President, the thinking, the attitudes, the spirit, the thrust behind this resolution corresponds so much to the way of thinking of my group that we are prepared to take his individual somewhat less realistic ideas with a pinch of salt so as not to spoil the general initiative. However, the approach could have been a little better, I think, if we had had a somewhat fuller debate in the Committee on budgets. As I have said before, and I

should like to conclude on this point, we should listen carefully to the Commission's reactions, since some of the wishes set out in this report will not be possible without the wholehearted cooperation of the Commission. With this proviso, we should like to give Mr Spinelli the green light for his difficult task.

I must just make one more point. If it should be the intention of this resolution to set the scene, regardless of what might happen later, for a rejection of the budget — after all it contains some rather pointed remarks — this is not what my group has in mind and let us hope, can surely not be the intention of the majority of the Committee on Budgets, but nevertheless one might occasionally get this impression from the text. However, this is not what we have in mind. It is our intention to do as we do in other years, but I hope, more forcefully this time, i. e. to get together to debate the matter with the Commission and Council and we are certainly not at this stage talking about rejection. Everything will depend on the attitude of the Commission, and in particular, the Council, in the next phase.

President. — I call the European Democratic Group.

Mr J. M. Taylor. — Mr President, two members of my group have asked me to suggest to Parliament that other industries are as important as agriculture and that in our present difficulties an Industrial Council, as well as an Industrial Committee in this Parliament, could be of some use. Other colleagues have said to me that transport measures should be properly and more fully treated in Mr Spinelli's report, and there is an amendment down to that effect.

Getting on to my own comments, I would like to pay tribute to the hard work and the imaginative thinking that Mr Spinelli has put into his guidelines for 1982. Now that is the point, Mr President; we must have guidelines now for 1982 while we have time. It was Mr Spinelli's idea that there should be an upper and lower limit set in the middle of the year. I thought that idea was the beginning of realism in the approach to Parliament's budget, and it has been restated in the form of an amendment tabled by my group. I think that that idea can and should lead on to two other things — firstly, the sensible employment of the first reading of the budget as a constructive step towards the second reading and secondly, the development of organized techniques in this Parliament for reducing — painlessly — the Parliament's fullest hopes for expenditure down to levels that in any given year actually prove to be reasonably at our disposal.

Mr President, you know better than anyone what happens when Parliament begins its run-up to its first reading. What it does then — and everybody on the Committee on Budgets know this — is to review a very wide range of ideas and amendments. Parliament

J. M. Taylor

is fearful of being seen to be half-hearted. It finds it hard to say no. It even tends to scowl at those who argue for restraint. Spurred on by the bidding processes of the groups and the factions who enter into mutual alliances for the purpose of supporting each other's amendments, the first parliamentary reading yields a final total of desired expenditure far far beyond what is really likely to be feasible. That would not perhaps be so bad at the end of a first reading if there was a sensible and realistic ladder down which the Parliament could, with some dignity, climb. But there is no such escape hatch. So we get to the second reading and we find disappointment, resentment and frustration in the wake of lots of hard work done by promoters of various schemes, all apparently to no avail. This is not all theory; the most recent time it happened was in Luxembourg last December. There we had the spectacle of a Parliament desperately trying to shed programmes or simply failing to find qualified majorities for amendments and in that way drifting steadily into the position previously set by the Council.

This Parliament, to my knowledge, has never looked seriously on the transition from the first to the second reading as an opportunity for refining. Our instinct is to develop by building up. We have no corresponding instinct for development by distillation and reduction and refinement. We have time to learn — not a lot, but we have some. Perhaps the answer, Mr President, is for Parliament to settle on a budget which would meet its wishes, but to express this budget in terms of ratios and proportions. I doubt if conciliation will work much better this year than it has done in previous years, so when we face the prospect of a Council of Ministers offering us a last-minute figure to which Parliament must adjust, the plan I am suggesting could arguably enable Parliament to make this adjustment *pro rata* in percentage terms and by a single amendment, rather than painfully trying to achieve inter-group cooperation on what must be sacrificed.

Mr President, I welcome the Spinelli guidelines. I commend the amendments tabled on behalf of my group and I ask Parliament, while time remains, to think very seriously about the upper and lower limits, about the transition from the first to the second reading and about techniques for adjusting spending plans downwards in an organized way. I repeat, Mr President, let us tackle these jobs while there is time for us to do them properly.

President. — I call the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Gauthier. — (*I*) Ladies and gentlemen, I am naturally enough in complete agreement with the guidelines given by Mr Spinelli, and in the short time remaining to me, I should like to emphasize and stress one particular aspect of the motion for a resolution, an

aspect which has in fact already been highlighted by Mr Spinelli himself, that is the problem of borrowing and lending operations.

It is my opinion — and this view is backed up by the way in which discussions progressed within the Committee on Budgets and by a close reading of the reactions expressed both at political and administrative level — that, within the framework of budget policy, we ought to devote an increasing amount of attention and care to following up and looking more closely at the problem of borrowing and lending operations.

It is obvious that this problem is very closely linked to the problem of own resources. We all know what has been and what is now the bold and sober commitment of this House, even if in the Committee on Budgets Mr Spinelli's motion for a resolution — which is the end result of collective negotiations between representatives of the various groups — has been modified to some extent and has had the corners rounded off a little. But, all in all, this motion for a resolution shows Parliament's full awareness of the decisive nature of this problem for the future of the Community, in order to make possible the development of serious policies over and above the policy on agricultural guarantees. And unfortunately we are forced to say that in this connection, beyond high-sounding words — expressing feelings which it is true we can share but which are no more than mere words — spoken by Mr Thorn, the attitude of the Commission on this problem is, to say the least, reticent, and indeed the Council's approach to problems of this nature is similarly faltering, reticent and largely passive.

But we are all, I feel, aware that we are now in a period in which the needs of the inhabitants of our countries and of our continent are becoming more and more urgent and vital — urgent problems are the general outlook for economic policy, and guarantees for continuing development, and Europe's overall potential for development. We need only think of the problems of transport and energy, to see how it is solely at Community level that we can possibly devise a policy which meets reasonable and rational criteria. This is without talking about the problems of employment, technological progress and so on.

Well, against this background, and if we adopt a realistic short and medium-term approach to the problems, and given the executive's lack of action on the question of own resources and given the biting urgency of the very real problems before us, the question of borrowing and lending operations becomes one which is not merely financial but political as well. What situation do we now find ourselves in? It is an unsatisfactory one where quantities are concerned. We are fortunate in enjoying on the international and world financial markets a very creditworthy reputation and therefore this gives us the opportunity to increase the Community debt to a marked extent, but we wish to do this within the framework of a coherent policy on

Gauthier

Community institutions, which would view Parliament as playing a major role, we do not want to see the problem of borrowing and lending operations being laid open to snap decisions or decisions taken at bureaucratic or government level, which would take away any possibility of democratic parliamentary control and even of administrative control. Therefore, in this political and financial context, the top-priority problem is that of entering borrowing and lending operations *en bloc* into the Budget.

As regards the various technical and financial means through which this policy on borrowing and lending operations may be developed, the problem remains of Parliament's assuming real powers of intervention and control, within the framework of a coherent policy which can come to grips with the increasing whittling away of own resources. I feel perfectly able to state that this problem of achieving greater political cohesion and organization means that imposing order on the question of borrowing and lending operations according to rational medium- and long-term options is a problem which is now ripe for treatment at political level by Parliament's committees and — we may even say — at administrative level, inasmuch as we are now all aware that controls are necessary. We are for example aware that the Court of Auditors has already delivered a clear opinion on this problem. What is needed is that we should have a clear view, impose order and set up a system to deal with this problem which in the past perhaps occurred in a spontaneous and somewhat haphazard fashion, but which, I repeat, today can and must be solved only within the framework of political options which are systematic, thoroughly rational and reflect administrative rigour.

This is the problem which I wish to stress, but before winding up, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to add one final remark. For some time now we have been discussing at length North-South problems, Parliament's commitment and that of the Community institutions on the question of hunger in the world. I feel however that we ought to be aware of the growing rift which exists between our words and our verbal commitment and even between the texts of resolutions, and our real budgetary commitments to these questions, particularly where aid to non-associated and developing countries is concerned. Therefore, I now address an appeal to you for Parliament to display some coherence at least, so that deeds can follow words and so that this important problem which is absolutely essential for re-affirming the European Community's position on the world stage, should be in future subjected to close scrutiny and the object of a broader commitment.

President. — I call the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mrs Pruvot. — (*F*) Mr President, I am speaking on behalf of Mr Scrivener. We are glad that the European

Parliament is already making a start this month on defining guidelines for Community budgetary policy for 1982. This will be of great help to the European Commission, which will submit the preliminary draft budget to us.

I must, however, emphasize in behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group that we are not entirely satisfied with Mr Spinelli's report. We feel that certain proposals are unrealistic and mean to some extent a reversal of present Community procedures.

Although it is desirable, as I have said, for the Assembly to state its main priorities today, I do not think that we should take over the role of the institution which has the initiative in this matter, namely the Commission. There has been an increasing tendency to do so in the last few months.

Having examined the motion for a resolution, I would like to make the following comments:

First of all I would remind you that the European Council gave a mandate to the Commission which must be fulfilled before the end of June. Is it really reasonable, as paragraph 1 of the resolution proposes, to bring this date forward to mid-April? I think that if Parliament did do so it would lose some of its credibility. Let us give the Commission a chance to work seriously on guidelines to which the Community will be committed in future.

I would add, again with reference to this paragraph, that it is inaccurate to say that the official aim of such a mandate is to submit proposals for amending agricultural regulations and for new own resources. This is a false interpretation of the mandate issued to the Commission.

The amendment which Mrs Scrivener has tabled on behalf of the Liberal Group seeks to take account of these realities.

The Liberal Group also proposes an amendment to paragraph 2. If the expenditure for the EAGGF Guarantee Section were curbed as a result of such proposals, and if an upper limit were set on agricultural expenditure as a result of an automatically increasing co-responsibility levy, then we would be heading straight towards a renationalization of its expenditure.

I must repeat once more that while the budget authority must do all it can to supervise the development and effectiveness of EAGGF Guarantee Section expenditure, it cannot have a direct influence upon the different items of agricultural expenditure. Its development depends on non-budgetary factors such as regulations on common market organizations and decisions on prices. Therefore it is easy to see why it is impossible to set an upper limit on expenditure in this case.

Let us move on to paragraph 3, in which there are a few points with which we seriously disagree. The

Pruvot

Commission has not yet made proposals about new own resources, while Parliament for its part has not yet adopted a position. Moreover, the reluctance of most of the Community countries on this matter is well known. This being so, it is unreasonable to pretend that the proposals could be ratified by the Member States before the preliminary draft budget for 1982 is even submitted, namely in mid-May. We propose an amendment to reword paragraph 3 as follows:

requests that the Commission in its budgetary proposals sets out the priorities of the new policies and describes in detail the financial consequences which would ensue if new own resources are needed.

The other paragraphs in this resolution are on the whole acceptable. In particular, the ideas set out in paragraph 8 are more in keeping with what is expected of Parliament, namely an indication of its main priorities for 1982. We aim in our last two amendments to promote a policy of exporting agri-foodstuffs and also to indicate to some extent what the objectives of a common energy policy must be.

These then are our comments on Mr Spinnelli's report on behalf of the Committee on Budgets. We sincerely hope that they are taken into account by the adoption of our amendments, failing which we shall decide what position to adopt when it comes to the final vote on the resolution.

President. — I call the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

Mr Ansquer. — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, as we embark upon the preliminary phase of the budgetary procedure, I want first of all to express the hope that there will be good interinstitutional cooperation during the whole of the procedure for the 1982 budget.

In fact, the Community, in a three-year period, has been faced with three serious budgetary crises. In our opinion, a state of almost permanent crisis would damage the Community, its strength, its evolution and its progress. However, under the present difficult economic circumstances the 1982 budget must demonstrate both moderation and effectiveness, which does not exclude either boldness or innovation. We must not just avoid the possible repetition of actions on the part of the Member States, but must also give priority to policies which clearly require Community coordination — transport and the environment, to mention only two.

If we are to be thorough and effective, the improvement which we and the rapporteur want to achieve in the operational budget must be extended to include the intervention budget of the Commission. The major budget items must not be artificially inflated, but must

be based on realistic policies. To facilitate our task and that of the rapporteur, we must try to improve the nomenclature and transparency of the budget. The practice which has developed over the last few years of having a large number of identical items in order to create financial reserves does not lead to good management.

These then, Mr President, are what should in our opinion be the primary considerations in drawing up the 1982 budget. On the other hand, we cannot accept certain aspects of Mr Spinelli's report. I will not enlarge, Mr Spinelli, on your request to the Commission 'to bring forward to mid-April the date for the submission of the draft decisions concerning the proposed amendments to the agricultural regulations and the new own resources'. You know better than anyone the intricate workings of the Community, the procedural and consultative difficulties, to believe that this call will be heeded. Everyone knows that we must not have any illusions. On the other hand, when it involves making a principle of the participation of producers in the financing of the common agricultural policy with a general 'automatically increasing co-responsibility levy', we cannot but voice our opposition to such proposals, which amount to no more than an attempt to make farmers alone bear the costs of the agricultural policy. The co-responsibility levy must remain a financial instrument intended to correct the malfunctionings of the common agricultural policy. Also, we must reject the determination of those who want to give the budget priority over the common policies. Surely the job of the budget is to finance existing common policies and not to dictate Community activity? Doubtless we must improve a number of policies and procedures, but let us not put the cart before the horse.

The rapid increase in the volume of the Community budget must also not be regarded as a panacea, and I would be very happy if someone would show me how 'any growth of the Community budget that is more rapid than that of the national budgets is not an inflationary factor but a factor making for greater stability and efficiency'. I think that this statement might usefully be explained and developed. Without wishing to be dogmatic, Mr President, and whilst acknowledging the truth of the Latin tag that no two situations are ever exactly the same, there are certain sacred rules.

With regard to the classification of expenditure, the Group of European Progressive Democrats has often called for realistic and fruitful discussions between the three institutions, because it is our belief that the increasing number of disagreements over the categories of expenditure, in particular between compulsory and non-compulsory, could jeopardize the entire budgetary structure. That is why, as the rapporteur, Mr Spinelli, suggests, if we fail to reach agreement a systematic recourse to the Court of Justice would sometimes appear to us to be even more detrimental both to the image of our Assembly and to the credibil-

Ansquer

ity of the whole budgetary authority. Recourse to the Court of Justice must in my view remain the exception. And I think that we are certainly in agreement there, Mr Spinelli.

To conclude, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, our Group has tabled a number of amendments to Mr Spinelli's motion for a resolution, not because we again feel that we have the key to the whole truth, but quite simply because we want to display some realism, this being the way which seems to us to be most effective for the building of the European Community.

President. — I call Mr de Ferranti.

Mr de Ferranti. — My amendment, in which I am supported by members of my group, is in no way intended to be critical of the excellent report that Mr Spinelli has presented to the House this afternoon, but is intended to submit to the Committee on Budgets, and to the House, an additional idea. I think, Mr President, you and many of the distinguished Members of the House now present, know very well indeed that the 1982 budget will be a testing one for the Community and we must not fail at this fence. But it must, if we are to succeed, be a budget in which we have new ideas. I would ask the House, therefore, to read the paper referred to in my amendment in order to learn the full details and explanation of the idea. I believe it would give an economic and social framework for the budget in which we could help to increase employment, help to return to growth without inflation i.e. help to resolve the present crisis and, above all, help to raise the standard of living in the poorer Member States and set a very important framework for the enlargement of the Community. In other words, it is aimed at convergence and the improvement of living standards throughout the Community.

It aims to do this, Mr President, simply by reducing fears that are always inherent in the job-changing process. It suggests that there should be a value-added tax which would be paid out to countries with lower than average GDP in proportion to the rate at which people were changing jobs. This would be measured by adding the rate at which people join the unemployment register to the rate at which they were leaving it. It is a formula in the tradition of Marjolin and McDougal and in the tradition of Mr Lange himself, whom I was pleased to see in his place listening to me.

But each of those propositions had difficulties. I believe that this proposition overcomes those difficulties. Our vote is in very early days; I would ask the House therefore to consider this proposal — to read the paper — and perhaps allow this particular horse to enter the race.

President. — The Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members has the floor.

Mr Pannella. — *(F)* Mr President, for once the three minutes allotted to me under the butcher's logic applied here do not bother me because I agree both on the content and on the form of Mr Spinelli's report. I would add to this, in the few seconds which I have left, that if we are going to be critical, then we must also be self-critical. Prestige is indispensable: however, the fact is that we are now losing it steadily rather than gaining it steadily, even though the direct elections had aroused great hopes in Europe and in ourselves.

In practice, there is very often a seemingly impenetrable barrier between words and actions. It is a barrier of misuse of powers and misuse of funds — about which I shall be speaking tomorrow at a press conference — and every day there are blatant indications of this from the political groups. I said misuse of political powers because, following a somewhat perverse logic, although the individual institutions are occasionally allowed to express their own ideas, a few days later there is total collusion and complicity between the real power in the Commission, the real power in the Parliament and the real power in the Council.

Mr President, we will make our own contribution. Our contribution will be to wash the dirty linen of our institutions, not as accessories or criminals, by night or in the corridors; we will attempt to wash the political, financial and administrative dirty linen of the institutions, beginning with our own, when we come to discuss the budget. This will also serve to show our honourable colleagues that they very often vote without knowing for what they are voting, that they are very often reduced to being yes-men, that they are very often ashamed of their vote when after the event, thanks to our Group's statements, they realize what the vote was about.

President. — I call Mr Pasmazoglou.

Mr Pasmazoglou. — *(EL)* Mr President, I have noted that most of the criticism directed at Mr Spinelli's report maintains that it is not sufficiently realistic. In my view it is Parliament's job to see what the outlook is for the Community and to inspire confidence and enthusiasm in this important work, and in this respect I maintain that the opposite is true. Mr Spinelli's report is realistic, and we support it unreservedly.

The European Community is currently facing three major policy problems. Firstly, there is the review of the common agricultural policy, and in this context I should like to draw attention to the large-scale waste of resources, particularly on dairy produce, while Mediterranean products, which are a matter of great

Presmazoglou

concern to Mediterranean countries such as Greece, are treated very shabbily. The other problem facing the Community is the measures which must be taken in certain new sectors, in particular the social sector and the protection of the environment, where much can and must be done. The third problem is the shortage of resources, and in this context I would emphasize the appropriateness of the solutions proposed in the Spinelli report. I would say that the Spinelli proposals, which in the final analysis will lead to a larger contribution by the economically stronger countries, will strengthen all the efforts being made by the European Community to unite the peoples of Europe. Essentially, the proposals have two main thrusts: the first is to limit wastage wherever it may occur, and the second is to strengthen regional development and social policy measures in the Community.

In conclusion, Mr President, I should like to stress the following. These proposals concern the future of the Community and its influence on international affairs. Firstly, because they strengthen not only the economically weaker countries of the Community, but also its economically stronger countries, and this is something which must be emphasized. Secondly, they create an environment in which development can get moving again and in which inflation can be tackled. This is precisely the approach which will lead to economic recovery and development. And finally, the approach proposed in the Spinelli report and in the Community budget for the coming years is the only one which will enable the European Community to play a major role in tackling the international monetary and economic problems.

President. — I call the Commission.

Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission. — Let me say at the outset that I intend to address myself to the report itself and not to deal with the many amendments. This partly because there are so many of them; partly because some of them at least, important as they are, are nonetheless really directed, it seems to me, to the debate on agricultural prices which will be taking place, I hope, later this month, and partly because the report by Mr Spinelli is something which is of absolutely essential importance.

I also want to make it quite clear to the House, before entering into detailed examination of it in a fairly brief period of time, that we support the initiative which Mr Spinelli has taken in his capacity as rapporteur for the 1982 budget in putting forward the resolution on budgetary guidelines for the year. The budget procedure is the focal point of the dialogue between the institutions and it is both right and helpful that within their respective spheres the institutions should make their positions known at a stage early enough to allow the other institutions to take them into account. It is in this spirit that the Commission welcomes the resolu-

tion put forward in Mr Spinelli's name. When Mr Notenboom said that he would be waiting with interest to know what the reaction of the Commission would be, I would like to emphasise that that is, indeed, our reaction.

I cannot, in view of the amount of time that is at the disposal of the House, speak at great length or other people will find themselves crowded out but it is, I think, important that I should go through the report taking the most important paragraphs. Some of these the Commission will be able to respond to in a helpful and constructive way. With others it will be necessary for me to be rather more reserved but I hope that the House will understand that whichever attitude I take it is our intention to go as far as we can towards welcoming this report and as far as we can towards working within the spirit of the report. In those instances where it is not possible for us fully to respond to the terms of the resolution and, as the House will discover, there are one or two, it will not be for lack of goodwill nor out of a desire not to cooperate. It will be for constitutional reasons. Even in those instances, however, where we have constitutional difficulties, it is our intention to do our best to find practical ways, as I have already said, to respond to the very constructive initiative which the rapporteur has put forward.

Let me now, Mr President, in order to truncate my speech a little, make my points paragraph by paragraph and I begin with paragraph 1, the mandate.

As the House knows, the mandate given to the Commission specified June of this year as the terminal date of the report and President Thorn has already told the House that it is our intention to deliver our report on time. I must say to the House in all honesty that we cannot bring forward the date to April, as has been suggested. We are working to a particular time-scale which has been laid out and I was grateful for the remarks made by Mrs Pruvot in her speech when she drew attention to the problems and when she advised the House not to press us in that regard. I would like to point out, though, that an opportunity will arise for Parliament to consider the major problems covered by the mandate when it debates the motion for a resolution on the future of the budget which has been tabled by Mr Glinne. As soon as the Commission's report is ready we will, of course, be laying it before Parliament, just as we shall be sending it forward to the Council.

And now we come to paragraph 2 — agricultural expenditure — and here I would like to say that I listened with very great interest to the remarks which Mr Arndt had to make about the attitude of some of his compatriots in government and in Parliament to the activities of the Community in general, the Parliament in particular, and attitudes towards the common agricultural policy and agricultural spending. I thought that they were of very considerable interest.

Tugendhat

The Commission, for its part, shares the preoccupation of Parliament, not just with the need for reducing surpluses but also with the need to reduce costs. In the Commission's proposals for agricultural prices and related measures for this year we have in fact laid considerable emphasis on co-responsibility. The Commission also wants to be in a position to make the most accurate budget estimates it possibly can concerning future agricultural expenditure needs and we accept the need to avoid, as far as possible, supplementary budgets in the course of the financial year. We managed to do that in fact last year but, as the House very well knows, not everything is under our control. Events not simply within the Community but also in other parts of the world, in North America, in the Soviet Union, in China, can have an important effect on agricultural prices and it is bound to be the case that, in some years, world markets and the weather will lead to a situation in which supplementary budgets will prove necessary. We share the House's distaste for them but I must point out to the House that in some years they will have to be brought forward.

As regards the commitments covering several years, a concept which I must confess to having some difficulty in understanding, I think they would be best examined in the context of the forthcoming debate on agricultural prices, since clearly it involves not simply budgetary policy but also agricultural policy as well. I think that the debates to which I have just referred would be an appropriate occasion on which to talk about it.

This brings me to a point which Mr Notenboom made in his speech when he said that he was pleased to see that in bringing forward proposals on structural measures as well as on prices we had in fact to some extent brought forward some of our mandate responsibilities. This prompts me to say one thing about agricultural prices and connected proposals. It is something which is important and it is something which grows out of the debate that has occurred and the amendments which have been laid before the House. The Commission takes the view that there is a link between its agricultural proposals and the freedom of manoeuvre left to the Community to solve the budgetary aspects of the mandate. I have said that we cannot anticipate our thinking on the mandate, but in all its proposals leading up to the mandate the Commission will act in a manner consistent with the budgetary requirements of the mandate and it calls on the other institutions, on Parliament and on the Council, on both of them, to do likewise.

What I have to say to you is this. Do not subsequently blame the Commission if we have difficulty in reconciling all the budgetary considerations, if you yourselves have taken decisions which actually foreclose some of the changes and improvements which you wish to see. When you consider individual items as they appear in the budget, even when they are as important as agriculture, please think of the whole

perspective and not simply of the individual items, because if the Parliament or the Council simply act on the individual items without considering the broader perspective it will be impossible for us to carry through the changes which I think all of us in this House, and in the Council no doubt, would like to see. On the question of additional 'own resources', there is little I have to say. We have gone over the ground several times before. The President of the Commission, Mr Thorn, made a very positive statement in his programme speech just last month. It was a statement made on behalf of the whole Commission. It is a statement to which I fully subscribe. Like Mr Spinelli, the Commission takes the view that the development of the Community cannot be artificially held back for lack of financial resources, nor can its priorities be distorted thereby. But as the Commission has already made clear, it cannot yet say when the right moment for a proposal on the Community's own resources will be. I note that in his resolution on the future of the budget, Mr Glinne makes the following statement:

Notes that any decisions on own resources must be subordinate to the decisions taken by the Community on the major political problems mentioned above.

The Community's priorities, the course of its development and the question of its financing must, I think, be looked at as a whole.

On the relationship between the Community's budget and national budgets, I will certainly draw the attention of Mr Ortoli, who is the Commissioner responsible within the Commission for drafting the annual document on the national budgets, to Mr Spinelli's views.

So far as the timetable for the draft budget and its priorities is concerned, the House knows that the Treaty confers on the Commission the sole right of initiative, which it exercises when it presents its draft budget. The Commission actually takes its decisions, as Mr Spinelli will know from his own experiences, in the second half of May, and that is the moment when it exercises its political responsibilities. I have to tell the House that if the Commission is to do a proper job in preparing the preliminary draft budget, it cannot compress its internal timetable, which has already been reduced by the pragmatic calendar, any further. Mr Spinelli's resolution, as now drafted, does not — and I am grateful to him for this — bring into question the Commission's right of initiative, and it appears to recognize the practical constraints of life.

As I told the Committee on Budgets, in late March or early April I shall be in a position to give an oral presentation on the basis of information then available concerning the broad financial framework within which the 1982 budget will have to be drawn up, and I am, of course, willing to have a discussion on the policy priorities for 1982. I shall be able to give some broad, and in certain cases somewhat uncertain, financial outlines. These may well take the form of ranges

Tugendhat

or brackets of estimates. The Commission will, however, do its very best to give as solid a picture as possible. This was a point which I made when I last came to the Committee on Budgets, and I was pleased to find that it seemed to get a good response from people in a number of different quarters.

Paragraph 8 of the resolution lists priorities for 1982. This is not the place for a detailed discussion, which will come later. Suffice it to say that the Commission is broadly in agreement with the priorities listed here.

On the budgetization of loans, the position of the Commission is well known and its proposal of June 1978 for budgetization and borrowing and lending remains on the table. The Commission hopes that further practical steps towards agreement will continue to be made.

On the classification of expenditure as compulsory or non-compulsory, the Commission agrees with Parliament that agreement between the two halves of the budgetary authority by means of conciliation is necessary. We also agree with Mr Notenboom that a political approach is a more fruitful one than a juridical approach. It is essential for the institutions to start talking to each other in a constructive way.

That, Mr President, brings me to a final general point. I would like to take this opportunity to repeat what I have so often said to the Committee on Budgets — namely, that the Commission supports the efforts that are being made to bring about an inter-institutional dialogue over both the budgetary procedure and the implementation of the budget. The Commission will actively assist in this dialogue. The revisions of the Financial Regulations are also being examined in the Committee on Budgets. The delivery of the Parliament's opinion and the Commission's consideration of it will take some time; and if the House thinks that it would be useful to try to deal with a priority package before the Regulation is considered as a whole, so that certain provisions can be in operation by 1982, then the Commission for its part would wish to help in that. It would no doubt serve the interests of all the institutions if that were possible.

I have not commented, Mr President, on any of the proposed amendments, for the reasons which I have said at the beginning. I will, of course, listen to the rest of the debate and I will certainly study the amendments themselves, but in a resolution of this kind I think it is right not to try to overload the central point by too much specific detail either on substance or on procedure or on policy. What is needed and what this resolution provides is a broad set of guidelines to give a framework to the subsequent conduct of the Community's business. The resolution provides what we regard as interesting and in many ways an encouraging framework, and the Commission would like to place it firmly on the record that it welcomes Mr Spinelli's initiative.

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

Vice-President

President. — I call Mr Balfe.

Mr Balfe. — Mr President, as the first speaker to follow Mr Tugendhat, may I give what I think is probably best described as a guarded welcome to the statement he has just given. I do so on my own behalf and also on behalf of the Socialist Group. This, of course, is the third budget in which we have been involved since we first came here, and although 1982 seems a long way away, I am sure this is only the first of a number of speeches which will be made on this budget.

It is significant in another very important respect. The rapporteur on this budget, Mr Spinelli, is the one person in this House who has often stood alongside some of us within the Socialist Group when we refused to support budgets in the past on the grounds that those budgets had very little to offer the ordinary people of Europe, the working people of Europe, the poorer people of Europe. I well remember the last budget put before this Parliament, when Mr Spinelli and members of the Socialist Group made exactly the same point. That is why we look forward with considerable hope to the evolution of this budget under the guidance of Mr Spinelli. As such, without endorsing every detail, I would like to say that I find the guidelines we have here before us basically sensible and good guidelines for this budget to develop on.

Nonetheless, we are still faced with the two old familiar challenges — the need to control and bring up to date the common agricultural policy and the need to put realistic amounts of money and realistic policies into this budget to benefit the poor, the unemployed, the people within Europe to whom this Common Market has meant very little, certainly very little that has been good. The struggle in the months ahead will also have to be fought against a backdrop which we all know well. At the end of this year or some time next year we are going to reach the ceiling of own resources allowed to us. We are then going to have to decide, in the debate which follows the exhaustion of own resources, what our priorities and the priorities of the Council are. It remains the firm contention of myself and my friends that the common agricultural policy has got to be brought under control and that at the moment we see no argument which would lead us to accept a need for additional own resources while the budget continues to be structured as it is at present.

The party that I represent in this House is frequently criticized for the fact that we say, as part of our philosophy, that there is no need to extend the powers of this Parliament. We say this and we say it strongly in the context of the budget at the moment, because it is quite clear that within the budgetary framework itself

Balfe

there is still much work to be done. There is a great illusion which often comes over this House that we should be seeking new things to do before we have yet managed to do the jobs already placed in front of us. Many items rejected from previous budgets are still before this House and are needed in order to make a balanced budget which will be of value to all the people we seek to represent. Many of those items are not expensive items. Many of them, for instance, the women's programme, action on the disabled, action in favour of youth, action in favour of the handicapped, are matters which would cost very little in the context of our carrying out the responsibilities we already have.

Some of the other areas of responsibility to which we must look can only help to coordinate the approach of Europe to the rest of the world. I have in mind particularly the need to bring trade under control, and I hope that in this year's budget we are going to agree to strengthen the Commission staff whose job is to monitor the anti-dumping regulations. This is a top priority if we are to bring European or EEC trade under control. There are far too few people engaged within the EEC in looking after the very vital area of the permeation of EEC markets and the way in which other countries around the world abuse the free trade regime. Let me make it quite clear that I am not speaking in favour of import controls. I am speaking in favour of fair, free trade. There is a big difference between the two concepts.

There is a vital need for this institution to come to terms with the powers it already has and to carry out the policies it has on many occasions considered or adopted. The annals of this Parliament are full of resolutions which we have taken on board without having the political will to produce the resources to bring them to fruition.

The document put forward by Mr Spinelli is, as I say, broadly acceptable. We are looking to him for great things, because so often in the past he has been one of the people who has stood with us who were critical of the budget. That is why we are looking to him for a positive budget. Most of all we are looking forward to a budget which will help the ordinary working people of Europe to realize that this EEC is for them and not just for their masters.

President. — I call Mr Pedini.

Mr Pedini. — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, Mr Tugendhat's speech has already turned this discussion into a duet between the Commission and the Parliament. Now it is up to us to add our voices to ensure that everything goes as smoothly as possible and to try to reconcile topics with timetables in order to obtain the most favourable outcome.

We in the European People's Party also believe that we are very fortunate in being able to draw on Mr Spinelli's experience, particularly his experience on the other side of the fence as a Member of the Commis-

sion. There is no one better placed when it comes to familiarity with the workings of the Community and no one in a better position to promote the reorganization of the budget so that it becomes a genuinely political instrument.

In this way, then, we should like to pay tribute to Mr Spinelli. We concur with his definition of the problem of own resources and of a well-ordered budget whose parts are blended into a coherent whole. We think that he was quite right to raise the questions of own resources and increases in the funds available while at the same time indicating the most effective ways in which such funds could be deployed, which he has done by establishing a list of priorities. On the one hand, therefore, the budget is to become a more political tool, and on the other, we are presented with a list of priorities.

I should like to express my own personal approval of the motion for a resolution which was put to us in the opening stages of this debate on the budget, and which — as Mr Tugendhat said — will have to go through various stages which will all take some time. I should nevertheless like to state very briefly — if you don't mind — my concern at some aspects of the overall state of the Community and should like to offer some recommendations.

First of all, I agree with Mr Spinelli that this debate on the budget should be an opportunity for us to think again about the agricultural policy and to correct some of its unsatisfactory aspects. We should not however like such a critical examination to lead to a situation in which the common agricultural policy would be jeopardized, Mr Spinelli, because, taken as a whole, this policy does have some merits. It has enabled Europe to feed itself independently at a time when the international economic situation has been very unsettled. In addition, it is through the common agricultural policy — and this should not be forgotten — that certain mechanisms have been institutionalized, mechanisms which have given the Community the minimum level of common authority which it needs. Let us reorganize where necessary; let us correct excesses, but let us not undermine the system as a whole as it has incontestable political value.

We approve Mr Spinelli's outline of the other priorities. It does however seem to me that this House should give top priority — second only to the tasks of the common agricultural policy which we have restated — to efforts on the part of Europe where energy is concerned. This is crucial, not just to enable us to meet our own increasingly pressing requirements, but also because, in tackling the problem of energy, we are giving a new impetus to applied scientific research and to the intellectual efforts which Europe must make in the wider scientific field. Nowadays these are essential ingredients for the up-to-date and successful management of the welfare of a community. Our great Community must make energy

Pedini

its cornerstone. Although I support Mr Spinelli's recommendations on industrial policy and on other aspects of sectoral policies, I should nevertheless like to see these areas take second place to the topic of energy and to the use of intellectual resources linked with this topic. Of course it is important for us to be aware of innovations in industry in our various countries, but we must not only be prepared for the inevitable changes in production and economic structure which such innovations will entail but also for changes in the attitude of our citizens towards new ways of deploying the labour force. New trends in industry do not just imply technological innovation, but bring with them the hope that we will ultimately be able to achieve — on the basis of the Treaties, which are behind everything that we do — mergers of firms on a Community scale. For, although the Community has been in existence for 20 years now, we have unfortunately not yet managed to achieve this. When are we going to have a budget which genuinely promotes European multinationals so that they can attain a size commensurate with the European market?

The fact is that this is a vital topic which we cannot afford to brush aside, Mr Spinelli, and we are counting on your help to support it. Mr Kavanagh will also speak about this tomorrow on behalf of the committee of which he is the vice-chairman. We are quite convinced that economic and industrial innovations, the development of an energy policy and the promotion of new forms of energy, and even the transformation of the common agricultural policy, will only be feasible if the Community also accepts its responsibilities with regard to the training of manpower. It is therefore vital to retain or to save — as the bare minimum — the educational action programme approved by the Council of Ministers during the period when you were in fact a Member of the Commission, but which are now in jeopardy, thanks to a careless vote on the part of this Parliament.

Mr President, I have already said that other people will be speaking about this subject. I myself, in my capacity as chairman of the Education Committee — please just let me tell you this — have just received a delegation of demonstrators who have come here to make an isolated protest before this Assembly. These people are not — although they could just as well have been — representative of factories and the like; no, these people are in fact representatives from centres of education. They came here to remind me of their opinions, which they asked me to put before this House, and which I may sum up as follows: our Community will not be able to develop economically and socially unless we provide education and training programmes to lay the groundwork for new technologies and new forms of energy. But above all this basic education must promote a new attitude which our Community needs if its future is to be safeguarded.

President. — Pressure of time forces us to suspend this debate until tomorrow morning.

8. Question Time

President. — The next item is the second part of Question Time (Doc. 1-964/80).

We begin with the questions addressed to the Council.

I call Question No 63, by Mr Hutton (H-644/80):

Will the President-in-Office seek the agreement of the Council to the constructive proposal made by Mr Gaston Thorn at Question Time on 19 November 1980¹ that the President-in-Office should at part-sessions be accompanied by colleagues from other Member States in the Council, at the level of ministers or junior ministers, in order to assure a closer and more continuous relationship between Council and Parliament?

Mr Van der Mei, President-in-Office of the Council. — (NL) Under the fourth paragraph of Article 140 of the EEC Treaty and Article 19 of the Council's Rules of Procedure, the Council is to be represented before Parliament by its President or any other of its Members. This does not prevent Representatives of other Member States attending Parliament's part-sessions if they so wish.

It ought to be pointed out however that Parliament should normally be addressed on the Council's behalf by the President or other Member officially designated to represent the Council.

Mr Hutton. — As the Council is a collegiate body whose decisions bind all its Members, why should not the President-in-Office be assisted by Council Members from other countries, possibly with personal experience or expertise to answer our questions in debates in Parliament to further democratize the Community? Or does the President-in-Office think that perhaps the small differences that might arise between Members from different member countries of the Council might give away to the Parliament the sort of strands of opinion which are expressed within the Council and which perhaps the Council is at pains to conceal from us?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) I should like to make it quite clear that the Council speaks through its Presidents and that the President speaks as the President of a collegiate body, i.e. he expresses the views of the Council. Should there be differences of opinion in the Council, it is obviously not the job of the President to express these differences of opinion. Secondly, I should like to point out that in the recent past several colleagues have in fact been present at a time — I am thinking, for example, of the Parliament debate on the report on the situation of women and of the delibera-

¹ Debates of the European Parliament of 19 November 1980, Provisional Edition, p. 366.

Van der Mei

tions following the address to Parliament by President Sadat. Thus, there is nothing at all unusual about several other colleagues accompanying the President-in-Office. However, when a statement is made on behalf of the Council, it is the President-in-Office who makes this statement.

President. — Since they deal with the same subject, I call Question No 64, by Mr Vié (H-649/80):

At its meetings in November the Council rejected all the proposed social measures for workers in the European steel industry. How can it justify this hostility towards workers in this sector who have been particularly hard hit by the crisis?

and Question No 70, by Mr Deleau (H-708/80):

Has the Council been able to assess the effect on employment of the postponement of its decisions regarding the financing of the social aspects of the iron and steel industry restructuring plan?

Mr Van der Mei, President-in-Office of the Council. — (NL) All the bodies of the European Coal and Steel Community, and in particular the Council, are paying the greatest attention to both the social and the economic aspects of the crisis which the European iron and steel industry is going through, with the major aim of helping to offset the effects on employment of restructuring the iron and steel industry.

The problem currently arising results from the fact that the Commission believes the ECSC, which has its own system of financial resources, is not in a position to comply as it would wish with all the readaptation applications currently submitted by the Member States, and therefore feels that use of external resources is necessary.

The Commission thinks that these should be sought in the general budget of the Communities. Some delegations have doubts about such a solution. If it is intended to introduce aid from outside the ECSC, the problem still remains how this is to be achieved.

In its Resolution of 3 March 1981 the Council confirmed that where unjustifiable burdens would be imposed on certain groups of workers, the appropriate social measures will have to be introduced to mitigate the effects of capacity reduction resulting from restructuring.

The Council will meet again on 26 March to take decisions on the above.

Mr Deleau. — (F) The reply given by the President of the Council suggests that the Commission felt that solutions should be sought in the general Community budget. However, has a budgetary appropriation been included for 1981, or are we going to have to wait

some years before this category of workers receives some help?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) As I have just explained, the Council intends to discuss this matter once again at its meeting on 26 March. As regards the specific question put by the honourable Member, I can inform you that no appropriation was included in the budget for 1981.

Mrs Lizin. — (F) Can the President of the Council tell us in what terms this item is included in the Council's agenda for 26 March. Are there any prospects of an agreement being reached and, more specifically, are those delegations which, for whatever reason, have had reservations, prepared to drop them? In a word, can we expect this Council meeting to have a positive outcome?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) The honourable Member asks on what terms the Council is to meet on 26 March. This question works on the assumption that I can foresee events in the Council to a far greater extent than is in fact the case. It is, I think, particularly difficult to say at this stage that the Council will meet on such or such terms on 26 March. I can, however, say that the Council generally speaking has the impression, as I pointed out in my original answer, that appropriate social measures are called for with a view to softening the blows as far as possible in this sector, which is particularly hard hit, and I also know, Mr President, that on 26 March the Council will endeavour to find the best and most responsible solution possible to the problems involved.

President. — I call Question No 65, by Mr Paisley (H-650/80):

In view of the extremely serious situation in the entire textile industry in Northern Ireland, which has been severely aggravated by cheap imports from non-EEC countries, what progress has been made in agreeing measures to protect our textile industry?

I call Mr Howell on a point of order.

Mr Howell. — I am asking for your guidance for one moment.

On the question that my colleague, Mr Hutton, raised, in your usual, extremely speedy fashion you managed not to call any supplementary questions other than Mr Hutton's. I did seek very hard to draw your attention to the fact that I sought the floor for one moment but you rushed past me onto the next question.

President. — Mr Howell, I hope you will forgive me, agreements, the Community is able to react speedily

President

can rest assured that it was not my intention to deny you the right to put a supplementary question. If you insist, we could return briefly to Mr Hutton's question after Mr Tyrrell's question has been put.

Mr Van der Mei, President-in-Office of the Council. — (NL) In 1977 the Community drew up an overall policy on imports of textile products originating in countries supplying low cost-price goods. In this framework it has negotiated a network of voluntary restraint agreements which lay down quantitative limitations of varying degrees of strictness according to the sensitivity of the products concerned. It has in general been possible as a result of these agreements to slow down and direct in an ordered manner the growth of imports from the countries in question.

Moreover, thanks to the machinery subsequently introduced by the Council for administering these Agreements, the Community is able to react speedily to any situation likely to disturb the Community market or that of one of its regions.

Mr Paisley. — Could the President-in-Office of the Council inform us what steps he is now going to take in view of the fact that the Northern Ireland textile industry once was 30 % of the total textile industry in the United Kingdom and now has been reduced until it is almost out of existence? Can he tell us how swiftly he can move in order to save what is left of it? Is he aware that textiles are being imported into EEC countries after being relabelled and are flooding the market and so doing permanent injury to the textile industry, especially in Northern Ireland?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) The honourable Member's question concerns, I think, not only matters of trade policy, but also matters of industrial development. As regards the trade policy aspects, I have just gone into them in my answer to his question. If we look at the figures, we see a 25 % increase in imports between 1973 and 1976. Over the period 1976 to 1979, however, the increase was only 4 %. Thus, the measures taken, which I mentioned in my original answer, have in fact been effective. So much for the trade policy aspect. As for industrial policy, i.e. the possibilities open to individual Member States to assist certain industries which are in difficulty, I can only say, Mr President, that I am not currently able to judge the extent of these possibilities. This is, I would have thought, something which the Member States would be in a better position to judge for themselves.

Mrs Kellett-Bowman. — The President-in-Office referred to imports from low-cost countries. Is the President-in-Office aware that far and away the greatest damage that has been done to the Community textile industry at the present time comes from imports the

United States? And what in fact is he proposing to ask the Commission to do about those particular imports which are smashing the textile industry in Europe?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) What the honourable Member has just stated in her question was — and I have naturally no wish to cast any aspersions — not an entirely accurate reflection of my answer, in which I referred to the growth in imports regardless of their origin. I was not referring exclusively to imports from low-cost countries.

Mr Turcat. — (F) My question is similar to that of Mrs Kellett-Bowman. I should be grateful if the President of the Council would tell us precisely how imports from the Third World on the one hand, and the United States on the other, have developed following the agreements mentioned.

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) I do not have at my disposal the exact figures broken down by origin, along the lines suggested by the honourable Member. I am prepared to consider submitting them in writing to this Assembly. As regards the United States, I should like to point out that on 16 December 1980, the Council endorsed the view that a new and more forceful initiative is required regarding imports from the United States. The Commission has accordingly been requested to continue its discussions with the United States.

Mr Beazley. — I think the President-in-Office has largely answered my question. But I did want to emphasize that the original questioner's point was that industry in Northern Ireland is being particularly strongly attacked by imports from America of synthetic fibres and carpets. Therefore I very much welcome the answer, and I ask the Council to look not just at the Northern Ireland situation and the British situation, but the whole of the European situation in regard to synthetic fibres and carpets imported from the United States on the basis of low oil prices.

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) I have taken due note of the points made by the honourable Member. He will no doubt be aware that when the Council discusses the textile industry, it considers it in the context of the entire Community, and not on the basis of individual areas.

President. — I call Question No 66, by Mr Israel (H-668/80):

Does the Council consider that questions relating to the international safeguarding of human rights fall within the scope of political cooperation?

If so, do not the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation have a moral duty to reply to

President

Members' questions concerning respect for human rights throughout the world?

Mr Van der Mei, President-in-Office of the Council.

— (NL) It is for the Ministers for Foreign Affairs meeting in European political cooperation to define, as indeed they have done, their willingness to reply to questions put to them by Members of the European Parliament.

Mr Israel. — (F) I addressed my question to the Council as the supreme European institution: I know what I am doing. Thus I am asking the Council whether or not it considers that questions relating to the international safeguarding of human rights fall within the scope of political cooperation. I am not in any way asking about the procedures according to which the Ministers meeting in political cooperation should reply to me. The question of human rights, Mr President, strikes me as sufficiently important to warrant a substantive answer and not a merely formal one.

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) It is not for the Council of Ministers as such, i.e. as a Community institution, to decide what falls within the scope of political cooperation.

President. — I call Question No 67, by Mr Marshall (H-674/80):

In view of the fact that the Arab boycott strikes at two fundamental Community principles, namely freedom of trade and respect for an individual's religion, can the Council indicate what proposals it has to counteract the boycott, especially as US anti-boycott legislation has been successful?

Mr Van der Mei, President-in-Office of the Council.

— (NL) The Council can only reaffirm the principle it has already stated on several occasions, whereby it attaches fundamental importance to non-discrimination both within the Community and in relations with third countries.

This principle is clearly set out in the agreements concluded by the Community with the various countries of the Mediterranean basin. In each of the agreements there is an article which stipulates that, in the areas covered by the agreement, the arrangements applied by the country in question *vis-à-vis* the Community may not give rise to any discrimination between the Member States, their nationals or their companies, and reciprocally as regards the arrangements applied by the Community in respect of that country.

Mr Marshall. — Would the President-in-Office of the Council not agree that anti-boycott legislation has

been particularly effective in the United States of America and that, if there could be similar legislation within the European Community, it would be equally effective? Would he not agree that it is up to the Community to adopt a European approach to this problem and show that it does not believe in discrimination by introducing anti-boycott legislation throughout the Community so that we can be seen not to be taking a one-sided approach to the problems of the Middle East?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) I have just explained quite clearly in my answer the view taken by the Community regarding the principle of non-discrimination. I explained quite clearly that the Community has included an article dealing with this point in various agreements. I would have thought the Community had done what might be expected of it.

Mr Israel. — (F) Mr President-in-Office, do you not think that the current situation is characterized by a certain imbalance, and hence a certain amount of injustice, between the various Member States as regards the problem of the boycott? We are currently faced with a range of differing reactions on the part of the countries of the Community to the blackmail of this boycott. I should therefore like to ask you whether or not you agree that this is an obstacle to the smooth running of the Community institutions?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) I am afraid I must repeat what I have just said. The Community — and this is what we are talking about, since I am speaking on behalf of the Council of the Community — has made its views on non-discrimination quite clear — indeed, it has also embodied these views in articles of the agreements it has concluded with various countries. I should think, Mr President, that this was clear enough.

Mr Tyrrell. — The principle to which the President-in-Office has referred are clear enough and they will naturally have the acceptance of the House; but do I understand him to be saying that he considered it enough for the Council to set out principles and include them in the agreements or does he regard it as part of the Council's duty to go further and see that those principles are enforced, which, in view of the continued existence of the boycott within the Community, they clearly are not?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) Naturally, the Community and the Council have more to do than simply set out principles. They must also act in accordance with them, which means that the Community should include principles of this kind in the agreements it concludes. The Community has in fact done this, and I do not think one can ask any more of the Community and the Council.

Mr Sieglerschmidt. — (D) Mr President, this Parliament is naturally familiar with the principles contained in the agreements. However, following on from Mr Tyrrell's question, I should like to ask once more what practical conclusions the Community — and I do not only mean the Council — has so far drawn from these august principles. I could quite understand if you were unable to answer this question here and now, but I should nevertheless be grateful if you could tell me in writing how these principles are put into practice within the European Community.

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) Firstly, the principle of non-discrimination is laid down in the agreements. Secondly, the agreements are legally binding on the contracting parties, i.e. the Community on the one hand and the other countries involved on the other. Thirdly, there is a joint committee which meets within the context of the agreements in order to discuss their application, and it is quite feasible that if anything were to come to light which was not in accordance with the letter and spirit of the agreement, it would be brought up in the relevant committee.

President. — Since its author is absent, Question No 68 will receive a written reply.¹

I call Question No 69, by Mr Lalor:

In the event of greatly reduced oil supplies from Iraq and Iran resulting from the present conflict in those countries, what sources of alternative oil supplies can the European Community rely upon?

Mr Van der Mei, President-in-Office of the Council. — (NL) As Parliament was told by the President-in-Office of the Council on 15 January 1981, the conflict between Iraq and Iran has not seriously interfered with the Community's oil supplies. The Community has been able to cope with the supply shortfall brought about by the conflict thanks to increased production by a number of Gulf countries, the existence of stocks in individual Member States and the energy-saving measures adopted. Moreover, both Iraq and Iran have partially resumed their exports.

Mr Lalor. — I am rather pleased to hear the President-in-Office convey that he is not in any way over-worried about the continuation of supplies of oil, and I am happy to learn that the difficulties in Iraq and Iran have not interfered too seriously with supplies. Is he fully satisfied that within the foreseeable future the prospects that he has outlined can be looked upon as reliable, and is he happy enough on the other hand with the progress made with the conservation measures taken within the Ten?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) It is, I think, particularly difficult to predict what will happen in the future, but I do think that the Community is taking account of all the possible situations which might arise in this field. Everyone in the Community is, I think, fully convinced of the gravity of the situation.

Mr Hord. — What is the Community doing to encourage the production of ethyl alcohol from Community agricultural products so as to replace traditional oil imports?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) As the honourable Member is well aware, the Council frequently acts on the basis of proposals from the Commission. We have not as yet received any proposals from the Commission on this point, but we have the impression that the possibility of such proposals being submitted is by no means out of the question.

Mr Kirk. — (DK) I was very pleased to hear the President of the Council's answer to this question by Mr Lalor, i.e. that there have been no real problems as regards our oil supplies. However, I should like to ask the President of the Council whether or not he agrees that the Community is in a very uncertain situation, that its oil supplies are in fact extremely uncertain in the long term, that over the last year there have been sharp increases in the price of the oil available to the Community, and that all this means that the Council must now pull up its socks and cooperate with the Commission in drawing up a common energy policy, so that we can gain a certain amount of control over the Community's oil supplies in the longer term?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) I must repeat that it is obviously very difficult to make precise long-term forecasts. If the honourable Member is voicing a certain doubt, a certain anxiety, I can say that in principle I can share this anxiety. However, I think it would be going much too far at this stage to say that in the long term supplies will undoubtedly be very uncertain. The honourable Member also stressed the importance of a common energy policy. This is a point on which I concur with him entirely.

Mr Moreland. — Would the President-in-Office not agree with me that the reason we have not suffered too much in the past year from the Iraq/Iran crisis in terms of our oil supplies is that over the last year Saudi Arabia has, in fact, increased its supplies quite substantially to the rest of the world, particularly to the Community? Does his situation not underline the very dramatic problem that could face the Community at any time in the future and bring home to us that we really have to consider the problem very seriously, much more seriously than perhaps the public realizes at present, and increase our own supply of indigenous

¹ See Annex.

Moreland

energy sources and improve our conservation policy considerably?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) The levelling off of energy consumption over the last few years has resulted partly from the level of economic activity. The fact that our concern regarding oil supplies could be regarded as serious, but that nevertheless we have so far managed to keep our supplies up to the mark, is connected with factors I have just mentioned, including, as the honourable Member himself has just pointed out, the increased Saudi Arabian production. If he is urging the Council to regard this entire business as an exceptionally serious matter, I can inform him that the Council has in fact taken this view and will do doubt continue to do so in the future.

Mr Fuchs. — (D) Mr President, are you prepared to do all you can to ensure that the joint negotiations between the European Community and the OPEC countries finally seriously get underway — e.g. via the Commission — with a view to achieving longer-term commitments regarding oil supplies and, above all, finding a solution to the pressing problem of the recycling of surplus revenue from oil? I regard this as a vital question if we want to make some progress as regards oil supplies.

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) I do not think the Community is conducting negotiations with the OPEC countries on this matter, although I do know that the entire question is being discussed within the International Energy Agency in which, as you know, various Member States are involved. You are aware of what is being done by the international oil companies, and you also know what individual Member States are doing as regards oil supplies.

President. — I call Question No 71, by Mrs Fourcade (H-717/80):

Insofar as it is the Community's aim to introduce a genuine energy policy, does the Council not feel that it should gradually gain better control over the supply of and demand for energy products and that, consequently, all information likely to influence the state of the market should be readily accessible?

Mr Van der Mei, President-in-Office of the Council. — (NL) The Council agrees with the honourable Member that the introduction of a genuine energy policy presupposes proper transparency of the market in energy products. However, it is to the Commission that the honourable Member should address her question, since it is for that institution to collect all the information necessary for the development and implementation of Community policies.

Mrs Fourcade. — (F) Does not the President-in-Office of the Council therefore think that, if it is for the Commission to collect this information, it is for the Member States in turn to provide them with it?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) Yes.

Mr Schmid. — (D) Mr President of the Council, do you not agree that, although it is the task of the Commission to collect information, it nevertheless needs a legal basis to do so and has made proposals for such a legal basis, but that these proposals have simply been held up by the Council of Ministers?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) I would have thought that the Commission had sufficient ways of obtaining this information from the Member States.

President. — I call Question No 72, by Mr Cousté¹ (H-718/70):

Does the Council intend to provide the aids which are indispensable for promoting a genuine market in high-capacity semi-conductors in Europe and which will enable Europe to make a major step forward in the field of data-processing and telecommunications?

Mr Van der Mei, President-in-Office of the Council. — (NL) In its Resolution of 11 September 1979, the Council acknowledged the critical importance of the micro-electronic component sector for the development and competitiveness of Community industry as a whole, and, in particular, invited the Commission to submit proposals to it as soon as possible for specific projects at Community level for promoting this technology. In September 1980, the Commission submitted to the Council a proposal for a Regulation on Community projects in the field of micro-electronic technology. Since the European Parliament, which was consulted on 19 September 1980, has not yet delivered its opinion, the Council is unfortunately unable to take a decision on this matter.

Mr Turcat. — (F) The Commission has made proposals on which Parliament is being consulted. The Committee on Energy and Research, for its part, has unanimously adopted an opinion on which I will have the honour of reporting in the near future. However, it is well known that the proposals fall far short of what the Commission and we ourselves would wish, i.e. the setting up of a European market and industrial structure, and the reason for this can be found in the lobbying to which the Commission has been subjected from industrialists and governments.

¹ Represented by Mr Turcat

Turcat

Does the Council intend to let things run their own course or does it intend to take the initiative and finally get round to drawing up a policy so that it will be possible to introduce the aids called for by Mr Cousté?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) I was very interested to hear from the honourable Member that his committee has drafted an opinion on this subject, which, at least as I understand it, covers a somewhat wider field than that to which the Commission proposals directly relate. The Council will naturally, as is customary, also be glad to familiarize itself with this opinion.

President. — I call Question No 73, by Mr Ansquer (H-739/80):

When does the Council intend to introduce the special 'EEC' mark?

Mr Van der Mei, President-in-Office of the Council. — (NL) The Council would draw the attention of the honourable Member to the fact that the Commission, when transmitting its proposals in this respect to the Council, stated in the covering letter:

The Commission thinks that the Council should act on these proposals, which constitute a whole, during 1983. The European Parliament and Economic and Social Committee should accordingly deliver their opinions before the end of 1981.

Since these proposals are at present before the European Parliament and the Economic and Social Committee for consultation, the Council has not as yet started to discuss them.

Mr Ansquer. — (F) Mr President, there can be no doubt that it is by means of measures of this kind, i.e. concrete measures such as the introduction of a 'Community mark', that the people of Europe will be able to appreciate the reality of the construction of Europe. This is why, hearing the President-in-Office's answer, I understood that the ball was in Parliament's court — that we should draft an opinion. My supplementary, therefore, is as follows. If Parliament delivers its opinion in the course of 1981, will the Council be able to keep to the time table and propose this Community mark before or during 1983?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) I fully agree with Mr Ansquer that the introduction of a European mark would be of considerable significance for the people of Europe. He went on to ask whether the Council would be able to keep to the timetable if Parliament issues its opinion in time. All I can say is that the Presidency — and of course the next presidency too, I should think — will do its utmost to observe this timetable.

Mrs Ewing. — Would the President-in-Office consider that in certain cases an EEC mark would also be protective in a rightful way? I am thinking of the kind of product made in the Shetland Islands from Shetland sheep, i.e. Shetland knitwear. At the present time there are pouring into Europe shetland jerseys which never came from any part of Europe, much less the Shetlands. Would the Council not realize that this kind of mark could also be protective in a just sense?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) As usual, Mrs Ewing has discovered an interesting aspect of this question. I have the impression that, in view of the fact that the European Parliament has still to deliver its opinion on this matter, Mrs Ewing will draw attention to this aspect in that opinion. It remains to be seen how the European Parliament's opinion will turn out and, as in the case of all opinions of this Parliament, we will give it very serious consideration.

Mr Seligman. — Does the Council agree that if we had that sort of trademark it would enable the public to know the origin of these products and, if they were European, it would in fact encourage preference in the Community — the practice of preference which is written into the Treaty?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) We can, I think, discover various very important aspects of the European mark in the course of discussion. However, I may perhaps have to disappoint the honourable Members by saying that I cannot really go into the substance of these questions, since the Council has not yet been able to discuss it. We are awaiting with great interest the opinion of the European Parliament in which the various aspects will undoubtedly play a role.

President. — Since its author is absent, Question No 74 will receive a written reply ¹.

I call Question No 75, by Mr Hänsch (H-741/80):

Can the Council confirm press reports that during a Commission meeting the British Prime Minister made a telephone call to the President of the Commission at the request of the British Commissioner, Mr Tugendhat, seeking a particular allocation of responsibilities to his advantage and claiming that the allocation of the duties in question to the Irish Commissioner Mr O'Kennedy, would be a 'slight to the United Kingdom'?

Does the Council agree that in view of this incident Commissioner Tugendhat's independence — a quality required of Commissioners by Article 10 of the Merger Treaty — is no longer 'beyond doubt' and is it therefore prepared to request that Commissioner Tugendhat be compulsorily retired pursuant to Article 13 of the Merger Treaty?

¹ See Annex.

Mr Van der Mei, President-in-Office of the Council. — (NL) The question raised by the honourable Member is not a matter for the Council since the allocation of responsibilities amongst Members of the Commission falls to that institution alone.

Mr Hänsch. — (D) Does the President-in-Office agree that, by her action, the British Prime Minister has given a bad example which the other governments should not follow if the independence of the Commission and the effectiveness of the Treaties are to be guaranteed? I would be interested to hear your opinion, Mr President of the Council.

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) I have just stated quite clearly, and I will repeat, that the matter raised by the honourable Member does not come within the competency of the Council.

Mr Spicer. — Although the President-in-Office has quite rightly referred this question back and said that it is no concern of the Council, would he not as a politician agree that it is an extremely naïve question and that since the inception of the Community, from time to time governments of Member States have intervened to forward the interests of their own nationals, not in a nationalistic sense but in the interests of the Community?

(Laughter)

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) The honourable Member will no doubt realize that it has never been, nor can it ever be, the job of the Presidency to pass comment on behalf of the Council on the nature of the questions.

(Laughter)

Mr Schmid. — (D) Mr President-in-Office, Mr Hänsch referred explicitly to Article 13 of the Merger Treaty and pointed out that the Council has the right to request that a Commissioner be compulsorily retired. Could you, therefore, please explain how you can state that this matter does not come within the competency of the Council?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) The honourable Member referred to the point made by Mr Hänsch in his question in which, on the basis of Article 13 of the Merger Treaty, he asks the Council whether it is prepared to request the Court of Justice, by virtue of this Article, to order the compulsory retirement of the Commissioner.

The answer is no.

President. — I call Question No 76, by Mr Bonde (H-743/80):

Will the Council see to it that the Commission is deprived of its possibilities for interfering in Danish regional development so as to allow the Danish authorities themselves to decide whether or not they wish to grant regional development aid to Kalundborg and other areas of unemployment in Denmark?

Mr Van der Mei, President-in-Office of the Council. — (NL) The Council has no precise information about the facts referred to by the honourable Member. Should the point at issue be the granting by the Danish authorities of regional aid as referred to in Article 92 (3) of the Treaty, the Council would point out that it does not have the power to alter a responsibility conferred on the Commission by an article in the Treaty.

Mr von der Vring. — (D) Has the President of the Council ever heard of the Commission forcing money on Denmark which it did not want?

Mr Bonde. — (DK) The problem here is that the Commission is restricting the areas where we can provide regional development aid, while at the same time the economic consequences of Community membership are such that the need for regional development has increased. Since Denmark joined the Community, unemployment has risen from 21 800 to a quarter of a million, which means in practical terms that the entire country has become a major regional development area. I should like to ask the President of the Council to go back to the Council and urge his colleagues to change the rules which currently make it possible for the Commission to interfere in Danish regional development.

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) These two questions are, in my view, more matters for the Commission. Mr Bonde asks whether I am willing to go back to the Council and deprive the Commission of some of its powers. I can say in answer to this that I am definitely willing to go home, but not to relieve the Commission of responsibilities conferred upon it by virtue of the Treaty.

Mr Kirk. — (DK) What we are supposed to be doing at the moment is, I think, putting supplementary questions, and since Mr Bonde did not put a supplementary question, I do not think he should have received an answer to his remarks either.

What I would like to ask the President of the Council is whether or not Denmark is still able to grant regional development aid provided it is not such as to distort competition. Is Denmark not in the same situation as all the other Member States, i.e. can it not grant regional development aid in areas where there is a need for it, provided this aid does not distort competition between the Member States? If the answer to

Kirk

this question is 'Yes', I should like to ask whether people should not then stop interfering in the Commission's tasks regarding regional development in the various areas of the Community.

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) As I already pointed out in my original answer, Article 92 (3) of the Treaty contains provisions regarding the various aspects of this question and mentions the compatibility of certain measures with the common market. If aids are granted for certain areas, the questions of whether these measures are in keeping with the common market must be examined. Who is responsible for looking into this question? The Commission. Thus, if you have problems in this field, you should address yourself not to the Council but to the Commission.

Mr Paisley. — Could the President-in-Office confirm that no money is available for any regional development unless it is applied for by the national government of that particular country?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) Yes.

President. — We continue with the questions addressed to the Foreign Ministers.

I call Question No 97, by Mrs Ewing (H-702/80):

In view of the huge drop in the number of Jews granted emigration visas in the Soviet Union (from 51 320 in 1979 to 21 471 in 1980, a reduction of 58 %), and in view of the huge increase in families who have applied to leave and in view of the almost total cessation of visas granted to long-term 'refusniks', will the Foreign Ministers state whether this matter was raised in Madrid and, if so, what assurances, if any, were given on this matter.

Mr Van der Mei, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — (NL) Various Western delegations including a number of Member States brought this matter up in a statement made at the CSCE follow-up meeting in Madrid but did not, however, receive any assurances.

Mrs Ewing. — Since the President-in-Office appears to agree that this is a very tragic matter in which the mere act of application is an act of courage and often results in severe harassment, may I ask him whether he would consider it appropriate to seek the rôle of mediator between Israel and the USSR and the United States and the USSR? At Madrid the USSR could answer criticisms to some extent by saying that many Jewish applicants were pleading the right to return to Israel but were ending up in New York. Does it not seem clear that the United States do not realize the harm they are doing by preventing the flow of applicants going to the State of Israel, and might it not be appropriate for the President to act directly or to offer his services as a mediator?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) As the honourable Members knows, within the context of European political cooperation, the President-in-Office can only make statements based on agreement between the Member States who take part in this political cooperation. This means that I cannot at this point in time answer the honourable Member's question.

Mr Marshall. — Would the President-in-Office of the Council not agree that it is essential to maintain the greatest possible pressure on the Russian authorities to liberalize their present policies? He might be interested to know that on a recent visit to Israel a former 'refusnik' said to me that when she was in Russia her only hope was the pressure of world opinion and the interest of the West. Can we have an assurance that the pressure of world opinion and the interest of the West will be maintained and increased?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) As I pointed out in my original answer, various Member States exercised the pressure referred to by the honourable Member in Madrid.

Mr Israel. — (F) In view of the great moral significance of this question, which is an aspect of the more general question of human rights, can the President of the Council assure us that it will remain on the agenda for the Foreign Ministers meeting in Political Cooperation?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) The agenda of the Foreign Ministers meeting in Political Cooperation includes subjects on which it might be expected that a consensus might be reached.

Mr Paisley. — While pursuing with vigour the protest of the EEC over the treatment of Jews by the Soviet authorities, will the President-in-Office also keep in mind similar treatment meted out to Christians, especially fundamental Christians in Russia; and is he aware that this treatment forced some Pentecostal Christian women recently to protest, only to be very savagely dealt with by the Kremlin authorities?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) Mr Paisley has pointed out that, in addition to the problem of the treatment of the Jews in the Soviet Union, there is also the problem of the treatment of Christians in the Soviet Union. He calls for similar attention to be paid to this problem, and I think we can only go along with him on this point.

Mr Turcat. — (F) In connection with the answer just given by the President-in-Office, I should like to know whether the consensus to which he refers in fact

Turcat

exists and if this question can therefore remain on the agenda, regardless of whether it concerns Jews or Christians.

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) I should like to repeat that the agenda of the Foreign Ministers meeting in Political Cooperation consists of matters on which there is a possibility of a consensus being reached.

President. — I call Mr Israël on a point of order.

Mr Israël. — (F) I should like to ask the President-in-Office whether or not he understood Mr Turcat's question correctly, i.e. is there a consensus within the Council on the question of Soviet Jews?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) As I have just explained in answer to questions by previous Members, the subjects included on the agenda for European political cooperation are ones which can be usefully discussed and on which it is likely that a consensus might be reached.

President. — I call Question No 98, by Mr Vlachopoulos (H-724/80):

As we all know, the wave of violence and terrorism grows incessantly and human life and dignity are daily in peril by anarchists and terrorists of every kind who blackmail governments and peoples — as in the recent example of the Italian judge who was kidnapped — with the result that law and order are paralyzed while the law of the jungle prevails.

Since this problem is worldwide, and also affects the Member States of the EEC, should it not form the subject of a discussion between the Foreign Ministers of the ten Member States with a view to finding a common basic response to this danger either through the imposition of a uniform penalty (reintroducing the death penalty for people committing terrorism and political kidnappings) or through the creation of a common criminal pursuit agency capable of combating and stamping out organized crime?

Mr Van der Mei, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — (NL) The importance of a common approach to the combating of terrorism has been the subject of the attention of the governments of the Member States for some time now. Since 1976, a working party of top officials has been working under the responsibility of the ministers of the Member States responsible for security matters. This working party meets regularly and has laid the basis for closer cooperation between the police authorities of the Member States. The wish of the European Council to establish closer cooperation between the Member States as regards the punishment of acts of terrorism has also led to the signing by the Ministers of Justice of the Member States in Dublin in December 1979 of an agreement between the Member States on the

application of the Council of Europe convention on the combating of terrorism. Clearly, these forms of cooperation afford adequate possibilities for an effective approach to the combating of terrorism, without prejudice to the opinion, responsibilities and legal traditions of each of the Member States.

Mr Vlachopoulos. — (EL) Mr President, I was glad to hear that serious steps are already being taken to combat terrorism. I am aware of the existence of this working party, just as I know that, on 27 January 1977, a convention on the suppression of terrorism was signed by the member countries of the Council of Europe. We are all aware that terrorism is on the increase, and that many peoples are now living in fear and insecurity. My aim therefore, Mr President, was to convey to Parliament my hope that all of us in this House will take a more serious look at this phenomenon which in one way or another is a source of concern to us all. I am sure that we shall be able to agree on an approach, since all the parties in this House — to their honour — have condemned terrorist activities.

Mr Marshall. — Would the President-in-Office not agree that one of the major Community problems is that one Community country has become a haven for terrorists who have committed crimes in a neighbouring Community country and that whatever lily-livered liberals may say, the majority of people within the Community believe that bloody terrorists who have committed dastardly crimes deserve the death penalty?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) The honourable Member has raised a number of points which have not been discussed within the context of European political cooperation.

Mr Tyrrell. — The President-in-Office referred to the Dublin convention of December 1979 as having been signed by the Member States. Would he please tell us how many have ratified it? Could he also tell us whether the Convention on Criminal Cooperation that was ready for signature in Rome in June 1980 is about to be opened for signature by the ten Member States, and if not, why not?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) I am not at present able to provide the honourable Member with the information he requires.

President. — I call Question No 99, by Mr Boyes (H-748/80):

In view of the important role played by a member of the group of non-aligned countries in a difficult international problem and the reply by Mr Gaston Thorn to my previous questions at the November 1980 part-session,

President

would the President-in-Office state whether he intends to meet the chairman (or his representatives) of the non-aligned countries during his term of office?

Mr Van der Mei, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — (NL) In view of the overcrowded agenda for the next few months, it is not likely that the President will be able to find time for a special meeting with the chairman of the non-aligned countries or his representative. However, the President-in-Office would naturally be very pleased if such an opportunity were to arise. I might point out in this connection, however, that the normal contacts between the President-in-Office of the Ten and the members of the group of non-aligned countries will continue at diplomatic level.

Mr Boyes. — It is unfortunate that that is the second President-in-Office who has given me that reply, and I regret it very much. The non-aligned countries are a large and very important bloc; we are going through a period marked by the proliferation of cruise missiles, the breakdown of SALT II, the election of a sabre-rattling Ronald Reagan as President of the United States already making threats of blockades; and I should have thought that the President-in-Office of the Council would be informing this Parliament that he will be meeting all peoples of the world who have an interest in peace. I would ask him if he will give me an assurance that he will review the answer that he has given me this afternoon.

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) Mr President, I have no intention of rephrasing my original answer as I do not think there was anything at all wrong with it. In principle, I said that I would be prepared to hold such a meeting, but that, in practical terms, it seems to me that it would be somewhat difficult to find time for such a meeting in view of the very full agenda. If this should prove possible, I should be very glad. What more can the honourable Member ask?

Mr Boyes. — I expected a better answer than that!

President. — I call Question No 100, by Mr Tyrrell (H-753/80):

What is impeding agreement on procedures for the transfer of nationals of Member States while serving prison sentences in a Member State other than their own, to a prison in their own Member State, where the rehabilitative process is likely to be more effective?

Mr Van der Mei, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — (NL) I was particularly interested in this question by the honourable Member, and I am therefore sorry to have to inform you that the question of the transfer of prisoners has not been discussed within the context of political cooperation.

Mr Tyrrell. — The Parliament knows from previous questions that have been asked and answered that this has been on the agenda of the Council of Justice Ministers meeting in cooperation since about 1977 and I am, therefore, surprised at the answer that has been given, which I take to mean that it is not currently on the agenda; and I would ask the President-in-Office whether he does not think that it ought to be restored to the agenda and whether he does not think that this little section of cooperation in matters affecting criminal justice is one that could be severed from the major field of the *espace judiciaire* and dealt with rapidly and effectively.

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) There are two aspects to the honourable Member's question, i.e. a procedural and a substantive aspect. I cannot answer the substantive question as this matter has not been discussed in the context of European political cooperation. As regards the procedural aspect, the honourable Member asks whether it would not be a good idea to include this matter on the agenda. Mr President, I should like to repeat in this connection that we include on the agenda for European political cooperation only such matters on which one might reasonably expect a consensus to be reached.

President. — I call Question No 101, by Mr Van Miert (H-754/80):

How do the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation view the proposal by the French President for a conference on Afghanistan of all the parties involved with the aim of stopping all foreign intervention at the same time and with supervision of this process?

Mr Van der Mei, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — (NL) The Member States have made various statements regarding Afghanistan within the context of political cooperation, the most recent being the declaration made following the meeting of the European Council in Venice on 12 and 13 June 1980, in which the European Council reaffirmed its conviction that it is essential that we should endeavour without delay to find a solution which, in accordance with the resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations, will guarantee the withdrawal of Soviet forces and enable the people of Afghanistan to exercise freely their right to self-determination. The European Council recalled that, on 28 April in Luxembourg, it had proposed that the major powers and the States within the region concerned should take up the necessary contacts. In particular, they should agree to respect the sovereignty and integrity of Afghanistan and to refrain from any interference in the internal affairs of that country, from positioning any troops in its territory or from entering into any form of military alliance with it. Finally, the European Council reaffirmed that it was prepared to support any practical initiative aimed at bringing a solution to the Afghanistan crisis nearer to hand.

Mr Van Miert. — (NL) Mr President, can you tell me then whether or not this position adopted by the Foreign Ministers means that they are not in favour of the real possibility that the United States will supply military equipment to the resistance, whether or not the ministers might be prepared to recognize the resistance as such and if they could look into the advisability of doing so?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) The aspects mentioned by the honourable Member have not up to now been discussed within the context of political cooperation.

Mr Spicer. — Would the President-in-Office not confirm that all talk of conferences and further intervention would be quite pointless if the one salient feature could be dealt with and if the Soviet occupation forces could be withdrawn from Afghanistan and end their brutal occupation of that country?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) I should like to remind the honourable Member of what I said in my original answer, in which I referred to the declaration of the European Council following the meeting in Venice on 12 and 13 June 1980. In that declaration, the aspect to which the honourable Member has drawn attention was made quite clear. The withdrawal of the Soviet troops is one of the main points contained in the Venice declaration.

Mr De Goede. — (NL) Can the President-in-Office of the Council give an undertaking that the Netherlands presidency will see to it that the question of Afghanistan and the relations between the Soviet Union and the West will be included on the agenda for the European Council to be held in two weeks time in Maastricht? My reasons for asking are as follows. Firstly, the most recent declaration by the Council is already eight months old, dating as it does from June 1980, and is hardly relevant by now. Secondly, there is the crumbling grain embargo *vis-à-vis* the Soviet Union and thirdly, the recent Brezhnev initiative is worth answering. Can the President promise that this matter will be discussed at the Summit, or at least that the Netherlands presidency will make an effort in this direction?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) Mr De Goede has asked whether this subject can be included on the agenda for the European Council meeting in Maastricht and mentioned a few reasons why this should be done. The Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation have not discussed these aspects as yet, and it is therefore impossible for me to give an affirmative answer to this question.

President. — I call Question No 102, by Mr Patterson (H-760/80):

Is any progress being made on the proposal that the ten Member States of the European Community should be represented in third countries by a single embassy and a single consular service?

Mr Van der Mei, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — (NL) The representation of the ten Member States of the Community in third countries by a single embassy and a single consular service has not in recent years been discussed within the context of European political cooperation. However, the honourable Member will not be unaware that, in specific cases in which the Community has adopted a joint position, the embassy of the country currently holding the presidency of the Ten acts as spokesman for the ten Member States in third countries.

Mr Patterson. — In view of that reply that the matter has not been discussed, I have to ask him why not? Does he not think that the title of his office, President-in-Office of the Ministers meeting in political cooperation, is significant and that this would be a significant example of political cooperation if it happened and is he prepared under the Dutch presidency to do a financial study of the savings to each Member State's budget of carrying out this proposal?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) This question was in fact discussed on one occasion by the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation, but they were unable to come to any agreement at that time.

Mr Deschamps. — (F) In that case, does not the President of the Council feel that the *de facto* cooperation which already exists in certain cases between the ambassadors of the Ten within the context of political cooperation should at least be affirmed and strengthened when this political cooperation comes to be reassessed — which is something which should take place in the near future — and does he not think that the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation could perhaps give their representatives instructions to this effect immediately?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) The *de facto* cooperation between the ambassadors to which the honourable Member refers is indeed important. I can endorse this point of view and do not think there is any misunderstanding on this point.

President. — Since its author is absent, Question No 103 will receive a written reply.¹

¹ See Annex.

President

I call Question No 104, by Mr Paisley (H-788/80):

In view of the possible entry of Spain into the EEC has the Spanish claim of jurisdiction over Gibraltar been discussed and what decisions have been taken?

Mr Van der Mei, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — (NL) The question of Gibraltar has always been regarded as a bilateral affair concerning the United Kingdom and Spain and has never been officially discussed by the Ten.

Mr Paisley. — Would the President-in-Office tell us the relationship at the moment between the Rock and the Community EEC and could he also tell us, if Spain comes into the EEC, what is going to be the relationship if the border between the Rock and Spain is still closed?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) The honourable Member has mentioned a number of aspects of this problem, but, as I have already said in my original answer, this is a matter which must be settled bilaterally by the United Kingdom and Spain.

Mr Simpson. — Will the President-in-Office of the Council acknowledge the fact of the referendum which took place a few years ago in Gibraltar whereby only 44 of the inhabitants were against retaining British citizenship and see that that matter is borne in mind at all times during any negotiations?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) However important a referendum may be, it has not been discussed within the context of political cooperation.

Miss Hooper. — In view of the fact that Gibraltar is part of the European Community does not the President-in-Office consider that the Council of Ministers should take some steps in helping towards the opening of the frontier between Spain and Gibraltar in accordance with the bilateral agreement between the United Kingdom and Spain?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) If I heard her correctly, the honourable Member has just put a question to the Council whereas we were, I thought, currently dealing with questions to the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation. Speaking in that capacity therefore — and I cannot speak in any other capacity without being out of order, Mr President — I must repeat once more that this is a matter which should be dealt with bilaterally by the United Kingdom and Spain.

Mr Patterson. — In view of that last answer I have to say that the President-in-Office may not be able to answer this question, but could he not say that the existence of a border between Gibraltar and Spain will be incompatible with membership of the Community when Spain becomes a member, and surely this should

be something which is discussed in political cooperation before that membership takes place?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) As the honourable Member is naturally aware, if the Member States of the Community talk about borders, they talk about customs borders. However, the border referred to by the honourable Member is a different kettle of fish, and if it is to be discussed it must, I repeat, be discussed on the bilateral basis I have already frequently referred to in answer to other questions.

President. — I call Question No 105, by Mr Kavanagh (H-814/80);

Will the Foreign Ministers join in the condemnation, and call for the cancellation, of the proposed tour of South Africa by the Irish Rugby Football Union?

Mr Van der Mei, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — (NL) The Ten as such are fully aware of the political implications of sporting contacts with South Africa. However, the ten Foreign Ministers have not discussed the question raised by the honourable Member within the context of political cooperation. They would nevertheless point out that the governments of certain individual Member States have publicly stated their disapproval of the tour of South Africa to which the honourable Member refers. The entire responsibility for the matter nevertheless rests with a private sports association in a particular country.

Mr Kavanagh. — In view of the likely adverse effects on Irish and Community relations, with independent African States in all areas — political, cultural, commercial or sporting — should not the Foreign Ministers show solidarity with the decision of a member government by adding their condemnation to that of a government of the Community in trying to dissuade this team and its officials from travelling to South Africa?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) Firstly, I should like to point out once more that this matter has not been discussed in the context of political cooperation. Secondly, I should like to refer you to what I said at the end of my previous answer, i.e. that the responsibility for this matter rests with a private sports association in a particular country.

Mr Paisley. — Is the President-in-Office aware that the Irish Rugby Football Union includes both Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland? And would he not agree with me that it is hypocrisy for the Irish government to make a protest on this issue when they were prepared to send their teams to the Olympic Games in Moscow?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) This is not a matter which has been discussed within the context of European political cooperation and I cannot, therefore, give an answer to this question either.

Mr Marshall. — Would the President-in-Office of the Council note the fact that many people within the Community welcome the proposed tour of the Irish Rugby Football Union to South Africa and would he please note that sporting links between the Community and South Africa have been responsible for the amelioration of some of the excesses of the detestable apartheid régime?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) I should naturally be glad to note all the points made by the honourable Member, which are very important.

Mr J. D. Taylor. — Is the President-in-Office of the Council aware that this team, representing both the United Kingdom and the Republic of Ireland, will be playing mixed race teams in South Africa and will be following in the steps and traditions of the British Lions team which went to South Africa last year? Is he aware that the majority of people throughout the entire island of Ireland are opposed to apartheid and is he aware also that, contrary to the misleading propaganda from republicans in the Republic of Ireland, the vast majority of rugby supporters throughout the entire island of Ireland welcome this visit to South Africa?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) I was very interested to hear the point made by the honourable Member.

Mr Enright. — Is the President aware of the strength of feeling shown at the recent ACP-EEC Joint Committee meeting held in Freetown, of which Mr Taylor should certainly have been aware? There was widespread feeling that it was sheer camouflage on the part of South Africa designed to hide apartheid and the fact that people are suffering much more in sport than ever before, as reported by English cricketers who have come back from coaching. Would the President-in-Office of the Council not agree that he should be giving a lead through the Foreign Ministers meeting in cooperation if we are to retain any credibility in important commercial relationships with countries like Nigeria?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) The Foreign Ministers are naturally concerned to promote the credibility of European political cooperation *vis-à-vis* the rest of the world.

President. — I call Mr De Goede for a procedural motion.

Mr De Goede. — (NL) Mr President, one cannot help noticing how often the President-in-Office has to answer that the subject has not been discussed within the context of political cooperation. I should therefore like to ask the Bureau to consider whether or not it would in future be more sensible first of all to ask the Council what matters have been discussed, so that we

can then go into these subjects in greater detail and obtain some factual information. Question Time as it is being conducted at present, Mr President, is, I think, extremely unsatisfactory.

President. — I take due note of your proposal and will submit it to the Bureau.

The second part of Question Time is closed.¹

9. Agenda for next sitting

President. — The next sitting will take place at 9 a.m., 3 p.m. and 9 p.m. tomorrow, Thursday, 12 March 1981, with the following agenda:

- vote on various requests for urgent procedure
- conclusion of the debate on the Lalor report on the Western Sahara and vote
- Poniatowski report on Zimbabwe
- Castellina report on Stabex
- continuation of the debate on the Spinelli report on the budget guidelines for 1982
- Pruvot report on youth activities
- Prag report on linking work and training for young people
- Lenz report on EEC-Romania relations
- Luster report on compensation for victims of acts of violence
- Malangré report on immigration controls in the United Kingdom
- Key report on the harmonization of social legislation in the field of transport
- Curry report on the disruption of the Community apple market
- Colleselli report on the situation of wine-growers in the Community
- Kirk report on fishing quotas for 1981
- Provan report on statistical surveys on bovine livestock
- Fruh report on infrastructures in less-favoured agricultural regions in Germany

6 p.m.: votes

- on the calendar of part-sessions from September to December 1981
- on the motions for resolutions on which the debate has closed.

The sitting is closed.

(The sitting was closed at 7.10 p.m.)

¹ Verification of credentials and decision on urgency: see minutes of proceedings.

ANNEX

Questions which could not be answered during Question Time, with written answers

I. *Questions to the Commission*

Question No 3, by Mr Ansquer (H-620/80)

Subject: Common strategy towards Japan

In the light of Japan's commercial expansionism does the Commission not think that a political response should be envisaged which would enable the Community interests to be protected?

Answer

1. The Commission is well aware of the challenge which Japan's economic might and export offensive pose for the Community.
2. On 25 November 1980 the Council of Ministers adopted a statement on the Community's relations with Japan. It covered three requests:
 - effective moderation of Japanese exports to the Community;
 - greater competitiveness by European industry;
 - greater involvement by European industry in the Japanese market.
3. Talks have since taken place on a number of occasions between the Commission and the Japanese Government. The Commission expressed its great concern at the economic and social problems caused by the sharp rise in Japanese exports. On 16 February 1981 the Council issued another statement expressing its concern at the trade relations between Japan and the Community.
4. In response to European pressure, the Japanese Government has urged the relevant industries in Japan to pursue their European export policies with greater discretion. In the light of these assurances the Commission will pay very close attention to the pattern of imports from Japan, especially as regards a number of key products.

*

* *

Question No 4, by Mr Tuckman (H-683/80)

Subject: VAT threshold for small firms

Is the Commission satisfied with the existing threshold embodied in the Sixth VAT Directive for the exemption of small firms from paying VAT and keeping records?

Answer

In reply to the honourable Member's question, the Commission is satisfied with the existing threshold for the exemption of small firms from paying VAT.

The Commission feels, nevertheless, that there is a need to revise the variations which were agreed on when the Sixth Directive was formulated and which permit certain Member States to apply higher exemption thresholds. The Commission intends to draw up proposals on this matter in connection with the report on the application of the VAT Directive which is to be submitted to the Council by 1 January 1982.

*

* *

Question No 5, by Mr Cronin (H-685/80)

Subject: 'Structures' or 'rural development'

In February 1979, the President of the Commission, Mr Roy Jenkins proposed that the term 'agricultural structures'¹ should be replaced by the term 'rural development'. Does the Commission intend to implement this suggestion?

Answer

The remark to which the honourable Member refers was made by President Jenkins in his programme speech to this Parliament two years ago.

The point which Mr Jenkins was making — and I entirely agree with him — is that our agricultural structures policy must in the end be concerned not with the number of cows or hectares, but with human beings and their way of life and standard of living. Our agricultural policy cannot work in isolation from our other instruments of regional, social, environmental and other policies.

That is the reason why this Commission will not only intensify its structural efforts in the agricultural policy, but will also seek to coordinate the actions of the other Community policies and funds in rural areas.

*

* *

Question No 6, by Mr Davern (H-686/80)

Subject: Serious shortage in Ireland of winter fodder for livestock

As a direct result of the bad summer in Ireland in 1980, many Irish farmers have insufficient winter fodder and may be forced to sell their livestock with unforeseeable disastrous consequences. What steps can the Commission take to avoid such a disaster?

Answer

I am pleased to be able to inform the honourable Member that the Commission has just proposed a number of measures to aid the livestock sector in Ireland in the present period of difficulty. These involve the following:

- a development programme for the livestock population, including aid for the production of silage, for the use of calcium, for the inspection of calves and artificial insemination;
- aid for the prevention of disease, including aid for the inspection of animals before they leave the herd;
- aid for cows in milk.

I believe that these measures can be of positive help to the Irish farmers, and I hope that they will meet with a favourable reception from this Parliament.

*

* *

¹ OJ No 239, Debates of the European Parliament, p. 34.

Question No 14, by Mr Normanton (H-697/80)

Subject: European Foundation

Can the Commission report progress towards the establishment of the European Foundation?

Answer

The Commission must acknowledge that no progress has been made in negotiations within the Council for an agreement among the Member States on the establishment of the European Foundation which was envisaged in the decision and directives of the European Council which met in Copenhagen on 7 and 8 April 1978. As in the past, the Commission is always ready to contribute to talks aimed at solving the existing problems.

*

* *

Question No 19, by Mrs Ewing (H-730/80)

Subject: EEC funds for fish farmers

Will the Commission make a statement on access to EEC funds by fish farmers?

Answer

1. On 18 July 1980 the Commission submitted to the Council a proposal for a common measure for restructuring, modernizing and developing the fishing industry and for developing aquaculture (document COM (80) 420 final), the financial provisions of which were subsequently amended in a proposal submitted to the Council on 2 December 1980 (document COM (80) 787 final).

This proposal provides, *inter alia*, for aid from EAGGF Guidance Fund (usually of 25 % of the cost) to investment projects in aquaculture and makes available 42 million ECU for this purpose over a period of five years.

2. This proposal has, however, not yet been adopted by the Council owing to the absence of agreement on other aspects of the common fisheries policy. At the present time, therefore, there are no EEC funds available for aid to fish farmers.

*

* *

Question No 20, by Mr Van Miert (H-755/80)

Subject: Request from the military régime in Bolivia for accreditation to the European Communities

Can the Commission confirm that the Bolivian military régime, sharply criticized in the European Parliament resolution of 19 September 1980 for its continued infringements of human rights, has submitted a request for accreditation to the European Communities, and what action does it intend to take in this matter?

Answer

The Bolivian Government has in fact submitted a request for the accreditation of an ambassador to the European Communities

The procedure for the approval of an ambassador requires agreement between the Council and the Commission. This procedure has not yet been completed

*

* *

Question No 22, by Mr Schmid (H-758/80)

Subject Closure subsidies for the steel industry

Does the Commission intend to rationalize the closure subsidies for the steel industry, financed at national or European level, and if so, on what legal basis?

Answer

The question as to whether closure subsidies can be a suitable and efficient measure in the restructuring of the steel industry is currently being studied by the Commission. Parliament will be promptly and fully informed of the conclusions.

*

* *

Question No 23, by Mrs Le Roux (H-759/80)

Subject Fixing of quotas in the fisheries sector

To what level does the Commission intend to reduce France's share of fishing in the EEC? Do these figures refer to the proportion of aid for ships, which has been set at 9 % for France for the next five years?

Answer

With regard to the first part of the question concerning France's share of fishing, the honourable Member is referred to the answer to Oral Question No 0-81/80 which she and other Members tabled to the Commission on 2 February 1981

With regard to the policy on investment aid for fishing fleets, the Commission did not propose that Community aid be allocated to Member States on a quota basis. Each project is assessed on its own merits, in the light of priority to be laid down in Community rules and with special regard for the multiannual programmes which are to be drawn up by the Member States and approved by the Commission.

*

* *

Question No 26, by Mr Van Aerssen (H-775/80)

Subject: Importing and exporting of works of art for exhibitions

Is the Commission aware of the difficulties facing the organizers of exhibitions when temporarily importing and exporting works of art and does the Commission agree that, despite the differences in rates of VAT, there are ways in which the regulations governing the temporary importation of works of art could be made more flexible?

What measure has the Commission proposed to improve the situation in this field?

Answer

The Commission is aware of the difficulties facing organizers of exhibitions when temporarily importing and exporting works of art. As it has already stated in its answer to Written Question No 1270/80, by Mrs Dienesch, the Commission will, for this reason, submit a proposal to the Council in the near future with a view to introducing a regulation for intra-Community transport of goods despatched from one Member State for temporary use in another

It is the aim of this proposal to make the arrangements covering the transport of goods of this kind more flexible by means of, *inter alia*, exemption from securities.

These provisions will apply both to artists transporting their own works and works of art being sent for exhibitions.

*

* *

Question No 27, by Mrs Pruvot (H-763/80)

Subject: Use of the regional press by the Commission

The Commission does not appear to make sufficient use of the Member States' regional press. Is the Commission not aware that these newspapers are read by the vast majority of Europeans? Is it in the position to improve the situation?

Answer

1. The Commission is in full agreement with the questioner and has endeavoured to find concrete solutions. In the light of the available resources, however, these are undoubtedly still too modest in their scope.
2. Activities in connection with the regional press date back several years and consist of two aspects. On the one hand, there is the regular provision of information of particular interest to the readers and on the other hand, the question of enabling journalists to come regularly to Brussels for the purpose of information or increasing their knowledge of European reality.
3. Permanent contacts have been established by our Press and Information Bureaus and a number of joint and individual information visits take place every year.
4. In addition, the Spokesmen's Group in Brussels sends its up-to-date news reports to a number of selected regional publications. The Directorate-General for Information for its part sends the weekly bulletin 'Eurofocus' to a list of approximately 7 000 selective regional and local publications. This bulletin mainly deals with the daily interests of the citizens.

*

* *

Subject: Aid to British Leyland

What action is the Commission currently taking with regard to the £ 990 million aid being given by the British Government to British Leyland?

Answer

The Commission has been informed of the aid to British Leyland, in accordance with Article 93(3) of the EEC Treaty. The Commission departments are examining this measure in the light of the Treaty rules on competition.

*

* *

Question No 30, by Mrs Kellett-Bowman (H-767/80)

Subject: Study on social work, education and training in the European Community

When does the Commission intend publishing the study on social work, education and training in the Community by Mrs Warchawiac which it received in November 1980?

Answer

The study on the training of social workers in the Member States of the European Community drawn up by Mrs Warchawiac was submitted to the Commission in December 1980. In view of the need to finalize and translate the study, the Commission is unable to give the exact date on which it will be available.

*

* *

Question No 31, by Mr Collins (H-768/80)

Subject: Dangers of lead poisoning

Will the Commission publish the recent study of the effects of lead in drinking water supplies and will it say whether it is its intention to take action to protect the public from the possible dangers of lead poisoning?

Answer

The Commission is not aware of a recent study carried out under its auspices on the effects of lead in drinking water.

A list of research work undertaken in this area in Europe was prepared four years ago by Commission officials for a WHO working party which met in London. The findings of this meeting were made available by the WHO European office in Copenhagen.

The Commission considered the working party's findings when it drew up its draft directive on the quality of water for human consumption. This directive was adopted by the Council on 15 July 1980 (80/778/EEC). As far as the standard quality of water is concerned, the directive is scheduled to come into force in July 1985.

*

* *

Question No 34, by Mr Møller (H-773/80)

Subject: Taxes levied on employers in Sweden

The Swedish authorities are systematically requiring Danish firms to pay employers' contributions backdated to 1976. The amount which one firm alone is required to pay may reach more than Skr 150 000 for the whole period.

Can the Commission state whether all Community firms operating on the Swedish market are taxed in this way, whether the trade barrier thus created is compatible with the terms of the free trade agreement between the Community and Sweden and, if not, what measures it intends to take to ensure that the terms of the agreement are observed?

Answer

According to the information available to the Commission, the difficulties facing Danish firms arise from the different definitions of the social security status of commercial agents in Denmark and Sweden.

The point of the Free Trade Agreement between Sweden and the Community is to eliminate barriers to trade by the introduction of free trade areas, in accordance with the provisions of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

In the Commission's opinion this difference in the method of financing the social security of commercial agents does not come under the provisions of the Free Trade Agreement.

The Commission has no information at present as to whether firms from other Community countries have experienced similar difficulties when selling through commercial agents on the Swedish market.

*

* *

Question No 35, by Mr Lynge (H-777/80)

Subject: Catch quotas

Does the Commission believe that coastal populations of the Community that are particularly dependent on fishing should at all times be allotted a joint quota corresponding to their fishing capacity, irrespective of whether that capacity is close to or possibly even equivalent to the TAC?

Answer

In working out its quota proposals, the Commission, in Article 4 of the draft basic regulation proposed by the Commission to the Council, follows the Council declaration of 30 May 1980 which provides that one of the allocation criteria is the special needs of regions where the local populations are particularly dependent upon fishing and the industries allied thereto. Other criteria are traditional activities and the loss of catch potential in third country waters.

*

* *

Question No 36, by Mr Albers (H-786/80)

Subject: Community transport policy

What implications does the absence of a Community ports policy have for the development of a Community transport policy, in particular in relation to fair competition and the allocation of costs?

Answer

The fourth plenary session of European ports, meeting under the chairmanship of my predecessor Mr Burke on 9/10 December 1980, came to the majority conclusion that there were no serious distortions to competition between the ports of the Community despite considerable differences in the way that they were administered and financed. The Commission shares the view of the ports that the development of a sound common transport policy will in itself tend to create a satisfactory situation as regards the relationship between the ports.

*

* *

Question No 37, by Mr Welsb (H-766/80)

Subject: Subsidized gas prices to Dutch growers

Would the Commission make a statement on the current position as regards the implementation of the procedure established by Article 163 of the Treaty of Rome in respect of subsidized prices from Gasunie to the Dutch horticultural industry?

Answer

The Commission is pursuing the procedure, which it has opened in the framework of Article 93, concerning gas tariffs in the Netherlands. Our final position will of course be influenced by the decisions which are to be taken in the Netherlands before 1 April on the new tariffs for gas supplies to horticulture, on which I have had contacts both with the government and with the representatives of agriculture.

*

* *

Question No 38, by Mr Paisley (H-787/80)

Subject: EEC grants

In view of the fact that approximately two thirds of all EEC aid granted for Northern Ireland (from the Regional Development Fund, the Social Fund and the Agricultural Fund (Guidance Section)), does not come to Northern Ireland as a direct cash addition to the Northern Ireland economy, but rather is retained by the UK Government to offset its own planned or existing expenditure in Northern Ireland, what steps does the Commission propose to take to ensure that Northern Ireland in fact benefits as intended by the EEC when the various grants are made, and, in particular, in view of the use made of the special problems of Northern Ireland by the UK Government in presenting its argument for a reduction in its budgetary contribution, will the Commission investigate how the resulting additional grants being made available for deprived areas of the UK, such as Northern Ireland, are in fact being spent in the designated areas by the UK Government?

Answer

The principles of the additionality of Community subsidies raised by the honourable Member is implemented very differently for the various financing instruments, measures and areas of intervention

Certain subsidies from the Guidance Section of the EAGGF are granted to the Member State in the form of refunds. Other subsidies from this Fund consist of direct payments to the beneficiaries

The European Social Fund finances the private sector directly. Apart from this expenditure is financed and benefits the State budget provided the State has financed the whole measure.

Finally, as regards the European Regional Fund, in a letter dated 23 February 1979, the Commission asked the governments of the Member States to furnish it with all the information needed to assess the apportionment of ERF subsidies in the national budgets. To date the Commission has not received this information from the United Kingdom Government.

On the specific question of the use of the appropriations approved for special measures to benefit the United Kingdom, one out of eight programmes submitted by that Member State concerns Northern Ireland. It is the responsibility of the Northern Ireland authorities to see that the measures provided for under this programme are carried out and the corresponding payments made.

*

* *

Question No 39, by Mr Patterson (H-789/80)

Subject: VAT relief for charities

Will the Commission confirm or deny the view of the United Kingdom Prime Minister that to relieve charities of value-added tax under Section 15 of the Sixth Council Directive of 17 May 1977 would be 'difficult or impossible to reconcile with our Community obligations' and will the Commission also say what the liability of charities to value-added tax is in other Member States?

Answer

Article 15 of the Sixth Council Directive No 77/388/EEC on value-added tax¹ deals with exemption of exports and like transactions and international transport. Paragraph 12 of that Article is the only provision of direct relevance to charities. It provides for an exemption for goods supplied to bodies which export them as part of their humanitarian, charitable or teaching activities abroad. Clearly application of this provision by a Member State is in accordance with its Community obligations

However, it is likely that the honourable Member is referring to section 15 of the United Kingdom's Finance Act, 1972 which enables certain bodies to obtain a refund of VAT borne on supplies of goods and services to them which are not purchased for the purposes of any business carried on by the body in question. Under the common VAT system, as laid down by the Sixth Directive, a tax credit on goods and services purchased by a firm is only allowed to the extent that these are used for the purposes of taxable transactions carried out by the firm. The Sixth Directive (which was adopted by the Council of Ministers representing all Member States) does not provide for a system of refund of

tax on the lines of Section 15 of the UK Finance Act 1972. It provides for the application of exemptions with refund of input tax (zero-rates) by Member States on a transitional basis only and in limited and unextendable circumstances. Consequently, the Commission can confirm that the granting of tax relief to charities under the mechanism provided for in Section 15 would give rise to difficulties *vis-à-vis* Community VAT legislation. However, it would also like to make it clear that the Community VAT legislation does not in any way prejudice the right of a Member State to grant direct subsidies, linked to their expenses or otherwise, to charities.

As to the VAT treatment of charities in other Member States, the situation regarding supplies of goods and services by them is governed by Article 13A (1) (g) of the Sixth VAT Directive. This provides that Member States shall exempt supplies by, *inter alia* 'organizations recognized as charitable by the Member States concerned'. The VAT legislation of Member States other than the UK does not appear to contain provisions providing for refund of tax borne by these organizations.

*

* *

Question No 40, by Mr Fernandez (H-790/80)

Subject: Common agricultural policy — milk

Imports of cereal substitutes at preferential rates of duty and the system of monetary compensatory amounts have resulted in the development of virtual 'milk factories' in the northern areas of the Community. These concerns are simply plants for processing imported feeds and therefore have nothing to do with the common agricultural policy, the mechanisms of which are designed to benefit farmers and their families. What measures does the Commission intend to take to prevent these 'milk factories' benefiting from Community finance?

Answer

In its agricultural prices package this year the Commission has proposed that the basic rate of the corresponsibility levy for milk should be tripled for those farmers producing more than 15 000 kg of milk per year per forage hectare. Such a level of production can be achieved only by farmers with high rates of stocking of cows and with high levels of yield obtained by the use of concentrate feedingstuffs.

*

* *

Question No 41, by Mr Spinelli (H-792/80)

Subject: Unacceptable statements by a director-general of the Commission

What action has the Commission taken or does it intend to take against a director-general of the Commission who stated in an interview with the *Financial Times* on 9 February 1981 that 'a few Commissioners do not have it in mind to reform the common agricultural policy, but to destroy it'?

Question No 62, by Mr Ruffolo (H-830/80)

Subject: Censuring of a Commission director-general

What steps has the Commission taken or does it intend to take to censure one of its directors-general who, in an interview published in the *Financial Times* on 9 February 1981, levelled accusations against Commission Members for opinions expressed in the course of their duties, thus calling into question the collegial nature of that institution, and how does it propose to prevent any repetition of such unacceptable behaviour?

¹ OJ L 145, p. 1, 13. 6. 1977.

Joint answer

The Commission has reminded Director-General Villain of the obligations incumbent on officials of the Commission concerning declarations to the press.

I would remind the honourable Members of two things. First, Mr Villain was reacting — too strongly, certainly — to an article which he felt impugned the Directorate-General for Agriculture. Second, in the interview quoted, Mr Villain did not, in fact, refer to any Member or Members of the Commission, either specifically or generally.

*

* *

Question No 42, by Mrs Macciocchi (H-793/80)

Subject: Gas from the USSR

Has the Commission been informed of the plan to conclude a 'contract of the century' between a consortium of eight countries, including five Member States of the Community (Belgium, France, Germany, Italy and the Netherlands) plus Austria, Spain and Sweden, and the USSR for the supply of a very large quantity of natural gas as from 1985, i.e. between 40 000 and 43 000 million cubic metres (compared with 24 000 million cubic metres currently supplied by the USSR mainly to Germany and Austria)? Has the Commission given any thought to the fact that, if the contract goes through, a country like the Federal Republic will be dependent on the USSR for 30 % of its natural gas and nearly 6 % of its total energy supplies, with all that this implies?

Answer

At present companies in the Federal Republic of Germany, France and Italy hold present contracts with the Soviet Union for the supply of 10 700, 4 000 and 7 000 million cubic metres of natural gas per year respectively, or a total of 21 700 million cubic metres per year for the Community.

When the new contracts have been concluded, the Federal Republic of Germany will obtain 29 % of its gas from the Soviet Union, corresponding to 5.4 % of its total energy supplies.

The government of the Federal Republic of Germany, in its written answer dated 11 February 1981 to Mr Wolfram, Member of the *Bundestag*, outlined in detail the consequences of this dependence on Soviet gas, and drew the following conclusion: 'The total quantity of natural gas obtained from the Soviet Union is none the less such that any shortfall as a result of a cessation of deliveries could be offset by various compensatory measures.'

Having examined the consequences of this situation from the point of view of the common energy policy, the Commission is able to support the view of the German Government.

Negotiations on this extensive and complex project are still underway.

*

* *

Question No 43, by Mrs Castle (H-796/80)

Subject: UK paper and board industry

Does the Commission intend to take steps to protect the UK paper and board industry from the unfair competition it faces in international markets as a result of the energy discounts enjoyed by its major competitors, particularly in Canada, North America and Scandinavia?

Answer

1 It must be said first of all that the advantages enjoyed by the Community's main competitors — the Scandinavian countries, Canada and the United States — are chiefly due to the greater availability of timber. This is a result of natural conditions and of the efforts of these countries to ensure

renewed supplies of the raw material. Production costs in the paper and board industries in these countries reflect these advantages and the close integration of the industries in question in other sectors involving the primary processing of timber

- 2 In addition, with regard to energy costs which are a major factor in paper manufacture, the Commission points out that
 - costs are not different in the case of oil (except in Canada);
 - production costs may be affected in the case of hydroelectric power, which is more readily available in certain countries,
 - other forms of energy may play a part (natural gas, coal, alternative sources of electricity, etc.)

In the case of oil, it is clear that a serious distortion exists by virtue of the pricing policy which is pursued in Canada, where domestic oil prices are kept below world levels. A similar situation exists in the United States.

3. As for the United States, President Reagan's decision of 28 January 1981 to deregulate the price of domestically-produced oil should serve in the medium term to cancel out the advantages enjoyed by the paper industry. With regard to natural gas, the Commission hopes that the new American administration will shortly submit proposals to Congress for the decontrol of prices and that Congress will be prompt in taking a decision.

On the question of Canada, on 20 February 1981 the Commission delivered a verbal communication to the Canadian authorities, stating that it was 'contrary to the undertakings given at the Tokyo summit meeting, in 1979, to keep domestic oil prices below world levels.'¹

With regard to the Scandinavian countries, the Commission has no reason to take any action.

*

* *

Question No 44, by Mr Fanton (H-797/80)

Subject: The Commission and the state of alert in the world food situation

Does the Commission not agree that its commitment to reduce European agricultural surpluses for budgetary reasons is in contradiction with the fears concerning food and agriculture expressed by the United Nations, which, alarmed by the world food situation in 1981, envisages a state of alert, particularly in Africa?

Answer

The Commission sees no contradiction between its desire to curb the production of certain agricultural products in the Community (and hence costs related to these products) and its concern to use its agricultural products to help combat hunger in the world.

A distinction needs to be made between the quantities of products which are affected by intervention measures as a result of trends on European markets and those which can be sold or supplied in the form of food aid by way of response to food shortages in the third world. Attempts to curb the former do not mean that the latter must be abandoned.

The Community feels bound to help formulate a world food strategy designed to avoid any widening of the gap between world supply and demand, which affects in particular the poorest developing countries.

Cereals are a case in point. Disturbances which have been apparent on the market in recent months (reduced stocks, appreciable rise in export prices) have not been caused solely by speculation as a result of an unusual market situation. A more basic reason is that a number of major exporting countries have needed to boost cereal crops tremendously in order to cope with import needs which are rapidly increasing.

¹ The domestic price will gradually be raised to 85 % of the American price if it is below world levels.

Consequently, it is the task of the Community to decide to what extent it will contribute — in addition to satisfying internal demand — to the efforts required of the cereal-exporting developed nations to cope with these growing needs, and it is also the task of the Community to make use of its available potential in the agricultural sector to improve the world food situation.

*

* *

Question No 45, by Mr D'Angelosante (H-798/80)

Subject: Approach by EEC officials to the Italian authorities on the purchase of containers

The Italian Government's Special Commissioner for the earthquake disaster area, Mr Zamberletti, has stated that Commission officials put pressure on the Italian authorities to change their mind and buy containers manufactured in Belgium from a firm recommended by them. Is this true and, if so, what does the Commission intend to do about it?

Answer

The Commission categorically denies the allegations to which the honourable Member refers.

*

* *

Question No 46, by Mr Hopper (H-799/80)

Subject: Loans made by the Commission

Further to the Commission's reply to Oral Question H-722/80,¹ can the Commission give an assurance that no outstanding loans which would otherwise be in default have been 'rolled over' (i. e. had their maturities extended) and that in no case has interest which should have been paid been added to the capital sum due?

Answer

Loan maturities have always been adhered to on the proper date. No maturities have been deferred or loans extended to delay repayment. Similarly, no interest has been added to any capital sum. Interest has always been settled in advance.

The only defaulting loans have been those referred to in the answer to Oral Question H-722/80, and they account for only 0.03 % of the total value of loans which is in the order of 5 000 million EUA. In any case, these outstanding loans do not represent irretrievable losses for the ECSC. In connection with the guarantees, a court case is now in progress to recover the amounts due.

By way of addition to this answer, the honourable Member may like to know that in 1974-75, at a time when long-term loans were not possible on the capital market, the ECSC negotiated medium-term (five-year) loans based on borrowing over a similar period. It was agreed with the undertakings that a new loan for the same project would be granted at the expiry of the first loan, the duration of which was too short for redemption. Stringent criteria were applied in carrying out these operations. They caused no problems and enabled the ECSC to continue aiding investments.

*

* *

Question No 47, by Mr Pasmazoglou (H-801/80)

Subject. Right to vote in municipal elections for subjects of Member States who live in other Member States

¹ Verbatim report of proceedings, provisional edition, 11 February 1981, p. 184.

A substantial number of subjects of Member States live in other Member States. Giving these persons the right to vote in municipal elections would not only be a contribution towards European integration but would also make municipal authorities more sensitive towards the problems of these people. Does the Commission share this view?

Answer

- 1 The Commission shares the opinion expressed by the honourable Member. On several occasions it has stated that it favours granting the right to vote in municipal elections to subjects of Member States who are not living in the State where they have attained the right to vote.

The Commission outlined its position in its answer to Oral Question H-87/79 by Mr Bettiza¹ and to Written Questions 312/79 by Mr Glinne² and 779/79 by Mr Jurgens.³ It stated that it was in favour of granting this right. The honourable Member may find it useful to look at these answers.

- 2 The Commission has in fact been studying for several years the problem of the active and passive right to vote in municipal elections by subjects of a Member State living in another country. This work began as a result of the Paris summit meeting of 9 and 10 December 1974. Paragraph 11 of the final communiqué stated: 'A working party will be instructed to study the conditions and timing under which the citizens of the Nine Member States could be given special rights as members of the Community.'⁴

During the course of the study the Commission reached the conclusion that these special rights should at least include voting rights and eligibility at municipal level for subjects of Member States living in another Member State.

The Commission stated in its report *Towards European Citizenship*⁵ that conferring special rights would be the 'logical goal of the principle of national treatment and integration into the host country'.

- 3 The Commission has made its position clearly known to the Council Working Party on Special Rights. Nevertheless, the recognition of such a right does involve considerable problems of implementation in several Member States, particularly problems of a constitutional nature.

The honourable Member will find the main aspects of the problem outlined in the report *Towards European Citizenship*.

Question No 48, by Mr Enright (H-802/80)

Subject: Information on women's rights

Can the Commission confirm a rumour that it is intending to end the financial provision to its information offices which has permitted them to employ staff with responsibility for information about how Community policies affect women, and if so, how does it justify this action in the light of Parliament's resolution on the position of women in the Community, and would the Commission outline the situation in each of its information offices in the Community?

Answer

1. There is no truth in the rumour to which the honourable Member refers.
2. The Commission is currently studying the implications of the report by the *Ad hoc* Committee on Women's Rights on the position of women in the European Community and the European Parliament resolution of 11 February 1981. The information aspects are also being studied. In this respect, it is already apparent that the implementation of the conclusions will depend on the funds available and the staff working in this area of information.

¹ OJ C 245 of September 1979.

² OJ C 74 of 24 March 1980.

³ OJ C 105 of 28 April 1980.

⁴ Bulletin of the European Communities, December 1974, paragraph 1104.

⁵ Supplement 7/75 to the Bulletin of the European Communities.

3. In each of its information offices the Commission caters for all sectors of public opinion, including women, within the Community.

*

* *

Question No 49, by Mr Spencer (H-803/80)

Subject: Tachographs

Community requirements regarding tachographs are at present preventing scouts, guides and other non-commercial, non-governmental organizations from making visits in lightweight transit vans, not fitted with tachographs, to other Member States. In the light of this, will the Commission make an exemption for such groups, or at least recognize the so-called 'mini-tachographs' which would greatly reduce the costs involved?

Answer

1. It is correct that Article 14 a (2) of Regulation No 543/69 in connection with Article 3 of Regulation 1463/70 although creating the possibility for Member States, after consulting the Commission, to grant exemptions from the fitting of a tachograph for vehicles which are constructed and equipped to carry not more than 15 persons including the driver and engaged in national transport operations, does not permit such exemptions for international trips.
2. The Commission has no power to make exemptions in the sense mentioned by the honourable Member.
3. Neither can the Commission, under the existing regulation, recognize any tachograph which does not conform to the tachograph specified in Regulation No 1463/70. The Commission is, however, willing to examine new elements.

*

* *

Question No 51, by Mr Blaney (H-809/80)

Subject: Potatoes

What commitments can the Commission give that seasonal measures permitting the import of new potatoes into the Community will not, as in the past, result in disturbance throughout the subsequent year on the Irish potato market, to the detriment of local producers?

Answer

The honourable Member will understand that, in the absence of a common organization of the market, the Commission's powers in respect of imports of new potatoes are limited. Such imports are, however, subject to the Common Customs Tariff, and in the particular case of imports from Cyprus, which the honourable Member may have in mind, the Commission will take care with the Cyprus authorities to ensure that there is no detriment to Irish producers.

*

* *

Question No 52, by Mr Provan (H-811/80)

Subject: Technical barriers to trade

In the case of tachographs, the issue of an E number should allow free circulation of those tachographs within the European Community. This does not appear to be the case in France where every tachograph has to be inspected by French authorities.

What does the Commission propose to do to allow the free circulation and free trade in tachographs within the Community?

Answer

The Commission has not recently received any complaint concerning barriers to the free circulation of tachographs and it is difficult to deal with these problems in the abstract.

If the honourable Member is aware of a particular complaint, he might advise the injured party to write to the Commission, so that we can examine the details and decide on appropriate action.

*

* *

Question No 53, by Mrs Viehoff (H-812/80)

Subject: Work for unemployed construction workers

In view of the considerable amount of unemployment in the construction industry, and the grave need for rapid building and repairs in southern Italy, will the Commission consider introducing a scheme under which construction workers unemployed in their own countries can be employed where they are needed?

Answer

An essential condition for the Commission to put forward a support scheme is that the Member State concerned requests assistance. Up to today the Commission has not been approached by the Italian Government for assistance in any direct reconstruction and rehabilitation programme following the earthquakes of November 1980 in southern Italy.

The Commission is however ready and willing to take into consideration any initiative such as suggested in the present question or of an analogous nature.

*

* *

Question No 54, by Mrs Baduș Glorioso (H-816/80)

Subject: The footwear industry

The customs tariffs applied by the countries of the European Economic Community to imported footwear are the lowest in the world. Many industrialized nations, on the other hand, protect their industries by means of high duties and/or quotas. At the International Congress on the development of the leather industry in the 1980s, held in Florence on 19 and 20 November 1980, Commissioner Davignon said the Community should step up its efforts to combat protectionism in order to maintain its potential in the footwear industry.

In view of the very poor external trade figures in this sector in 1980, in particular the fall in Italian exports on the American market (a drop of 52 % during the first eleven months of 1980), what measures has the Commission taken or what measures does it intend to take, within the framework of the common commercial policy, to assure greater access for Community products to the markets of the developed countries and to ensure that the Community footwear industry does not bear the brunt of the protectionism of the other industrialized nations?

Answer

The Commission attaches great importance to what in its view is the main objective in the international footwear trade, namely the widest possible liberalization of goods traffic, to which some industrial countries in particular must contribute by eliminating import barriers.

The Commission has been striving persistently towards this goal for several years. Only recently it made it quite clear to Canada that the Community would not passively accept a further one-year

extension of the generally binding import quota which was introduced provisionally by the Canadian authorities for a period of three years. Negotiations are at present taking place on this issue and the Community has already made it known that in the event of an extension of the quota it will apply for compensation or if necessary adopt retaliatory measures. In addition the Commission has on several occasions pointed out to the Australian and Japanese authorities that their import policy on footwear is abusively restrictive.

In 1979 the Commission rejected the application of the United States to negotiate a voluntary restriction of Italian footwear exports to the American market. On the basis of this position no measures were introduced by the American authorities. If Italian footwear exports to the United States dropped sharply in 1980, then this decline must undoubtedly be attributed to the joint impact of economic factors and fashion trends. None the less the American application for restrictions made importers uncertain, which is why such initiatives are regrettable.

Furthermore it should be mentioned that on the question of raw material supplies to the footwear industry, the Commission is working incessantly towards a definitive liberalization of world trade in leather and raw hides, i. e. for the abolition of the export restrictions on these goods in some supplier third countries such as Brazil and Argentina.

Finally, the Commission wishes to inform the honourable Member that its competent services are at present examining all the problems of the footwear sector in detail with a view to working out certain guidelines for discussions with Member States.

*

* *

Question No 55, by Lord Bethell (H-819/80)

Subject: Food aid received by Poland from the Community

Will the Commission give details of the food aid received by Poland from the Community so far this year and will the Commission list the quantities of each item despatched to Poland? What efforts are being made to make the Polish people aware of the existence and extent of this Community food aid programme?

Answer

The quantities of agricultural products which have been made available by the Community to Poland at special prices are:

— 30 000 tonnes of butter	— 15 000 tonnes of rice
— 3 000 tonnes of whole milk powder	— 10 000 tonnes of pearled barley
— 15 000 tonnes of beef	— 50 000 tonnes of sugar
— 35 000 tonnes of pork	— 40 000 tonnes of rapeseed
— 200 000 tonnes of cereals	— 600 tonnes of olive oil

Deliveries began at the end of January and will probably be completed in most cases by the end of April

The Commission hopes that, in view of financial effort undertaken by the Community, these supplies will be recognized as a significant contribution to the welfare of the Polish people.

*

* *

Question No 56, by Mr Robert Jackson (H-820/80)

Subject: Advisory Committee on veterinary training

Why has the Commission not set up the Advisory Committee on Veterinary Training so that it could start its work at the end of 1980 at the same time as the Council Directive¹ on the mutual recognition of veterinary surgeons' qualification entered into force?

¹ OJ L 362 of 23 December 1975.

Answer

The Commission is happy to tell the honourable Member that the arrangements for setting up the Advisory Committee on Veterinary Training have now been finalized. The meeting is scheduled to be held in September 1981

*

* *

Question No 57, by Mrs Cresson (H-820/80)

Subject: Action programme on the environment

The second environmental action programme is due to expire in 1981. Can the Commission state the progress made with the drawing-up of the third programme?

Answer

The Commission departments are currently working on the continuation of the Community's environmental policy and action programme. A submission will be made to the Council during the second half of 1981.

*

* *

Question No 58, by Mr Moreau (H-823/80)

Subject: European conference on combatting unemployment

At the last meeting of the European Council it was proposed that there should be a major conference of the Ministers responsible for Economic Affairs, Finance, Social Affairs and Employment to draw up a strategy for combatting unemployment. What steps have the Commission and the Council taken to enable this conference to take place as soon as possible, preferably before the summer holiday period?

Answer

At the end of its discussion of the economic and social situation in the Community, the European Council of 1 and 2 December asked the Commission to intensify its studies with a view to coordinating Community efforts to achieve improved growth and combat unemployment, so that the Council, jointly composed of Economic Affairs, Finance and Social Affairs Ministers, may consider the matter further.

The Commission is aware that a combined effort by governments with the collaboration of employers' and labour organizations is essential if the job situation is to be improved, and it has already begun preparatory work to formulate a consistent economic and social strategy to combat unemployment and to facilitate the development of new social, regional and industrial structures. The Commission will seek the collaboration of the Standing Committee on Employment and the Council at the earliest opportunity.

*

* *

Question No 59, by Mr Sarre (H-824/80)

Subject: Multifibre Arrangement

Does the Commission not agree that, in the framework of the renegotiation of the Multifibre Arrangement, immediate measures should be taken to restrain abnormal imports of synthetic fibres and that the Commission should, as a matter of urgency, express its support for the renewal of the Multifibre Arrangement, which is due to expire at the end of 1981?

Answer

As regards the need for *immediate* measures, the latest figures for imports of polyamide, polyester and acrylic fibres into the Community show that there has been a rapid and marked fall compared with the amounts imported in the first half of 1980. This has been due to a number of factors, such as the Community's anti-dumping measures for acrylic and polyester fibres, price rises in America and the recovery of the dollar. President Reagan's decision to decontrol oil prices may result in further price rises.

As regards the prospects for having these imports covered by the Multifibre Agreement, the honourable Member will no doubt be aware that certain simple fibres are not covered by the general provisions of the MFA, although they can be brought within the agreement's scope by reference to Article 12 (2). He will likewise not doubt appreciate that the MFA has never been applied among the industrialized countries. However, should there be a renewed increase in imports of these fibres, the Commission will consider all appropriate efficient and rapid means available, whether within the framework of GATT (e.g. anti-dumping or subsidies provisions) or within some other framework. Finally, as regards our position *vis-à-vis* the renewal of the Multifibre Agreement, the Commission will be making its recommendation within the next two to three weeks so that the Council can take a decision on its negotiating position in good time before the next meeting of the GATT Textiles Committee on 7 and 8 May. The negotiations proper will commence at this meeting.

*

* *

Question No 60, by Mr Lomas (H-827/80)

Subject: Nicaragua

Will the Commission give serious and urgent consideration to making substantial aid available to the Government of Nicaragua, particularly food aid and medical and educational equipment?

Answer

1. Community aid to Nicaragua has been substantial since the Sandinistas took power in July 1979. Total aid to the country in 1979 and 1980 amounted to 17 million EUA (approximately \$ 24 million), with a large proportion of this going on food aid.¹

In addition, special aid worth \$ 1 300 000 was linked to the literacy campaign.² Also, a considerable proportion of the food aid counterpart funds has been, or is going to be, used for education projects (\$ 2 200 000 to finance the literacy campaign which ended in August 1980, \$ 2 100 000 for the construction of about 100 schools in rural areas).

2. The Commission's future plans are as follows.

- a) Food aid may be gradually replaced by financial and technical aid. A major integrated rural development project in the Wastala region is currently being studied, with a possible decision on Community financing by the end of the year.
- b) Food aid:

- emergency aid: 500 000 EUA
- food aid: 10 600 000 EUA
- financial and technical aid: 5 700 000 EUA
- sales promotion: 200 000 EUA.

¹ The total aid of 17 million EUA can be broken down as follows:

² As a result of the campaign the level of literacy rose to 87 % (compared with 49 % before the revolution); the campaign was considered a great success by UNESCO, which awarded Nicaragua the Krupskaja prize.

- the 1981 programme submitted by the Commission on 13 February 1981 includes the following amounts for Nicaragua: 10 000 tonnes of cereals and 2 000 tonnes of powdered milk (worth 3 800 000 EUA at world prices);
- the Commission is currently studying the feasibility of a multiannual programme of food aid for Nicaragua (in implementation of the Council Resolution of 18 November 1980) linked in particular to the country's education programmes;
- pursuant to the same Council Resolution, the Commission is studying the possibility of creating emergency stocks on a regional basis in the Central American area, following a formal request by the Nicaraguan Government.

*

* *

Question No 61, by Sir David Lancaster Nicolson (H-829/80)

Subject: Commission's basic price for steel imports

The Commission's basic prices for steel imports from third countries expressed in sterling have been substantially higher than those expressed in other Community currencies almost continuously since March 1979. (Currently they are more than 20 % higher.) When will this discrimination against British steel consumers be ended? If not, how does the Commission justify its maintenance when Article 4 of the Treaty of Paris prohibits such discrimination?

Answer

In connection with the publication of the basic prices for imports of certain steel products, the Commission pays attention to fluctuations in exchange rates and fixes if necessary the EUA equivalent. As a rule, exchange rates are fixed on the basis of an average value over a period of time in order to level out excessive fluctuation.

The Commission's exchange rates were last fixed on 31 October 1980. Sterling rose for a time but at the moment shows signs of falling. The Commission will keep a close watch on exchange rates and readjust them if this is called for. It must be pointed out that imports which fall below the basic import price and which are affected by fluctuating exchange rates are negligible in relation to the total consumption of steel products in the United Kingdom.

*

* *

II *Questions to the Council*

Question No 68, by Mr Cronin (H-690/80)

Subject: Support for projects of Community interest in transport infrastructure

Will the Council indicate what progress it is making in relation to the provision of Community support for projects of Community interest in the field of transport infrastructure?

Answer

At its 674th meeting, held in Brussels on 4 December 1980, the Council discussed the matter raised by the honourable Member.

At that meeting the Council confirmed its resolve to achieve progress in this important sector of the common transport policy.

The President of the Council of Ministers of Transport has, moreover, recently confirmed this approach to the relevant European Parliament Committee.

*

* *

Question No 74, by Mr Prag (H-740/80)

Subject. European Foundation

Would the President-in-Office state what steps the Council intends to take to implement the decision of the Heads of Government of the Community, meeting in the European Council of March 26, 1977, to set up a European Foundation intended to assist the promotion of greater public understanding of European integration?

Answer

Although the general outline of the Foundation was sketched by the European Council and the objective remains a valid one, it has not yet been possible to establish a system for the operation of the Foundation and more especially to lay down specific financing arrangements.

The question was raised again at the Council meeting on 15 and 16 December 1980. The Presidency was forced to conclude that, unfortunately, the positions of the delegations had not altered since 1978. Therefore the prerequisites for unanimous agreement on the detailed arrangements for setting up the Foundation have not yet been met

*

* *

Question No 77, by Mr Seligman (H-665/80)

Subject. Shared responsibility for contributions to the developing countries

In view of the urgency to implement new energy investments in the developing countries, will the Council report on progress so far in reviewing aid policies, procedures and other contributions to developing countries?

Answer

The Council shares the Commission's views on the urgent need for investment in the energy sector in the developing countries, including investment in new forms of energy. This is why the Community is encouraging the energy investments deemed desirable by the countries concerned through the means of action available to it, particularly its development aid.

The Second ACP-EEC Lomé Convention provides for Community aid for numerous activities aimed at developing both the traditional and non-traditional energy potential and the self-sufficiency of the ACP States.

Similar action is being undertaken under other co-operation agreements with developing countries and under the aid programmes to non-associated countries.

The whole matter is currently being examined by the Council bodies from the point of view of Community aid, and this examination will also have to take into account the fact that these questions will also be dealt with in the framework of the North-South Dialogue.

*

* *

Question No 78, by Mr Adam (H-726/80)

Subject. Supplementary measures in favour of the United Kingdom

The proposed regulations, COM(80)333 final, submitted to the Council by the Commission contained in the preamble the statement that 'the supplementary measures should aim to realize

special programmes of investments which contribute to greater convergence of the economic policies of the Member States'. The supplementary measures were also seen as 'promoting convergence by improving the structures of the United Kingdom economy'.

These references to economic convergence have been deleted from the Council Regulations as published in the Official Journal L 284 of 29. 10. 80, pages 4-8, Regulation Number 2744/80. Article 1 of the proposed regulations gave as one of the aims 'the reduction of regional disparities'. This has also been deleted from the Regulations approved by the Council.

Will the Council explain why economic convergence has been abandoned as one of the main purposes of these supplementary measures?

Answer

The honourable Member's attention is drawn to the fact that the supplementary measures in favour of the United Kingdom decided on last October represent the implementation of the agreement reached by the Council on 30 May 1980 concerning the United Kingdom's contribution to the Community budget.

These measures are therefore of a special nature. They are intended to benefit a single Member State for a limited period of time.

*

* *

Question No 79, by Miss Quin (H-752/80)

Subject: Council Regulation establishing supplementary measures in favour of the United Kingdom

In Article 2 of the proposal for a Council regulation establishing supplementary measures in favour of the United Kingdom, submitted by the Commission to the Council on 12 June 1980, housing in the public sector was mentioned as a possible beneficiary of these supplementary measures. In the final regulation (27 October 1980) this reference was omitted. What were the reasons for this omission from the final regulation?

Answer

In the Regulation establishing supplementary measures in favour of the United Kingdom, the Council decided it was more appropriate to lay down in Article 3 the eligibility criteria with which investments must comply in order to qualify for financial assistance from the Community, rather than to specify the eligible categories of investments as the Commission had originally proposed.

*

* *

Question No 80, by Miss Hooper (H-756/80)

Subject: ACP sugar commitment

Is the Council aware that sugar beet refiners have a price advantage over sugar cane refiners because the cost of cane sugar raws is considerably higher than the basic cost of beet?

In view of the Council's obligation to continue refining the ACP sugar cane quota, what consideration is the Council giving to a method of equalizing this factor and ensuring that sugar cane refiners do not go out of business?

Answer

During the annual adoption of the Regulation fixing the Community prices for sugar cane and beet — both of which, under the Protocol on sugar, regulate the level of the guaranteed price of ACP sugar — the Council takes account of the technical information it receives from the Commission, including information regarding the processing margin.

The Council takes the measures required to prevent any discrimination between refiners and in particular has introduced a differential charge which serves to fill the gap between the refining margins in question. It should also be remembered that the problem concerns not only 'pure' refineries but also 'mixed' sugar refineries.

As to the Community's obligations *vis-à-vis* ACP sugar, the Community has given an undertaking to buy and to import for an unspecified period agreed quantities of ACP cane sugar totalling approximately 1.3 million tonnes annually under price conditions fixed according to the provision of the ACP Protocol on Sugar. This is a firm commitment which the Community will respect.

*

* *

Question No 81, by Mr Møller (H-774/80)

Subject: Remarks made at the Council of Ministers for Fisheries

At the meeting of the Council of Ministers for Fisheries held on 27 January 1981 the German Minister, Mr Josef Ertl, addressed a number of remarks to the Danish Minister, Mr Karl Hjortnaes, which have prompted an exchange of letters between the two countries' Ministries of Foreign Affairs

Can the Council condone the tone adopted by the German Minister *vis-à-vis* the Danish Minister?

Answer

It is not for the Council to comment on questions which have already been the subject of an explanation between the Ministers concerned.

*

* *

Question No 82, by Mr Pinnfarina (H-778/80)

Subject: Trade in steel with third countries

Does the Council consider that import reduction criteria analogous to those governing the planned reduction in Community output should be applied when the steel negotiations with third countries are reopened?

Answer

At its meeting on 24 and 25 November 1980 the Council approved various measures whereby the Commission was to suggest to certain third countries exporting steel to the Community that they conclude new bilateral arrangements with the Community for 1981.

As in previous years, these arrangements involve not only compliance with price discipline but also the observance of traditional trade patterns. They also take account both of any reduction in consumption to be anticipated in 1981 and of the anti-crisis measures implemented under Article 58 of the ECSC Treaty which expire on 30 June 1981.

In other words, as far as the quantitative aspects of the arrangements are concerned, the Council has indeed adopted for 1981 an approach which takes account, for the entire year, of the planned reduction in Community output and consumption.

*

* *

Question No 83, by Mr Pranchère (H-780/80)

Subject: Baby-beef

Since its accession to the Community, Greece has been granted a preferential scheme allowing it to continue importing baby-beef from Yugoslavia. At the same time, in violation of Community prefer-

ences, Athens is reportedly preparing to introduce an autonomous scheme enabling Greece to market Yugoslav baby-beef at prices below those of French beef of the same category.

Will the Council ensure that Community preference is observed and take steps to prevent Greece becoming a gateway to the Italian market for Yugoslav beef exports?

Answer

Since the Council has not yet been able — following the accession of Greece — to adopt the negotiating directives for the purpose of adapting the interim agreement with Yugoslavia, the arrangements in force for baby-beef on the Greek market are the same as elsewhere in the Community

In order to avoid any legal hiatus, the Council decided independently on 20 January 1981 that overall exports of baby-beef from Yugoslavia to the Ten should be kept within a total quota limit of 8 700 tonnes until 31 March 1981. It was also agreed by the Council that if, as a result of this decision, the pattern of exports from Yugoslavia were to cause difficulties, the Commission would take the necessary preventive action.

Community preference is assured by the proper implementation of the procedures laid down in the EEC-Yugoslavia Agreement which is supervised by the Commission.

In the light of all this, the Council sees no reason to share the honourable Member's concern over the observance of Community preference.

*

* *

Question No 86, by Mr Balfe (H-817/80)

Subject: The Annual Report of the Court of Auditors of the European Communities for the financial year 1979

Does the Council consider 'rather primitive accounting systems' acceptable when such a vast amount of public money is involved and noting that the Court recommends that a decision be taken to establish a claim for the unspent surplus, does the Council support this recommendation of the Court of Auditors?

Answer

The Court of Auditors' report for the financial year 1979 is currently being examined by the Council in accordance with Article 206b of the EEC Treaty, although the Council is not required to adopt a position on every observation made by the Court of Auditors.

The Council also notes that the recommendation to which the honourable Member refers is addressed to the European Parliament.

*

* *

Question No 87, by Mrs Le Roux (H-791/80)

Subject: Barriers to imports of dairy products

Although it enjoys a preferential scheme for its imports of New Zealand butter, the United Kingdom unlawfully maintains barriers to imports of dairy products from the other Member States of the Community. Does the Council intend to take measures to remove these barriers which penalize dairy producers of the other countries of the Community?

Answer

It is in the first instance for the Commission, as custodian of the Treaty, to decide whether or not the United Kingdom has infringed Community principles. The Commission has already initiated the appropriate procedures. The Council cannot therefore adopt a position on the matter.

*

* *

Question No 88, by Mr Fanton (H-804/80)

Subject: New Community scale for the classification of adult bovine carcasses

Can the Council give the reasons for its delay in adopting the new Community scale for the classification of adult bovine carcasses which should have come into effect on 1 January 1981?

Answer

The delay in establishing a Community scale for the classification of adult bovine carcasses, and the failure to observe the deadline set by the Council in May 1980 in this connection (31 January 1981) are due to political and technical problems which came to light during detailed examination of the Commission proposal by the Council bodies.

Recognizing the need to carry out detailed technical studies, the Commission, in its proposals on 'Agricultural prices and related measures' for the 1981/1982 marketing year, proposed that the Council set a new deadline, notably adoption of the scale during the discussion on the agricultural prices in the hope that it would be effectively put into operation during the 1981/1982 marketing year, and in any case not later than the beginning of the 1982/1983 marketing year for intervention measures and, if possible, for the recording of quotations.

The Council will make every effort to reach a decision on this proposal in the weeks ahead

*

* *

Question No 90, by Mr Soussouroyannis (H-805/80)

Subject: Low birthrate in Member States of the EEC

What measures are to be taken to remedy the low birthrate noted in Member States of the EEC?

Answer

As a general rule the Council debates on the basis of Commission proposals within the framework of the powers conferred on it by the Treaty. The Council has not received any proposal or communication from the Commission on the subject of declining birthrates.

*

* *

Question No 91, by Mr Vlachopoulos (H-806/80)

Subject: Measures to combat drugs in Member States of the EEC

Can the Council state what measures are to be taken in the near future to combat drugs, since we need to be united in tackling this scourge which is ruining the youth of Europe?

Answer

The Council shares the honourable Member's concern about the harmful effects of drugs on the youth of Europe. The Council considers that the efforts being made by the Member States to step up their cooperation in the fight against drugs are highly praiseworthy and are meeting a real need.

*

* *

Question No 92, by Mr Beazley (H-781/80)

Subject Defective products

Will the Council please clarify why the form of wording chosen in the draft directive on liability for defective products is such that industrial accidents may be covered as well as consumer accidents, and in view of the fact that this clearly was not the original intent of the draft directive can the Council state whether it is now the intention of the Council to proceed on this basis or can this House be assured that the directive, when it appears, will exclude liability for defective products which may cause damage to people at their place of work?

Answer

As the draft directive in question was drawn up by the Commission, it is not for the Council to explain the form of wording chosen.

The preparatory work on this draft directive is well under way within the Council's competent bodies but as yet no final attitude has been adopted by the Council on the various problems which arise in this context, nor on the draft directive as a whole. Under the circumstances, the honourable Member will understand that it is hardly possible for the Council to express any firm indication at this stage concerning the final scope of the directive.

The honourable Member may however be assured that the problem mentioned in his oral question had not escaped its attention and is under active consideration.

*

* *

Question No 93, by Mrs Viehoff (H-813/80)

Subject: Work for unemployed construction workers

In view of the urgent need for rapid building and repairs to housing in southern Italy, and the considerable amount of unemployment in the construction industry, will the Council call on the Commission immediately to draw up proposals for a scheme under which construction workers unemployed in their own countries can be employed where they are needed?

Answer

By virtue of the provisions currently in force regarding the free movement of workers within the Community, subjects of Member States can take on and carry out paid work in the territory of another Member State on the same terms as the nationals of that State.

However, an initiative along the lines of that suggested by the honourable Member would probably not contribute to solving the serious problems facing the Italian Government in connection with reconstruction in the areas of southern Italy which have been hit by the earthquake, since there are already a large number of unemployed workers on the labour market in these areas.

*

* *

Question No 94, by Mrs Baduel Glorioso (H-815/80)

Subject: Food aid to Vietnam

Does the Council intend in 1981 to resume the supply of food aid to Vietnam, which was suspended at the beginning of 1979 and has never been resumed in spite of the serious food shortage there as a result of the war?

Answer

Community food aid to Vietnam was suspended in 1979 owing to that country's attitude over the painful issue of refugees. On the other hand, the Community made a considerable aid effort for southeast Asian refugees and the victims of events in Cambodia.

To date, the Commission has not felt that conditions for resumption of food aid to Vietnam have been satisfied — a viewpoint shared by the Council — nor has it put forward any proposals concerning Vietnam in the 1981 food aid programme currently being examined by the Council's subordinate bodies.

*

* *

Question No 95, by Mr Van Miert (H-825/80)

Subject: Court of Justice

Does the Council consider it to be in keeping with the spirit and letter of the Treaties that in connection with the proposals for increasing the number of judges and advocates-general at the Court of Justice, the President should contact the group of 'large' countries and 'small' countries separately?

Answer

The Council can give the honourable Member its full assurance that its work, whether at the level of the Council itself or at the level of the preparatory bodies and not only in the present case but in all cases, is carried out completely in accordance with the provisions and spirit of the Treaty and its rules of procedure and that no distinction is made between representatives of the countries referred to by the honourable Member as 'large' and 'small' countries.

This does not, however, mean that in cases where it proves difficult to come to a decision, the Presidency might not take up informal contacts with the delegations involved. These contacts may be with individual delegations or a group of delegations and contacts of both kinds have taken place in connection with the preparation of the decision regarding the increasing of the number of judges and advocates-general. The Council does not think that any of this is in conflict with the spirit and letter of the Treaties.

* *

Question No 96, by Mr Lomas (H-826/80)

Subject: Jamaica

In view of the assistance being given to the Jamaican Government by the EEC, has the Council raised with the Jamaican Government the many cases of persecution and discrimination against journalists who are critical of the Seaga regime?

Answer

Cases of the nature mentioned by the honourable Member have not come to the attention of the Council

*

* *

III Questions to the Foreign Ministers

Question No 103, by Mr Cousté (H-782/80)

Subject Turkish régime and respect for human rights

Has the Council registered any change in Turkey's commitments towards human rights since the military *coup d'état* of September 1980?

Answer

The honourable Member is undoubtedly aware of the fact that the Turkish authorities have repeatedly given assurance to the effect that they would attempt as soon as possible to re-establish democracy and the full respect for human rights, and the Ten have so far had no reason to doubt the goodwill of the Turkish authorities in this respect. It should be pointed out in this connection that the Turkish Government has announced its intention to convene a constitutional assembly in the course of this year.

In accordance with the statement issued at the end of the political cooperation meeting held on 15 September 1980, the Ten will naturally continue to keep a close eye on the development of the situation in Turkey

*

* *

Question No 106, by Mr Balfe (H-818/80)

Subject: «Berufsverbot» in the Federal Republic of Germany

Are the Foreign Ministers aware that the operation of the «Berufsverbot» in the Federal Republic of Germany is causing grave concern to those people involved in human rights in the United Kingdom? In particular, concern has been expressed at the current proceedings against Herr Lothar Letsche in the Baden-Württemberg Court.

I am also concerned at the non-reply to my question of 1 December 1980.¹

Will the Foreign Ministers comment on the current position?

Answer

The Ten would draw the attention of the honourable Member to the answer to Question No H-584/80 (formerly O/57/80), put by Mr Wurtz and others, on the same subject, which was given to the European Parliament during Question Time on 17 December 1980.

¹ Written Question No 1753/80

SITTING OF THURSDAY, 12 MARCH 1981

Contents

- | | | | |
|---|-----|--|--|
| 1. Approval of minutes | 162 | | |
| 2. Decision on urgency:
Mr J. M. Taylor; Mr Møller; Mr Lange; Mr
Notenboom; Mr Kirk; Mr Johnson; Mr
Calvez; Lord Bethell; Mr Ripa di Meana;
Mr Haagerup; Mrs Baduel Glorioso; Mrs
Gaiotti de Biase; Mr Radoux; Mr Moreau | 163 | | |
| 3. Western Sahara (continuation of debate and
vote):
Point of order: Mr Boyes | 167 | | |
| Mr Habsburg; Mrs Baduel Glorioso; Mrs
Macciocchi; Mr Romualdi; Mr Haralampo-
poulos; Mr Penders; Mr Michel; Mr
Pannella; Mr Lalor; Mr Schall; Mr Lalor | 167 | | |
| Explanations of vote: Mrs Van den Heuvel;
Mr Newton Dunn; Mr Kappos | 174 | | |
| Point of order: Mr Beyer de Ryke | 176 | | |
| Explanations of vote: Mrs Hammerich; Mr
Lomas; Mr Fergusson | 176 | | |
| Point of order: Mr Fotilas | 177 | | |
| Explanation of vote: Mrs Lizin | 177 | | |
| Adoption of the resolution | 177 | | |
| 4. Accession of Zimbabwe to the Convention of
Lomé — Report (Doc. 1-834/80) by Mr
Poniatowski (Committee on Development
and Cooperation):
Mr Poniatowski, rapporteur | 178 | | |
| Mr Cohen; Mr Wawrzik; Sir Frederick
Warner; Mr Robert Jackson; Mr Cheysson
(Commission); Mr Bersani | 179 | | |
| 5. Operation of STABEX — Report (Doc.
1-698/80) by Mrs Castellina (Committee on
Development and Cooperation):
Mr Poniatowski, deputy rapporteur | 182 | | |
| Mr Michel, Mr Christopher Jackson; Mr De
Gucht; Mr Skovmand; Mr Cheysson
(Commission) | 183 | | |
| Points of order: Mr Enright; Mr Pannella;
Mr Forth | 188 | | |
| 6. Financial and budgetary policy of the
Communities for 1982 (resumption):
Mr Baillet; Mr Colla; Mr Robert Jackson;
Mr Kavanagh; Mr Seligman; Mr Lange; Mr
Spinelli | 190 | | |
| 7. Youth activities — Report (Doc. 1-826/80)
by Mrs Pruoot (Committee on Youth,
Culture, Education, Information and Sport):
Mrs Pruoot, rapporteur | 196 | | |
| 8. Welcome | 197 | | |
| 9. Youth activities (continuation):
Mr Pedini (Chairman of the Committee on
Youth, Culture, Education, Information and
Sport); Mrs Vieboff; Mr Brok; Mr Hutton;
Mr Vandemeulenbroucke; Mr Israel; Mr
Psmazoglou; Mr Richard (Commission); Mr
Coutsocheras; Miss Brookes; Mr Kappos; Mr
Bøgb; Mr Buttafuoco; Mr Peponis; Mr
Dalakouras | 197 | | |
| 10. Linking work and training for young persons
in the Community — Report (Doc. 1-460/80)
by Mr Prag (Committee on Social Affairs and
Employment):
Mr Prag, rapporteur | 209 | | |
| Mr Boyes; Mrs Gaiotti de Biase; Mr Kellett-
Bowman | 211 | | |
| 11. Date and place of part-sessions:
Mr Enright; Mr von der Vring; Mr Forth;
Mr Estgen | 214 | | |
| 12. Votes:
Bocklet report (Doc. 1-839/80): Common
organization of the market in sugar:
Mr Bocklet, rapporteur | 215 | | |
| Point of order: Mr Sherlock | 215 | | |
| Mr Bocklet; Mr Dimopoulos; Mr Bocklet
Explanations of vote: Mr Georgiadis; Mr
Dimopoulos; Mr Tolman; Mr Papaefstrati
Mr Frangos; Mr Vergès; Mr Louwes | | | |

<i>Rejection of the motion for a resolution</i> . . .	221	<i>Mrs Lenz, rapporteur</i>	236
<i>Poniatowski report (Doc. 1-834/80): Accession of Zimbabwe to the Convention of Lomé:</i>		<i>Mr Radoux; Mr Welsh; Mr Bettiza; Mr Almirante; Mr Rieger; Mr De Clercq; Mr Narjes (Commission)</i>	237
<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	221		
<i>Castellina report (Doc. 1-698/80): Operation of STABEX:</i>		15. <i>Compensation for victims of acts of violence — Report (Doc. 1-464/80) by Mr Luster (Legal Affairs Committee):</i>	
<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	221	<i>Mr Luster, rapporteur</i>	241
<i>Spinelli report (Doc. 1-939/80): Financial and budgetary policy of the Communities for 1982:</i>		<i>Mr Sieglerschmidt; Mr Price; Mr Almirante; Mr Narjes (Commission)</i>	242
<i>Mr Spinelli, rapporteur</i>	222		
<i>Point of order: Mr Price</i>	223	16. <i>UK immigration controls — Report (Doc. 1-573/80) by Mr Malangré (Legal Affairs Committee):</i>	
<i>Mr Spinelli</i>	223	<i>Mr Malangré, rapporteur</i>	244
<i>Explanations of vote: Mr Baillot; Mrs Scrivener</i>	223	<i>Mr Megahy; Mr Prout; Mr De Gucht; Mrs Ewing; Mr Narjes (Commission)</i>	245
<i>Point of order: Mr Collins</i>	224		
<i>Explanation of vote: Mr Pannella</i>	224	17. <i>Disturbance of the Community apple market — Report (Doc. 1-757/80) by Mr Curry (Committee on Agriculture):</i>	
<i>Point of order: Mr Brøndlund Nielsen</i>	224	<i>Mr Curry, rapporteur</i>	248
<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	225	<i>Mr J. D. Taylor; Mr Martin; Mr Dalsager (Commission)</i>	249
<i>Pruvot report (Doc. 1-826/80): Youth activities:</i>			
<i>Mrs Pruvot, rapporteur</i>	225	18. <i>Situation in the Community wine-growing sector — Report (Doc. 1-680/80) by Mr Colleselli (Committee on Agriculture):</i>	
<i>Mrs Viehoff; Mrs Pruvot</i>	225	<i>Mr Colleselli, rapporteur</i>	250
<i>Explanations of vote: Mr Coutsocheras; Mrs Viehoff</i>	226	<i>Mr Dalsass; Mr d'Ormesson</i>	252
<i>Point of order: Mr Pannella</i>	226	<i>Point of order: Mr Sutra</i>	252
<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	226	<i>Mr Dalsager (Commission)</i>	252
13. <i>Linking work and training for young persons in the Community (resumption):</i>		<i>Points of order: Mr Oehler; Mr Frangos</i>	252
<i>Mrs Le Roux; Mrs Nielsen; Mr Bøgh; Mr Pasmazoglou; Mr Richard (Commission); Mrs Viehoff, deputy draftsman of an opinion; Mr Estgen; Mrs Boserup; Mr Buttafuoco; Mr Hahn</i>	227		
14. <i>EEC-Romania relations — Report (Doc. 1-678/80) by Mrs Lenz (Committee on External Economic Relations):</i>		19. <i>Urgent procedure</i>	253
		20. <i>Agenda for next sitting</i>	253

IN THE CHAIR: MR DANKERT

Vice-President

(The sitting was opened at 10 a.m.)

President. — The sitting is open.

1. *Approval of minutes*

President. — The minutes of proceedings of yesterday's sitting have been distributed.

Since there are no comments, the minutes of proceedings are approved.¹

¹ Documents received: see minutes of proceedings.

2. Decision on urgency

President. — I have received two motions for resolutions by Mr Fanti and others (Docs. No 1-3/81 and 1-11/81) and another motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-13/81) on El Salvador by Mr de la Malène, on behalf of the Group of the European Progressive Democrats.²

I would remind you that Parliament decided in principle yesterday morning that the debate on El Salvador would not be dealt with under urgent procedure pursuant to Rule 14. I cannot therefore ask Parliament again to decide on this point, as this would be in conflict with the way in which we have hitherto dealt with requests for urgent procedure, since more than a year ago — at the request of the Communist and Allies Group, in fact — we laid down the principle that Parliament would not decide on the urgency of a particular motion for a resolution, but on the urgency of the subject to which the request for urgent procedure related.

Subsequently, it has been decided that if the request for urgent procedure is adopted, all the motions for resolutions dealing with the same subject would be discussed in Parliament. Thus, logically, if the request for urgent procedure is not adopted during a particular part-session, no motions for resolution on the same subject can be dealt with in the same part-session.

In addition, the final paragraph of Rule 12 (2) states that 'if a procedural motion to amend the agenda is rejected, it shall not be tabled again during the same part-session'. Since Parliament rejected the request for an extra item regarding El Salvador to be included on today's agenda under urgent procedure it is, as I see it, inadmissible to put the same request to Parliament again today. Thus I propose that the motions for resolutions tabled should be dealt with in accordance with the provisions of Article 25 and referred to the appropriate committee.

Since there are no objections, that is agreed.

The first item on the agenda is the decision on the urgency of a number of motions for resolutions.

We begin with the motion for a resolution by Mr Taylor and others (Doc. 1-4/81) on the 1982 budget guidelines.

I call Mr Taylor.

Mr J. M. Taylor. — Mr President, any political institution which is funded by public money and which is

anxious about its own budget is properly entitled to regard examination of the issues as being of the first importance and of real and genuine urgency. Far more urgency, if I may say so, than many of the more esoteric items which claim urgency in this Chamber from time to time.

(Cries of 'Hear, hear!')

No group in this Parliament has more consistently or unitedly worried and harried the Parliament's own budget. We feel that we have been justified in doing so and we feel now that if the answers that emerge from the enquiries we are making, are reassuring, which they may well be, then well and good. But proper and scrupulous examination of the Parliament's budget is a very high priority. We think these guidelines that we are setting down are of the first importance and we therefore claim urgency, and I so move.

President. — I call Mr Møller.

Mr Møller. — *(DK)* Mr President, I am very happy to support Mr Taylor's proposal. I have noted with pleasure that the Committee on Budgets has selected as its rapporteur on the Parliament budget a man who is normally critical of the Community, that is Mr Bonde. What is more, I was delighted to see how he got down to the job of gathering as much information as possible, for this Parliament cannot and must not have anything to hide. I offer Mr Bonde my congratulations on his efforts to date to ensure that this Parliament is as efficient and as effective as possible, and at the same time as cost-effective as possible.

I therefore recommend to you — for we should prepare for the budget debate in good time, since we know how difficult it can become in the autumn — that we give our support straight away to Mr Bonde, with the one reservation which is contained in Mr Taylor's proposal, which is that Parliament should set up a committee which can follow up all the facts and all the criticisms which may be brought to light by Mr Bonde; it is my hope that this will be done in the constructive spirit which I know to be Mr Bonde's own, that is, a spirit of constructive, rather than negative criticism for the benefit of our own cooperation and for our Community. I therefore think it important that we should try to have this approved by urgent procedure. And I thank Mr Bonde once again for his excellent efforts.

President. — I call the Socialist Group.

Mr Lange. — *(D)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, that a group should regard these issues as being of prime importance and worthy of urgent consideration — as Mr Taylor said — is of course laudable. However, these issues are not just the

² See minutes of proceedings.

Lange

concern of the Group of the European Progressive Democrats, neither now nor in the future. On the contrary, no group has a prerogative in this affair, which is of interest to the other groups as well. What is more, this motion for a resolution poses many problems which cannot be resolved *ad hoc* without appropriate and thorough preparation. Although he didn't spell it out, Mr Møller nevertheless gave himself away. But we cannot make any special arrangements to supervise a rapporteur. If we once started to do so, then the floodgates would be opened and we would never know whose hands were going to be tied next. But to get back to the main point, I think that these matters will have to be examined thoroughly — as we agreed in committee on Monday — when staff requirements and the first preliminary draft budget for Parliament are discussed in committee. Then no stone will be left unturned. Where necessary, everything will be made public. This whole subject is far too delicate to be put before this House without the adequate preparation of a relevant report.

For these reasons, I would strongly recommend that we reject this request for urgency and let the committee have the chance to deal with these questions when it considers the first preliminary draft budget for Parliament.

President. — I call the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

Mr Notenboom. — (NL) Mr President, I should just like to comment briefly on the proposal to reject the request for urgency we have just heard. We are opposed to dealing with this matter under urgent procedure since it is for the Bureau to take the initiative as regards Parliament's budget. In accordance with Rule 49 (3) the Bureau must take the first step and it is Parliament which has the last word. Thus Parliament is given every possible chance. Following the preliminary discussions between the Bureau and the Committee on Budgets, we have managed to ensure that this time — this has not happened for many years — the Bureau will act in accordance with Rule 49 (3), i.e. the Bureau is to make a proposal. If we in Parliament now go and issue preliminary guidelines, we will be preventing the Bureau from doing what it should do, which is one of the reasons why we are opposed to urgent procedure in this case. It is certainly not because we want to be more stringent. I hope that finally everyone — the Bureau, the Committee on Budgets and Parliament too — will take account of the stringency called for in this resolution. However, if a resolution were tabled at this stage, we should be reversing the roles since Parliament has the last word but the Bureau has the first.

President. — The European Democratic Group has the floor.

Mr Kirk. — (DK) Mr President, I think it should be pointed out that we already have on the order paper a debate on the guidelines for the Community budget for 1982. I think, too, that we should remember that one of the reasons we shall not get around to discussing this proposal during this part-session is that Mr Lange's committee was unable to submit a report. However, as the previous speakers who have supported the request have said, it is important that Parliament as a whole should concern itself with these matters and bring its attention to bear on its own budget. I therefore think that it is essential for this Parliament to make an effort and have the question debated by urgent procedure during this part-session. We shall do everything in our power to help Mr Bonde make Parliament work more effectively, and I do not believe that Parliament can forgo its right to be involved in setting out the guidelines for that work. I do not believe that, just because Mr Lange's committee has not been able to reach any conclusions, this should prevent Parliament's being able to state its view on the guidelines.

(Parliament rejected the request for urgent procedure)¹

*

* *

President. — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-6/81) by Mr Johnson and others: UN Conference on the Law of the Sea.*

I call Mr Johnson.

Mr Johnson. — Mr President, on 2 March the United States Secretary of State instructed US representatives to the United Nations Law of the Sea Conference to seek to ensure that negotiations do not end at the present session of the Conference. Now this twelfth hour action, which was apparently incited by deep-sea mining interests in the United States, puts at risk everything that has been achieved in almost ten years of negotiation. There is a real danger that we shall not see an international maritime regime agreed this spring; in fact, there is a danger that we may not see an international maritime regime agreed at all. The consequences, as *The Times* made clear in an editorial yesterday, would not be limited to maritime issues, important as these are. As *The Times* put it, it will only be a matter of time before disputes spill over into the area of international politics. It is therefore urgent that this EEC Parliament debate the issue this week and that we send now a clear signal to our representatives in New York and to the United States Government that

¹ The motion for a resolution was referred to the appropriate committee.

Johnson

we wish to see the Law of the Sea Conference concluded this session and along the lines of the compromise package which has so painstakingly been worked out. I recognize, of course, that there is a report on the Law of the Sea at present being considered in committee, and I hope that this report will ultimately come before the House. If we have an urgent debate tomorrow it will not prejudice later deliberations. We are on a tactical point here, Mr President, where every day counts.

President. — The Liberal and Democratic Group has the floor.

Mr Calvez. — (F) Mr President, our Group is anxious to point out that the current attitude of the United States is cause for serious concern, since the Americans are trying to reassess their position on provisions concerning deep-sea mining and environmental protection. In view of the importance of the problems which are raised, our Group is in favour of an urgent debate.

(Parliament adopted urgent procedure)¹

*

* *

President. — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-7/81) by Lord Bethell and others: Community aid for Afghan refugees in Pakistan.*

I call Lord Bethell.

Lord Bethell. — Mr President, this request for urgency procedure has been signed by individuals, I am happy to say, from all groups in this Parliament, and I very much hope that it will be approved.

The circumstances are as follows. You will have read yesterday in your press that President Reagan pledged his word to provide assistance to the guerilla fighters in Afghanistan. Now it may be that the United States will decide to provide arms for the resistance in that country and it may choose to give surface-to-air missiles to enable the guerillas to shoot down the helicopter gun-ships which are decimating the civilian population of Afghanistan. However, this is not the matter that I am putting before you today. The matter which we are being asked to debate urgently is purely humanitarian. It arises, though, from the attacks that

are continuing on the civilian population by the Soviet occupation forces, a fact which only the most unconstituted Soviet apologist would begin to deny. The attacks have forced very large numbers of Afghan refugees to cross into Pakistan. The number is now one-and-a-half million, and this is the alarming and the urgent part about it. The flow of refugees has doubled in recent weeks. In January 1981, roughly 150 000 people crossed the border into Northern Pakistan, double the rate of most of 1980.

Now this places an intolerable burden on the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, and in order to assist this the United States has made a special contribution of 23 million dollars during 1981. But no such contribution is at present envisaged by the European Community, Mr President, and this is why I put to you that the matter is urgent. It is true that the Community gave generously last year — a matter of 17 million units of account — but at the moment aid to the refugees in the north of Pakistan is not envisaged by the Commission. I hope, though, that if urgent procedure is granted by this House, this matter can be clarified tomorrow in a brief debate. I therefore invite you to put this question to the House, that the matter be debated urgently tomorrow.

President. — The Socialist Group has the floor.

Mr Ripa di Meana. — (I) Mr President, I recently visited the Afghan refugee camps in the north-west province of Pakistan. To be precise, I was there in January at the time when the UN High Commissioner announced that the number of Afghan refugees officially recorded by the United Nations had risen above one and a half million. There are no official figures on the number of refugees in Iran. The figure which is generally quoted by reliable sources puts the number of Afghan refugees in that country at about 400 000 people. In other words, more than 10 % of the population of Afghanistan has fled the country of their birth as a result of the Soviet invasion.

These people are all living under canvas. Many of them have been living like this for more than a year. Food is in very short supply and sanitary conditions are inadequate, although luckily there have been no epidemics so far. In many camps water supplies are not enough to cover basic needs. The refugees arrived with their flocks of goats and donkeys, and there is no pasture for the animals. To keep themselves warm and to cook their food the refugees are taking wood from the forests every day, and this is causing serious problems of deforestation.

This human tide halted for a while in the North-West Frontier Province, in Baluchistan and along the border where ethnic similarities make it easier for them to live alongside the local population, but it is now pouring

¹ The item was placed on the agenda of 13 March.

Ripa di Meana

deeper into Pakistan, towards Punjab and Sind, bringing with it serious threats of racial unrest.

I had long discussions with the UN High Commissioner from Austria, Mr Kohaut, who has overall responsibility for the camps, and with the Canadian official, Mr McAlpine, who is in charge of the camps in the Peshawar area. They told me how welcome European aid had been last year and they expressed the hope that it would be increased in 1981 to cope with the growing number of Afghan refugees. The sad fact is that in Pakistan alone this number is very soon going to reach the dramatic figure of two million.

On behalf of the Socialist Group, therefore, I support the request for urgency which Lord Bethell presented just now.

President. — The Liberal and Democratic Group has the floor.

Mr Haagerup. — (DK) Mr President, I should like to thank Lord Bethell for taking this initiative. I think it was needed and that there was a call for it in this instance. My Group will support the initiative.

President. — I call Mrs Baduel Glorioso.

Mrs Baduel Glorioso. — (F) Mr President, I really fail to understand why this Parliament should think the question of Afghan refugees in Pakistan is a matter of urgency. After all, it was this Parliament which voted against urgency in the case of El Salvador, where the government has been involved in 3 000 deaths and where a stand on our part could help the country. I shall be voting against urgent procedure and I want to say quite categorically that this political bias in viewing matters is outrageous.

(Applause from certain quarters on the left — Parliament adopted urgent procedure)¹

*
* *

President. — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-10/81) by Mrs Gaiotti de Biase and others: Adaptation of the Cooperation Agreement with Yugoslavia.*

I call Mrs Gaiotti de Biase.

Mrs Gaiotti de Biase. — (I) There are obvious reasons for this request for urgent procedure, Mr President. Less than a year ago this Parliament welcomed the Cooperation Agreement with Yugoslavia as an event of tremendous political significance. We saw it as a sign of the way in which the Community seeks both economic development and political stability in the world. As things stand now, it seems that serious differences among the Member States are eroding the harmony of last year's vote. We gradually seem to be detecting a kind of incompatibility between two things which we happily welcomed before: upholding the Community's commitments to Yugoslavia and continuing the traditional two-way trade between Greece and Yugoslavia following the accession of Greece to the Community, especially with regard to baby-beef.

The European Parliament delegation, during its meetings with the delegation from the Yugoslav Parliament, took careful note of Yugoslav concern about the level of imports and the need to increase rather than decrease the volume of trade. I think Parliament should make a definite gesture for the benefit of the Council today, so that there are no interruptions between the end of the provisional agreements and the framing of final agreements and so that the commitments which were publicly made are upheld.

(Applause from various quarters on the left)

President. — The Socialist Group has the floor.

Mr Radoux. — (F) Mr President, we second what Mrs Gaiotti de Biase has just said. Nothing came of the meeting which was held last week and we have reason to believe that the Council will be considering this matter next week. There is therefore a straightforward reason why Parliament would do well to make its position known now.

(Parliament adopted urgent procedure)¹

President. — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-14/81) by Mr Moreau and others (S), Mr Michel and others (EEP) and Mr Carossino and others (COM): Joint meeting of the Council.*

I call Mr Moreau.

Mr Moreau. — (F) Mr President, as concern grows throughout Europe and as the unemployment problem and the economic situation get worse, we feel that the suggestion by the Council Presidency for a joint meeting between Ministers of Labour and Ministers of

¹ The item was placed on the agenda of 13 March.

¹ The item was placed on the agenda of 13 March.

Moreau

Economic Affairs becomes increasingly important. In our view, in spite of all the difficulties besetting the preparation of this meeting, Parliament ought to make it quite clear that it is anxious to see the meeting take place.

I am well aware that meetings of this kind can sometimes seem to be a formality, but there are two points which I feel Parliament must really stress. Firstly, we have to indicate how anxious we are for this meeting to be held, and secondly, we have to say how keen we are to see the Commission and the Council of Ministers make the necessary effort and establish the proper contacts so that the meeting does take place and produce the results which will be a new source of encouragement for our citizens.

(Parliament adopted urgent procedure)¹

3. Western Sahara (continuation of debate and vote)

President. — The next item is the continuation of the debate on the Lalor report (Doc. 1-532/80).²

I call Mr Boyes on a point of order.

Mr Boyes. — Mr President, the President of Parliament welcomed to the Chamber representatives from Morocco. This morning representatives of the parliament of the Sahara Republic are in the gallery and I hope the President and the Parliament will be prepared to give them a welcome too.

(Applause from various quarters on the left)

President. — Mr Boyes, I would like to comply with your suggestion but I must inform you that I have received no official notification concerning the visit of this delegation, so I have some difficulty in doing so. I regret this.

(Applause from various quarters of the European Democratic Group — Mr Boyes insistently requested the floor)

Mr Boyes, only delegations which have been officially announced are welcomed by the Chair. I have not been officially informed of the visit by this delegation. A welcome could be extended to this delegation, but only on the basis of prior official notification. As I have received no such notification I regret I cannot extend a welcome to this delegation. If I were to comply with your request, I would have to welcome a delegation every hour or so.

(Applause from various quarters of the European Democratic Group)

We shall continue with the debate.

I call Mr Habsburg.

Mr Habsburg. — *(D)* Mr President, Europe's contribution to the events in the Maghreb region ought to be to bring its influence to bear in order that Moroccans and Algerians, with whom we have such close links, may reach some sort of agreement, this being what the King of Morocco recently and unequivocally named as being the aim of his policies.

At the moment, these two great nations are divided by a conflict in the Western Sahara, in which it is quite clear that Morocco was not the aggressor, since all the battles have taken place on Moroccan soil. I know the Western Sahara and its inhabitants from having made numerous visits to that region over the last 25 years. I know from my own personal experience that the so-called 'freedom movement' Polisario is neither representative of a nation nor a legitimate political party. Polisario is a foreign legion in the pay of the Libyan tyrant Gaddafi, who has just shown his true colours by invading Chad. The Soviet weapons in the hands of alleged freedom fighters show who is really behind this Polisario. The ultimate goal of the totalitarian and imperialistic united front between the Soviet Union and Gaddafi is not the Western Sahara. They are aiming at the Straits of Gibraltar, which we in the North of Europe are also dependent upon. Should Gibraltar or Tangiers fall into the hands of a power which is allied with the Soviet Union then the Mediterranean and the states bordering on it will be at the mercy of the Red fleet of Admiral Gorshkov.

Europe's future is being acted out today in Africa. A glance at the map should prove this to those whose political bias still blinds them to it. Seen from this objective viewpoint, the argument that the frontiers established during colonialization should not be altered has an incredibly unworldly ring to it. Colonialism is universally condemned and this, as the great statesman Turgot demonstrated as early as the 18th century, is perfectly justifiable from a political stance. But then, however, people go on to defend stubbornly one of the most questionable and dangerous aspects of colonialism, namely borders which only too often were unjustifiable in historical, legal, ethnic and economic terms. We are talking about sacrificing tangible interests of the population now living there to some artificial divisions drawn up by conquistadors or bureaucrats. I ask you, is this a realistic attitude?

In addition, every single person in this House who has a personal knowledge of the Western Sahara has so far spoken in support of this report. The only people who were against it are those who do not possess this

¹ The item was placed on the agenda of 13 March.

² See debates of 9 March.

Habsburg

experience. We are, therefore, obliged to the rapporteur for the practical service he has rendered world peace and Europe. It will be to the credit of Parliament if it adopts this report and the motion for a resolution accompanying it.

President. — I call Mrs Baduel Glorioso.

Mrs Baduel Glorioso. — (*I*) Mr President, can I just ask a question first of all? Mr Habsburg spoke in the debate on the Lalor report at ten to two during the last sitting of the part-session in Luxembourg. How come he has spoken again? Is it in order for someone to speak twice in the same debate?

President. — I was not aware of the fact, but according to my assistants here it is possible, though unusual.

Mrs Baduel Glorioso. — (*I*) Ah, that is excellent news. I am very pleased to hear that, because I too shall use this new procedure.

(*Laughter*)

Mr President, on behalf of my Group, I submit that the Lalor report is unacceptable, as are the amendments, and therefore we shall vote against them. They are all unacceptable for a certain number of reasons which I shall now rapidly explain.

Lord Bethell spoke on Monday — and I do not always agree with him, but this time I must — about the unlawful pressure which had been exerted on the Members of this House via the sending of literature and in other ways. However, he omitted to mention two concrete facts which in my opinion are of extreme importance. Firstly, the rapporteur, very shortly after being appointed, was invited to the Kingdom of Morocco. It is for this reason that I am not surprised that he did not meet representatives of the Sahrawi people nor of the Polisario Front. Secondly, the Moroccan delegation invited by the EP-Maghreb delegation, has chosen this week to be persuaded finally into attending a session of Parliament just when we are discussing a matter of some delicacy for Morocco itself.

Well, in my opinion, the two attempts to bring pressure to bear which I have referred to above, when compared to what Lord Bethell mentioned in his speech, and which I should not have encouraged him to mention, have far weightier implications than the fact that we all received a load of literature through the post, even if one is speaking in terms of their actual physical weight.

But there is one reason why we cannot vote in favour of the Lalor report. This is because it does not, in fact,

take the true situation into account. Parliament cannot refute the facts. It is a fact that the Sahrawi people exists and that it has a right to self-determination. It is a fact that the Polisario freedom movement exists and that it has been recognized by more than forty countries.

Similarly, this House cannot once again ignore UN Resolution 1514, the OAU resolution and the fact that the Sahrawi Republic is the 51st country to become a member of the Pan-African Organization. We cannot overlook the fact that on 20 February the United Nations' Committee on Human Rights deplored the continuing occupation of the Western Sahara by Morocco, since this occupation is hampering the right of the people of this territory to exercise its self-determination, and that this occupation also infringes the other basic rights of that people. However, the representatives of the four largest political parties in France had already before this, on 9 January and after having visited the Western Sahara, declared that nine-tenths of the territory in dispute is now occupied by the Polisario Front.

Lastly, the most important factor — one which Mr Lalor really could not take into account, given that his report was drawn up before the latest decisions which I have just referred to — is that of the decision taken by the Conference of Ministers from the non-aligned countries held in New Dehli between 9 and 12 February last, in which, with no reservations whatsoever, not even from Morocco, explicit reference is made to the inalienable right to self-determination of the peoples of the Western Sahara. I should like to remind you all that the Kingdom of Morocco expressed no reservations on this matter, which has however been the case for other countries under the same type of circumstances.

This motion for a resolution is unacceptable, lastly, because it does not take into account the fact that we have relations, as a Community, with all the countries of the Maghreb and that the parliamentary delegation in this House is called the 'Maghreb delegation'. This means that the report does not give sufficient consideration to the objective difficulties which will arise, if this resolution is passed, in our relations with other countries in that area, particularly with Algeria and Tunisia.

For these reasons, with this motion for a resolution, we will not help or contribute towards finding a peaceful solution to this difficult problem and it is for this reason, I repeat, that we are firmly against it. Let us not depart from the role which is and should be that of Europe — and particularly of this House — which is one of helping to find solutions to conflicts, working for détente and for peace in all the areas of the world. If we were to take sides so openly in support of one of the conflicting parties, then we would be likely to jeopardize the negotiations which are taking place at

Baduel Glorioso

the moment, and the search for peaceful solutions which is at present under way.

I should like to mention, in this connection, that the rapporteur himself refers to 'innocent peoples', so that even if he omits to respect the Sahrawi Republic and the existence of a freedom movement known as the Polisario, he does refer to 'innocent peoples'.

Mr Lalor, do you wish to see the rights of these innocent peoples defended, or on the other hand do you and all those who will vote with you in favour of your motion for a resolution, not wish to consider these innocent peoples?

(Applause from the extreme left)

President. — I call Mrs Macciocchi.

Mrs Macciocchi. — *(I)* Mr President, I shall be quite detached during this debate, I should only like to mention a number of facts which in my opinion are being overlooked. By this, I mean some new developments in the situation and the way in which roles have been reshuffled amongst the supporters of the Polisario front.

Firstly, there is the growing role of Libya which is tending to replace Algeria as the main supporter of Polisario, in spite of the distance which separates it from them. It is for this reason that Algeria's attitude was more moderate at the time of Chadli taking over from Boumedienne as president. It is common knowledge that direct exchanges have taken place between Algeria and Morocco, which up to now have borne no fruit. This is nonetheless a good sign. As a result, mediation by the European Community — which is recommended in the Lalor motion for a resolution — is pointless and perhaps downright dangerous. Diplomatic intervention by the Community would force the protagonists to fall back on firmer positions in order to save face, whereas secret discussions, which have already started, would make much greater flexibility possible. In addition, Mauritania, the main ally of Morocco, has retreated in favour of the Polisario and might well become a jumping-off point for the latter's operations and replace Algeria in the event that the latter cuts down on its aid.

In addition, this resolution is in my opinion too vague to be really effective. To my mind, it is in fact pointless because it does not make the least reference to self-determination — as many other Members have mentioned — whilst this principle has been approved, as we have seen, both by the UN and under certain circumstances even by Morocco. This resolution urges Algeria to forbid 'the use of its territory bordering on Morocco for the launching of armed attacks on that country' without going into details of exactly what should be considered as Moroccan territory. Does the

former Spanish Sahara belong to Morocco, as Rabat states and as Algeria disputes? This appeal is, as a result, in my opinion, pointless and in the worst analysis hypocritical. There is question of bilateral negotiations without stating which countries or parties are referred to. In fact, a negotiated solution to this problem cannot simply be bilateral since it ought to involve the presence of at least Morocco, Algeria, Libya, Mauritania without mentioning the Polisario.

In these circumstances, a resolution of this sort has no meaning, and we cannot in truth vote in favour of it because it is vague. Nonetheless, we ought to clearly state that the principle of self-determination for all the peoples of the Sahara exists, thereby involving in any future consultation peoples which live in other parts of the Sahara which did not belong to the former Spanish colony. However, it is to be wished that elections can be held, after a ceasefire has been signed, under international control.

President. — I call Mr Romualdi.

Mr Romualdi. — *(I)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, whatever our differences, we do not feel that it is possible to have any objective reasons for disagreeing with the clear and forthright stance adopted by Mr Lalor in his report on the Western Sahara. It is perhaps a very patchy report because he tries, with not a little success, to place everything in its true perspective, because he aims at expressing the solidarity of this House with the nomads and poor population of the Western Sahara, but at the same time wishes to condemn terrorism and guerilla tactics which have absolutely nothing to do, in our opinion, with the free right of peoples to self-determination, about which so much has been said and is still being said, and which has even less to do with the freedom of the Sahrawi people to self-determination.

The first thing which must be done, and it is right that the Lalor report stresses this, is to firmly establish who are and how many inhabitants there are who originate from the Western Sahara, how many and who are the refugees who are in Algerian territory around Tinduf. In other words — words which are especially dear to the hearts of my fellow Communist Members — we must know exactly what and who the Polisario Front represents, since it would seem that the Member States of the Community ought to recognize them. A great deal has been said about the Polisario and its exploits, but it is not a simple matter to give an honest opinion of what they are and what they truly represent. What we need to know is whether they really represent the aspirations and rights of a population seeking its own national identity and its own independence, or if they alternatively represent the aspiration of politico-military organizations towards armed terrorism, organizations which have deliberately built up in the Western Sahara a sanctuary for

Romualdi

guerillas and for the Communist revolution, in order to create an unbridgeable gap of hatred and bloodshed between Algeria and Morocco, with the obvious intention of preventing these two great African and Mediterranean nations from finding a way, by objective and responsible assessment of the real causes of their harsh and painful conflict, to do away with their differences and solve their problems in a climate of mutual understanding. What are the Cubans doing in or around Tinduf, those now infamous pedlars of other peoples' guerilla warfare, terrorism and revolutions? What are the soldiers and Libyan agents of Gaddafi, and other people armed with Gaddafi's weapons and paid from his coffers, doing there? Gaddafi has openly stated that he is committed to supporting all wars of independence and liberation waged by Africans and not just by them alone. The Lalor report wishes, along just these lines, to commit the Community to a major campaign of conciliation, which will be part of a disinterested but also careful and caring move towards mediation and peace. This means assuming responsibilities, and is a duty which the Member States of the Community must not, and cannot, shirk. This is the only way they have of showing by their actions that they are serving the vital interests and freedom of decision of the Sahrawi people, inasmuch as such a people exists. Let us understand each other in this matter, because the fact is that, whether this please my fellow Radical-Socialist or Communist Members or not, that even though this problem has been pending for years, we do not have the least certainty of what the real weight in terms of people and numbers the Sahrawi have. This means that we do not know if the Sahrawi people really and truly exists.

When, in 1974, the International Red Cross intervened with Western powers in order to organize a massive aid programme to help people who were refugees in Algerian territory, and under the threat of starvation, or death through poverty and disease, the Red Cross representatives stated, giving documentary evidence — and we can submit proof at this very moment — that such refugees amount to approximately 50 000 persons — men, women and children — originating from all sorts of places, from Upper Volta, Mauritania, and Chad and that amongst them there were 20 000 Tuaregs originating from Mali and Niger, driven from there by drought, thirst, hunger and even worse disasters.

This is why we must ask ourselves just how many Sahrawi there are. Once the necessary research has been carried out, we shall perhaps learn that what we are dealing with is a tiny population, whose main requirement is to be freed from any kind of artificial system of national structure, from any kind of unlawful pressure and particularly freed from the presence of armed men which has transformed the territory in which they generally lived, or in which they very often led their own nomadic existence, into a breeding ground for guerilla warfare. We must, ladies and gentlemen, stamp out this breeding ground first

and foremost by meeting with generosity and good judgment the requirements of these people and then by doing our best to further agreements and peace initiatives between the powers which are directly involved. Good relations between them are necessary not just in order to handle their own mutual interests successfully but also in order to carry out a broad policy of cooperation and development between the small and large populations, between the States and nations of the whole African, Mediterranean and European world. This is a world prepared for a great future, ladies and gentlemen, which we cannot permit ourselves the luxury of seeing jeopardized by Communist manipulation, whatever they may call themselves, and above all when they are skillfully hidden behind an impressive facade which urges people to wage wars of independence and liberation on behalf of foundling nationalisms which have no real roots or traditions worthy of the name.

President. — I call Mr Haralampopoulos.

Mr Haralampopoulos. — (*EL*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to start by expressing my surprise at what I have heard being said by some of the Members on the subject of the Western Sahara on Monday and today. In my view the problem of the Western Sahara has been properly defined by the UN decisions, which recognize the right of the people of the Sahara to independence and self-determination. I believe that the proclamation of the Arab Republic of the Sahara was the result not of discussions of dubious negotiations, but of the struggle of the people of the Sahara — a struggle similar to earlier struggles against dependence and colonialism.

Nor can we compare Morocco, which is the occupying power, with Algeria, which offers refuge to inhabitants of the Western Sahara who have been forced to flee from the Moroccan armed forces. We representatives of the Panhellenic Socialist Movement, PASOK, will vote against the text — as, I think, will the whole Socialist Group — for the following reasons.

Firstly, the text does not expressly recognize the Arab Republic of the Western Sahara.

Secondly, the text does not mention the interventions by French and Americans in the region — interventions officially documented in a report by our French colleagues.

Thirdly, the report does not recognize the Polisario, which was the moving force behind the people of the Sahara and which gave expression to the anticolonialist struggle.

Fourthly, the report compares Algeria with Morocco, which — as I said before is essentially an occupying power.

Haralampopoulos

In general terms, the text is out of touch with the spirit of latest developments in the region, developments which, after the recognition of the Arab Republic of the Sahara by Mauritania, leave Morocco totally isolated in the Arab world. Finally, we believe that the European Community must join its voice with that of the United Nations, the Organization of African Unity and the 45 countries which have already recognized the Arab Republic of the Sahara. For all those reasons, we shall be voting against the motion for a resolution.

President. — I understand there is a Moroccan civil servant in the official gallery, tape recording the proceedings. I have to announce to him that he must stop if he has no press accreditation.

I call Mr Penders.

Mr Penders. — (NL) Mr President, I should like to say first of all how glad I am that we have finally got round to discussing the Lalor report today. The way we have been pressed and even blackmailed not to discuss the report is unacceptable for a free democratic body. The Lalor report was discussed and adopted in the Political Affairs Committee completely in accordance with the procedures laid down and it is now perfectly in order that it should be discussed in the plenary assembly. However, when people start applying pressure, one might well be suspicious of their motives. So much for the procedural aspect, and now to the question itself. I must admit — and I never made any secret of this — that the Lalor report presents me with great difficulties since it goes against two golden rules which have applied since the Second World War during the process of decolonization. The first is that the colonial border should be left intact, as otherwise one is left with hopeless confusion, and the other is that the populations of former colonies have the right to self-determination and to decide their own fate.

I fully realize that other points could be made in the case of Morocco since, after all, Morocco is a State which has existed for centuries now and the colonial history of Morocco in the 20th century was hardly more than an episode of a few decades. I am also aware of the fact that in 1958 the region of Tafaya was added to Morocco without a referendum and I also know that in 1969, the same thing happened in the case of the Ifni enclave. Nevertheless, I take the view that it is important to apply these old golden rules of decolonization for an area as extensive as the Spanish Western Sahara and — let us be honest — this has not been the case. In 1975, Mauritania and Morocco shared out the Western Sahara between them. This is an inadmissible violation of the golden rule. Secondly, as regards the right to self-determination, the popula-

tion of the Western Sahara was not given a chance to exercise this right and notice that I am speaking of the *population*, I am not yet speaking of the *people* of the Western Sahara. Whether or not one can speak of a 'people' will become apparent when the population is allowed to exercise its right of self-determination. And then people say to me, 'What are you getting so worked up about, Mr Penders? The people there can catch fish and eat figs — they are perfectly happy with Morocco, don't get so worked up about it.' Well, all the better, Mr President, if it is in fact the case that the population is perfectly happy with Morocco, there is no reason whatsoever why this should not be made clear by means of a referendum. I should also like to point out in this connection that, in my view, it is an omission that the Lalor report makes no mention of an important party in the conflict, i.e. the Polisario. I do not regard the Polisario movement as the sole representatives of the population of the Western Sahara — I reject this claim as I do those of the SWAPO and the PLO. However it is nevertheless an important factor and if we are to establish peace in that part of the world, the Polisario must be involved in the talks. We have all had very positive things to say about the statements of the European Council on 2 December which say among other things that the PLO should be involved in the peace talks. Well then, this principle obviously applies in the case of Polisario too.

Finally, Mr President, I should like to make a few remarks regarding the international context, which we should never lose sight of. There are, naturally, tensions in Africa. There is considerable unrest, and rightly so, concerning the behaviour of Libya *vis-à-vis*, for example, Chad. However, Mr President, this unrest can also be seen in Algeria. *Le Monde* stated on 11 March that President Chadli Bendjedid has issued quite explicit warnings to Libya. Naturally and quite rightly, there is unrest concerning attempts by the Soviet Union to exploit the conflict. However, this unrest exists in Algeria too. There is a pressing need for reorganization of rigid groupings in Africa and is it in our own interests as Western countries to drive Algeria and Libya back into the same camp? Have we already forgotten the positive role played by Algeria in the drama of the Iranian hostages? Just one more final point, Mr President. I and various other members of my Group have decided that we cannot vote in favour for the motion for a resolution contained in the Lalor report.

President. — I call Mr Michel.

Mr Michel. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I have read Mr Lalor's report carefully. I thank him for the caution he exercised and for the subtle wording of his motion for a resolution. I do, however, feel that his final remarks are somewhat watered down.

Michel

I did not intend to speak during this debate but I feel morally obliged to give my own eye-witness account, which is very fresh since it is only one week old. I did in fact have to preside over the Parliamentary delegation which went on a mission from Sierra Leone to Senegal and from Senegal to Mauritania. As recently as Wednesday, Thursday and Friday of last week we were in the latter country. This fact-finding mission from Parliament was made up of representatives of the various groups, two Socialist Members, two Liberal Members, two Christian-Democrat Members, a Communist Member, a representative of Mr Pannella's Technical Coordination Group, and a Member from the Group of European Progressive Democrats. One Member of our Parliament, in point of fact our esteemed colleague from the Liberal Group, Mr Irmer, directly addressing the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Mauritania, put some very straight questions concerning the Sahrawi people and the Polisario Front. These questions mainly covered the possible outcome of the struggle now taking place, the risk of a serious deterioration of this conflict which would go against the civilian population, and the risk of its spreading to other countries and of disturbing elements from outside infiltrating the country, particularly because of arms supply by and the increasing influence of the Soviet Union, which in his opinion was becoming a matter for increasing concern not just for the Sahara but also for the whole of West Africa.

And now, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I shall give you the replies which the Mauritanian Foreign Minister gave him. They were as straightforward as the questions and can be broken into six points, which I shall briefly sum up.

Firstly, the frontiers of African countries, which are frequently artificial, sometimes paradoxical and insufficient, were mapped out by Europeans without consulting the populations involved. They divided up Africa as they saw fit and by spheres of influence during the 19th century at what is known as the Berlin Conference.

Secondly, in the meantime in almost all parts of Africa we have witnessed the process of decolonization over the last three decades. This has met with success almost everywhere, except in regions where it has not yet been completed and particularly where there is apartheid, which is a creed you all condemn. The Foreign Minister stressed that Mauritania had not called into question these artificial frontiers, which took no account, in some countries, of ethnic and cultural groups and ancient alliances.

Thirdly, Spain — which recently, as you are aware, went from dictatorship to democracy, which it would seem is still unstable but does exist — decolonized the Spanish Sahara. At an international conference held in Madrid, it was decided that the Spanish Sahara should be divided up half and half between Morocco and Mauritania. Algeria felt that it had been cheated.

Fourthly, Mauritania took up arms, for its part, and conducted a war in order to keep the portion of the Sahara which had been given over to it. This war lasted three years, and its outcome was to wear down Mauritania, bankrupt its meagre resources and overthrow the former government, which had ruled for more than two decades. The fact is that the Sahara war involved brothers of the same race. It created a split between the Sahrawi people and Mauritania which the latter country now wished to heal.

Fifth point: you Europeans ask, 'Who make up the Sahrawi people today and what will become of them in the future?' Whatever the reply to that question, it is not for Europe to give it. It is for the inhabitants of the Sahara, be they 100, 150 or 300 000, to give their reply, without restraint and safe from the threats of the great powers and their weapons. Are there many Sahrawi or not? This is unimportant. In Europe, nations with 300 000 inhabitants — and other nations — exist, but I do not think that you are prepared to do away with Luxembourg, Monaco or Lichtenstein. Do you, or do you not, therefore, want to respect our wishes? Do you want to observe human rights and the right to self-determination as well?

The sixth point concerned the supply of arms and infiltration by outside elements. These do exist but they are happening on all sides, and not on just one. Weapons are being supplied in ample quantities, and the main source is not Russia. So, do not throw stones. Put your own house in order first. Mauritania, for her part, as the Sahrawi people's closest neighbour, has decided: firstly, that it will break off hostilities with its brothers, secondly, that it will no longer claim any territory or mineral resources, even if it was offered them, thirdly, that it will cede to the Sahrawi people the right to avail itself of its own territory and exploit its mineral resources.

Having given this factual account, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, which is itself open to verification by the Members who are here and who can correct what I have said if they so wish, I should like to conclude by stating that, should the European Community offer its services in order really to pave the way for a peaceful settlement and reconciliation aimed at the self-determination of the Sahrawi people, then we cannot but be pleased. But it is not enough to look at what is happening in the Sahara or elsewhere from a distance. We must also ask ourselves — it is our duty to do so — how other people see us and judge our intervention and our acts. You are aware that in this respect the resolution does not go quite far enough. We are forced to observe that the Lalor report concludes by suggesting that the Community mediate between Morocco and Algeria with a view to preserving peace and stability in that region. Another point is that, in my opinion, and judging by what we saw on the spot, any such mediation is impossible if the aspirations of the Sahrawi people itself are overlooked. Lastly, I beg you not to make this tragedy into

Michel

a clash between the Right and the Left or the Centre in this House. This is not the issue. And anyway, such attitudes are out of date. Let us simply observe that the legitimate rights of the Sahrawi people are gaining ever wider recognition at international level, as the conferences of the Organization of African Unity have shown, and also as various statements made recently in the Member States show. This opinion is also that of more than forty member countries of the United Nations. I should also like to draw your attention to the views recently expressed by the Dutch Parliament, by the Italian Christian Democrats, by the Greek New Democracy Party, and even, Mr Lalor, by Mr Jacques Chirac himself in a recent statement. To sum up, we must recognize the Sahrawi people as worthy to bear the burden of its own aspirations and problems. Together with Polisario, it should be present at the peace negotiations the report recommends if they are to have any meaning at all!

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MR MØLLER

Vice-President

President. — I call Mr Pannella.

(Interruptions)

Mr Pannella. — *(F)* Did I hear asses braying?... Mr President for the fifteen items on today's agenda, my group has a total speaking time of nine minutes. As a result, I am forced to restrict my remarks to a very short explanation of vote. This is how you want to make us believe in the serious nature of debates here.

Thanks to Mr Michel's speech and to his unbending intellectual honesty, I am able to speak very briefly since I share the views which he expressed at the end of his speech. I truly do not think that the situation is as black and white as some people would have us think. But I too am always frightened when I hear people talking about national independence for hundreds of thousands of people, because — although there have been a few exceptions in history, and in Europe — very often this is simply a way of rendering nations dependent in a different way — a dependence which is harsh and cruel, coming as it does after the official dependence which old-fashioned colonialism represented. I am sorry that Mr Lalor maintained a stance which is in some ways too one-sided. I feel that we ought at least to have mentioned the existence of other parties in this affair. He did not mention them, and for this I am sorry. His Group, particularly through Mr Israel, pays close attention to questions of freedom and independence of nations. I am sorry to

have to vote against this report. I should like to see it rejected so that we might reach an agreement which would be capable of gaining the support of a very broad majority in this House.

President. — I call the rapporteur.

Mr Lalor, rapporteur. — Mr President, I intend being decidedly brief in this debate on the Western Sahara. I should say initially, however, that the job of rapporteur on this issue was not one that I sought. However, it does appear that in its own way this particular report, and the debate on it within the European Parliament, has in itself created history.

There has been, as Mr Penders has said, some peculiar underhand move in order to prevent this report (a) coming to the House and (b) being finally debated and concluded. I have the opportunity of taking up this issue because, before Mr Penders concluded, he said he was not in support of the report.

I am afraid that, in addition to the external pressures to which so much reference has been made here in this House during the course of the debate, there have unfortunately been pressures from within. This is something I must condemn and it would be disastrous for this Parliament if this were allowed to continue.

(Applause)

Before going further, I must refer as well to the remarks made by my colleague on the Political Affairs Committee, Mrs Baduel Glorioso, who while she did not say so in so many words, created the impression that I had been in Morocco at the invitation of the Moroccan Government. I want to categorically put it on record that this is not so. I was subjected as a rapporteur to far more pressure than any of the Members here. Goodness knows, judging by the correspondence received on all sides, you must have been conscious of the tremendous pressure you yourselves were all under so you can well imagine the type of pressure on the unfortunate Irishman who had to prepare this report.

(Laughter)

One of the possible reasons why I was asked to draw up this report may have been alluded to in the contribution made by the second last speaker here, Mr Michel. He spoke of 'brother against brother', and this unfortunately is an experience we had in my country back at the beginning of the century. I have some little knowledge of it, despite the fact that I was naturally too young to be involved then. I am aware of the bitterness and the hardship created at that time and the scars that still remain in my country. It is because of my knowledge of the scars and wounds that can remain that I was so careful in the preparation of this

Lalor

report on the Western Sahara. I deliberately avoided taking sides and I defy anybody to stand up here in this House and say that that is a prejudiced report on one side or the other.

(Applause)

Quite a number of points were raised which need clarification. Mr President, I do not intend going into all of them, but I am glad that in her remarks Mrs van den Heuvel raised the question of self-determination. It is generally accepted that this is an acceptable principle towards the resolution of this conflict. However, self-determination, as seen by the United Nations, does not mean separation. For the purpose of clarification, I quote paragraph 6 of United Nations Resolution 1514 concerning decolonization, which affirms that 'every attempt to destroy partially or wholly the national unity and territorial integrity of a country is incompatible with the objectives of the United Nations Charter'. Morocco is satisfied therefore that self-determination, as seen by the United Nations, does not mean separation. What is central to the whole question of self-determination is, of course, the holding of a referendum. One has to ask why certain parties have refused to allow a census of the refugees to be taken by the High Commissioner of the United Nations with a view to authenticating their origin and establishing once and for all whether they come from the Western Sahara, Mali, Chad, Niger, Mauritania or Algeria, as was hinted by more than one speaker in this debate.

I am terribly anxious to have a fair resolution adopted here, Mr President, and I do not think anybody honestly reading down through my resolution can say that it is biased. It is because of that that I confidently expect this House to give its full and wholehearted approval to a resolution that asks for mediation and a peaceful solution to this problem without any further bloodshed. I make no apology to Mrs Baduel Glorioso or anybody else in this House for my very opening remarks where I voiced my concern and asked this Parliament to voice its concern at the fate of the innocent people caught up in these hostilities.

(Sustained applause)

President. — We shall now proceed to the vote. I have received from the Communist and Allies Group a request for a roll-call vote when we come to vote on the motion for a resolution as a whole.

Amendments No 9, No 10 and No 11 have been withdrawn.

I call Mr Schall.

Mr Schall. — *(D)* Mr President, I wish to inform the House that I am withdrawing Amendments No 2, No 3, No 4, No 5, No 7 and No 8. I am retaining only Amendments No 1 and No 6.

President. — Amendments No 2, No 3, No 4, No 5, No 7 and No 8 are therefore withdrawn.

(Parliament adopted the first four indents of the preamble)

After the fourth indent of the preamble, Mr Schall has tabled Amendment No 1 seeking to insert the following new indent:

- having regard to the spirit of Resolution 1514 (XV) of the General Assembly of the United Nations of 14 December 1960 on the right to independence of countries and peoples under colonial rule, particularly paragraph 6 thereof, and the pertinent resolutions of the OAU, the non-aligned nations and the United Nations of the right of self-determination of the population of the Sahara following the end of Spanish administrative authority in the Western Sahara.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Lalor, rapporteur. — Mr President, I am willing to accept this amendment. I refrained from going into the pros and cons of the various United Nations resolutions, as it is obvious that the two parties concerned here, Algeria and Morocco, uphold different interpretations, but I have no objection to the amendment.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 1, the fifth and sixth indents of the preamble and paragraph 1 and paragraphs 2 to 7)

President. — After paragraph 7, Mr Schall has tabled Amendment No 6 seeking to insert the following new paragraph:

- Calls on the Libyan Government to abandon its plans for destabilization and domination in the Sahel area, and to refrain from any action calculated to jeopardize the territorial integrity or national identity of countries in this region.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Lalor, rapporteur. — Amendment No 6 is acceptable.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 6 and then paragraphs 8 to 10)

President. — Explanations of vote may now be given.

I call Mrs Van den Heuvel.

Mrs Van den Heuvel. — *(NL)* Mr President, I should like to give an explanation of vote on behalf of the Socialist Group in order to explain once more to our colleagues, including those who were not present

Van den Heuvel

at the end of the meeting of Friday 13 February, what objections we and others have against this resolution. There are many international interpretations of the problem of the Western Sahara but I will mention only a few of them so as not to take up too much time. After two months of intensive study — and I am saying this particularly for the benefit of Mr Habsburg who does not assume any expert knowledge of this matter — a UN study committee came to the conclusion that as far back as 1975 that the Polisario Front was the major political factor in this area.

In 1979, the OAU expressed the principle of the right of self-determination for the people of the Western Sahara and received the support of the UN Commission on Human Rights. In 1980, the United Nations General Assembly affirmed, with 82 votes to 6, that the Sahrawi people have an inalienable right to self-determination and appealed to the Moroccan Government to begin negotiations immediately. Partly on the basis of these two statements, the Socialist Group have been pressing during this entire Parliamentary debate for a solution to the conflict in which account would be taken of all the parties involved and in which, in particular, freedom of expression would be guaranteed for these people of the Western Sahara. Unfortunately, we have not been able to convince the majority of this Parliament which is so fond of claiming expert knowledge in territorial matters but is also glad to make use of statements by the United Nations when it suits them. We are therefore obliged to vote against this resolution.

(Applause from certain quarters of the Socialist Group)

President. — I call Mr Newton Dunn.

Mr Newton Dunn. — I have visited both of the principal countries involved in this conflict on several occasions, Morocco and Algeria. Mr President, the most important consideration, which has been completely overlooked in this debate, is that wars are fought over material possessions. In this case the possession at stake is phosphate rock. The Moroccans are building a protective wall around the Saharan towns on the edge of the coast, and this protective wall extends 110 kilometres inland to include rich phosphate rock deposits at Bou Kraa. Phosphate rock consists of deposits of ancient fish bone; it is an irreplaceable ingredient of fertilizer and increases crop yields by some 40 %.

Now some 90 % of the world's reserves of phosphate rock are located in the north Morocco. Morocco has only one principal competitor as a world supplier of this material at present, that is Florida in the USA. However, Florida's exports are going to disappear over the next 20 years, and thereafter Morocco could well hold a worldwide monopoly of a material that is critically important for feeding the world's population,

which, as we all know, is going to increase from 4 000 million to 6 000 million in the next 20 years. In 1974, following OPEC's fourfold price increase for oil, Morocco attempted to quadruple its own phosphate rock price, but the move collapsed due to the existing competition from the USA. Another such attempt might not fail a second time, and the world might be faced with extremely high prices — monopoly prices — for an essential raw material.

For that reason, Mr President, I believe that the Bou Kraa deposits of phosphate rock in the old Spanish Sahara must be exploited competitively and I am therefore personally obliged to abstain on this report.

President. — I call Mr Kappos.

Mr Kappos. — *(EL)* Mr President, we are totally opposed to the resolution on the Western Sahara. This resolution is unacceptable, it lowers Parliament's standing and reminds one of the old days when imperialism was all the rage. Mr President, this resolution is unacceptable first of all because it deprives the people of the Western Sahara of its most sacred right — the right to liberty. What is more, it denies the existence of the people of the Western Sahara, which is fighting doggedly for its freedom and has succeeded in having its rights recognized by the United Nations Organization, by the Organization of African Unity and by the Conference of Non-aligned countries. Moreover, the resolution ignores the fact that the State which has been created through the people's struggle under Polisario has been recognized by about 50 countries all over the world. Parliament cannot refuse to accept this fact.

In addition, this resolution essentially aligns the European Parliament with the imperialists, in their blatant and brutal interventions in the affairs of the Western Sahara. I am referring to the interventions by the French and the American imperialists on behalf of Morocco.

Only the most reactionary circles, the greediest monopolies, could propose such a resolution. We Greeks, especially the Communists, are particularly sensitive on questions such as this. The reason, among others, is that we have a similar problem over the Republic of Cyprus. Mr President, 40 % of Cyprus is occupied by the Turks, and there are 200 000 Cypriot refugees. The Cypriot people is also struggling for its rights, for its independence, for its integrity. As a result, adopting a resolution such as this one on the Western Sahara would mean that whoever accepts it or votes for it was condemning the people of Cyprus to continue in the present situation, which is one of occupation and flight.

For these reasons, Mr President, we shall be voting against the text. We support the struggle of the people

Kappos

of the Western Sahara under the Polisario Front, and we believe that the people of the Western Sahara will be victorious.

(Mixed reactions)

President. — I call Mr Beyer de Ryke on a point of order.

Mr Beyer de Ryke. — *(F)* Mr President, I am not going to stand up and give an explanation of vote because I think it is quite unnecessary. What we get here are not explanations of vote but repetition of what has been said at length during the debates. We are voting in favour, and that is all there is to it.

(Applause)

President. — The Rules of Procedure state that a Member is entitled to three minutes for an explanation of vote.

I call Mrs Hammerich.

Mrs Hammerich. — *(DK)* Mr President, I should like to explain why our Group cannot in any way support his report. This has to do not only with the fact that we are against the European Parliament conducting foreign policy, but with other matters as well.

We find this report on the Western Sahara very offensive, not only because it is marked by a number of mistakes and omissions, but, for a national independence movement such as ours, it is particularly unacceptable because it does not even mention those people who really do have an interest in the matter — the people of the Western Sahara and their acknowledged organized representatives, the Polisario Front. It is more a manifestation of traditional power politics, as many speakers yesterday made abundantly obvious; perhaps the clearest expression of this came from Mr d'Ormesson who recommended that the EEC help — as he put it — the North African States, even providing military assistance in the case of certain countries. The same old sabre-rattling in the interests of major powers! We find it quite impossible to support this report.

President. — I call Mr Lomas.

Mr Lomas. — Mr President, I shall vote against this motion because it really is a travesty of the situation in the Western Sahara. It portrays the conflict as being between Morocco and Algeria when everybody, at least everybody outside this Parliament, knows that the conflict is between the Moroccan invading forces

and the Sahrawi people represented by the Polisario Front. The United Nations recognizes this; the Organization of African States recognizes this; the United Nations Human Rights Commission recognizes this; the International Court of Justice recognizes this.

The Organization of African States chairman made a visit to the Western Sahara. I just want to read what he said following his visit. He said that although, before they visited the Western Sahara, they thought the Polisario Front was a clandestine movement,

(Protests from the European Democratic Group)

once they got there they found it was obviously a dominant political force in the territory; there were mass demonstrations of support by the people there for the Polisario Front and all the people they encountered there were in favour of Moroccan withdrawal and independence for the people of the Western Sahara.

Mr President, I speak with some feeling on this subject because I visited that part of the territory and have seen the results of Moroccan aggression: thousands of Sahrawis have been killed, thousands more are refugees, and it is really not good for the Moroccan people either. It is a drain on their economy, Moroccan soldiers are being killed there, and it would be in the best interests of both the Moroccan people and the Sahrawi people if the invading army withdrew.

Mr President, I close by making this appeal: if this Parliament carries this motion it will completely isolate itself from almost the whole of the rest of world opinion. I urge Parliament to reject this motion. You must know in your hearts whether you like it or not, that a motion without any reference to one of the major factors in the area — the Polisario Front — can do nothing towards solving the problems and helping to bring peace to that part of the world.

(Applause from the Socialist Group)

President. — I call Mr Fergusson.

Mr Fergusson. — Mr President, from someone like Mr Lomas, who has shamelessly defended terrorism in front of this Parliament . . .

(Loud interruptions from certain quarters of the Socialist Group)

. . . and who in his first intervention in this Parliament described the Vietnamese boat-people as illegal emigrants, I think that last intervention was about as much as this Parliament can take.

Fergusson

(Interruptions from certain quarters of the Socialist Group)

Speaking now on behalf of my Group, we shall give our support to this report that is before us, a report which was approved, as we know, some time ago by the Political Affairs Committee. We are very conscious of the wider political turmoil and concern that this report has caused in the states neighbouring the Western Sahara and, as Mr Lalor has pointed out, we have all been subject to intense external pressure, which, as parliamentarians, it is, of course, our duty to take note of, but not to be intimidated by. Our overwhelming wish in this affair is for a peaceful settlement, for good relations between Morocco and Algeria and for the chance for ourselves, as a Community and as individual States, to enjoy the best possible rapport with both these countries, for whom we have a high regard. It is always a matter of distress when two friends have fallen out with each other. It is a matter for anger, furthermore, when a third party, referred to in Amendment No 6, that was before us, has quite clearly been meddling mischievously and stirring up the dispute between our two friends and not only there. We do not believe that disputes should be settled by force. We believe in negotiation, because that seems to be the best way to the peace and the friendship and stability we seek.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Fotilas on a point of order.

Mr Fotilas. — *(EL)* Mr President, this is the second time this week that I have observed with particular concern a phenomenon which I had hoped would not be a feature of the European Parliament. You will be aware that some of the Greek Members came to this Parliament with certain reservations as regards the advisability of Greece's accession. However, we never expected to be faced with a breakdown of morals in the European Parliament. I have just heard one Member speak of another Member in totally unacceptable terms, indulging in personal insults instead of criticism of his views.

(Applause)

And two days ago I heard another Member speak of a Roman circus. I am not acquainted with every detail of the Rules of Procedure, but I assume that, as far as the European Parliament and the morals of its Members are concerned, we cannot accept such personal insults, which are not conducive to the proper functioning of this House.

(Applause)

It is the duty of the Bureau to intervene and forbid such insults, not only for the protection of those

against whom they are directed, but also for the protection of those who make them, because the time will come when they too will hear from us what we think of them.

(Applause from various quarters of the Socialist Group)

President. — Mr Fotilas, it is of course the case that the President is entitled to intervene if words of abuse are exchanged between Members. I suggest that we always try to conduct debates here in a civilized manner, and that Members do not insult each other in any way. I did hear the attack that was made against Mr Lomas, but I did not see any cause to intervene, because I did not feel that it amounted to insults.

(Protests from various quarters of the Socialist Group)

I call Mrs Lizin.

Mrs Lizin. — *(F)* Mr President, as one who prompted one of the motions which led Mr Lalor to discover a part of the world he may not have known very well, I should like to justify my vote against his report.

It is my view that the adoption of this report would bring dishonour on this Parliament and, sad to say, this is very probably what is going to happen. What is the reason? Simply to satisfy a few obsessed people with blinkered views which can be summed up as follows: for most people in this Parliament any liberation movement which asserts its determination to fight against colonialism is a front for international communism and destined to fail. Unfortunately, history shows in every case that where the will of the people is a factor such movements succeed, and very often succeed against the European powers.

We have heard the same things here about the Polisario Front as the Right in France was trotting out the Algerian FLN until the final victory came: it did not exist or it was just a handful of communists in the pay of Moscow. What we had wanted, and what I had wanted, was a report which contributed to peace. This report, however, ignores the resolutions passed by the United Nations and the OAU. It discredits the majority in this Parliament and confirms its inability to understand the movement in Africa against neocolonialism. Worse still, the report depicts Parliament as a supporter of neocolonialism in the eyes of a world which stands in judgment on us.

(Applause from certain quarters of the Socialist Group — Parliament adopted the resolution)¹

¹ By roll-call vote: see minutes of proceedings.

4. Accession of Zimbabwe to the Convention of Lomé

President. — The next item is the report (Doc.1-834/80), drawn up by Mr Poniatowski on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation, on

the recommendation from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-710/80) for a regulation concerning the conclusion of the agreement on the accession of the Republic of Zimbabwe to the second ACP-EEC Convention of Lomé; and

the recommendation from the Commission to the Council for a regulation concluding the interim agreement between the European Economic Community and the Republic of Zimbabwe.

I call the rapporteur.

Mr Poniatowski, rapporteur. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the negotiations concerning the accession of Zimbabwe to the second Lomé Convention were concluded on 4 November 1980. This agreement is in the process of being ratified by the Parliaments of the Nine Member States, Greece as yet not being party to the second Lomé Convention. For the period from 1 January 1981 until the entry into force of the act of accession, an Interim Agreement has been drawn up according to which the commercial relations of the EEC and Zimbabwe are governed by the provisions of the second Lomé Convention. At this point in the procedure, the European Parliament is required to give its opinion on a draft regulation of the Council approving, in the name of the Community, the accession of Zimbabwe to the second Lomé Convention.

An identical procedure has been used for all the previous enlargements of the Convention. These compulsory opinions, however, assume a special importance as they allow the European Parliament to participate in the ratification procedures for accession agreements.

In the case of Zimbabwe, it is doubly appropriate that the European Parliament should give its opinion. In fact, added to the ratification procedure is the exceptional political significance of the first enlargement of the Lomé II Convention. This aspect was emphasized quite correctly by the ACP-EEC Consultative Assembly in its resolution on Zimbabwe, adopted on 26 September 1980. The fact that one of the first decisions of the Republic of Zimbabwe, after such a long and difficult struggle for its independence, was to ask for accession to the Lomé II Convention has major political implications. It was the Community's duty to give a prompt and satisfactory answer to this request.

This answer is satisfactory, from the point of view of the specific interest of this new member country, in three production sectors: beef and veal, sugar and tobacco. The aim of the negotiations was therefore not simply the assumption by Zimbabwe of the rights and

obligations deriving from the Lomé II Convention, which did not present any problems, but also the establishment of special conditions, notably in the commercial field, allowing for the country's particular situation. The trade arrangements relating to beef and veal, sugar and tobacco are defined in three declarations annexed to the accession agreement.

In order to formulate an opinion on the trade arrangements defined in the three declarations, I must refer you to the request expressed by the Consultative Assembly in its resolution of 26 September 1980, in paragraph 2 of which it asked that Zimbabwe, on its accession to the Convention, be granted quotas for sugar and beef and veal over and above those provided for under the Lomé II Convention. It can be seen, on reading the report submitted to our Parliament, that this demand is satisfied both with respect to beef and veal and with respect to sugar. With regard to beef and veal, Zimbabwe will have an annual export quota of 8 100 tonnes to the Community under the same conditions as other ACP producer countries. With regard to sugar, the Community has agreed, starting from the 1982/83 delivery period, to buy annually 25 000 tonnes in accordance with the price conditions of the Sugar Protocol. Furthermore, the negotiators noted that Zimbabwe wished to become a party to the Community's Protocol on Sugar, which would nevertheless not involve an increase of the total ACP quota, the 25 000 tonnes either being delivered as part of the outstanding ACP quantities or used as Community food aid.

This arrangement can be considered as satisfactory in that it offers guarantees to Zimbabwe. It is now up to the Community to specify the means by which it will keep to its commitments. The problem of tobacco exports from Zimbabwe is mentioned in the minutes annexed to the Accession Agreement. These minutes show that the Community has explained the problems involved for the Community in tobacco imports, in particular imports coming from ACP states. Clearly, this means that whilst upholding the free access to the Community for ACP tobacco provided for by the Lomé Convention, the Community has informed Zimbabwe that if ACP exports increase considerably, the safeguard clause can be applied. This Community declaration is actually incompatible with the spirit of the Lomé II Convention. In fact, although a solution has been found to the problems of sugar and beef and veal, the problem of tobacco exports from Zimbabwe still remain unsolved. The few points I have just referred to are contained in the motion for a resolution before you.

By way of conclusion, Mr President, I would like to emphasize again the great political significance of Zimbabwe's action in asking to become a member of the Lomé Convention immediately on becoming independent. This action takes on a special significance because of the recent history of this country, because

Poniatowski

of its geographical situation and finally as regards the economic and political developments of Africa. The ACP and European members of the Joint Committee were aware of this significance when they gave a standing ovation to the Zimbabwean observers attending the recent meeting at Freetown. In the same spirit, the ACP representatives proposed that the next meeting of the ACP-EEC Joint Committee should take place in Zimbabwe. It falls today to the European Parliament, through the ratification of the Accession Agreement of Zimbabwe to the ACP-EEC Convention, to demonstrate its support for this country and to welcome its accession to the Lomé II Convention.

President. — I call the Socialist Group.

Mr Cohen. — *(NL)* Mr President, we are naturally very pleased at the accession of Zimbabwe to the Convention of Lomé. We also wholeheartedly and without any reservations approve the motion for a resolution contained in the Poniatowski report. Since the North-South Dialogue only progresses by very small steps — indeed one sometimes gets the impression that it is a bit like the Echternach procession — we are very pleased that at this time at any rate something in the field of development cooperation still appears to be a living reality, i.e. the Lomé Convention which, as I have already said in another context, is not a model or an example — it is not the only possibility for development cooperation — but, I repeat, it is nevertheless a living reality in the present situation. It is therefore understandable that Zimbabwe should have requested to accede to the Convention so shortly after gaining independence. The European Community has conducted the negotiations on the accession with a certain amount of flexibility but, as Mr Poniatowski has just pointed out, perhaps not enough.

There are three problems, i.e. sugar, beef and tobacco on which we have not in fact managed to come to an agreement. In the case of sugar, a very ingenious but not very generous solution has been found. The legal difficulties have been cleared out of the way. Zimbabwe is content, at least for the moment, but it is obvious that we in the Community must give further consideration to the question of what in fact we want to do as regards this product and how we intend to put our ideas into practice since this first example of Zimbabwe has already shown that there is so much hesitancy that we have only been able to overcome the problems by means of very curious and technically complex solutions.

Nevertheless, we are pleased at the accession of Zimbabwe, which brings the total of countries associated with the Community under the Lomé Convention to 61. These 61 countries represent virtually half of the total number of developing countries in the world. Zimbabwe has in the meantime already ratified the Convention, on 5 March. The Act of Accession has

not yet been deposited with the Council Secretariat, but it has been dealt with by the Zimbabwe Parliament.

For our part, we in the ten Member States have not got so far and I should like to make an urgent appeal to all our national parliaments to ratify the act as soon, as possible. We have already been somewhat remiss — we hesitated for an extremely long time with the Lomé Convention itself. In the final months of last year the pressure was brought to bear on our national parliaments from all sides in the hope that they would get things moving as regards the ratification and I should now like to appeal to the national parliaments responsible since the financial provisions of the Lomé Convention cannot come into force until the act has been ratified by the European parties too. It is essential that this should be done and, as Mr Poniatowski has just pointed out, Zimbabwe deserves nothing less. Although it has only recently acceded to the Lomé Convention, it has already proposed, two weeks ago at the meeting of the Joint Committee in Sierra Leone, that the next meeting of the Joint Committee should be held in Zimbabwe. This proposal was adopted unanimously and enthusiastically welcomed by all the members of the Committee, both those from the ACP countries and the European members.

Mr President, I intend to leave it at that as regards the shortcomings of the agreement which has been concluded with Zimbabwe. I will merely state that there are shortcomings and I hope that this has been a lesson from which we can learn in the case of any future accessions. We must consider what we are actually hoping to achieve in the future with our development policy in general and the Lomé Convention in particular. In spite of the difficulties, we achieved what we were trying to achieve. Zimbabwe has joined. Now it is up to us to ratify the act without delay.

President. — I call the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

Mr Wawrzik. — *(D)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to make a brief explanation of our vote in favour of Mr Poniatowski's report and motion for a resolution. We regret it was not possible in the negotiations to settle every point as our partners would have liked. I do feel, however, that the overall agreement is one to which we can and should lend our support. It is our belief that this agreement will not only contribute to the economic development of Zimbabwe, but also go some way towards stabilizing the internal political structure. We are aware that difficulties have arisen in this area and, for our part, we wish to make some contribution at least through economic cooperation towards Zimbabwe's receiving all the support it requires in order to achieve lasting internal peace and a stable political system.

President. — I call the European Democratic Group.

Sir Frederick Warner. — Mr President, this debate today marks a further important stage in the process of welcoming Zimbabwe into full membership of the Lomé Convention. Zimbabwe is an important country, and the sooner that the ratification procedures are completed the happier we shall all be.

I can only say, however, that one must feel considerable disappointment at the amount of money which Member States have felt able to put forward in bilateral aid. We would have liked to have seen more money forthcoming in bilateral aid from our own governments, from the United States and particularly from Japan. A country of the economic power and importance of Japan ought to do better than provide only 3 ½ million dollars worth of aid in the present programme for Zimbabwe, and I would appeal to our Japanese friends to reconsider this very meagre offer.

On the three difficult points to which previous speakers have referred I would briefly say the following. On beef and veal, if anyone really has any doubts I suggest that they can be aside. The European meat trade is now overwhelmingly in our favour, and the Community has become the largest exporter of meat in the world. In these circumstances we can well afford to take this small quota from Zimbabwe. On sugar, the solution is not ideal but it is certainly ingenious. We must make sure that it is honoured and that, whatever happens, we keep to our pledge to buy the annual quota, even if it is in excess.

Thirdly, on tobacco, I would say that the solution is not satisfactory. It is legally acceptable; one cannot say that it is a wrong or unconstitutional solution, but it does run entirely contrary to the spirit of two very important resolutions adopted last year by this Parliament — the Ferrero resolution on food aid and the Wawrzik resolution on the conclusion of the second Lomé Convention. Both of these state clearly that the Community should move as rapidly as possible towards unrestricted access for agricultural products from the Lomé countries and this agreement would appear to constitute a possible obstacle to this. I hope that as soon as possible we can move on to a more satisfactory position.

President. — I call Mr Jackson.

Mr Robert Jackson. — Mr President, as I only have two minutes, I shall only make two observations. First, let the House note the rather niggardly treatment that the Community is according to Zimbabwe. Quite apart from the matter of tobacco which Sir Fred Warner has referred to, let us note that in the case of two other key commodities in the agreement, beef and sugar, the quotas that have been accorded to

Zimbabwe are simply taken from residuals. They do not in fact represent any increase in overall provision by the Community. We have to do more for Zimbabwe both on trade and in aid.

Secondly let me underline what Mr Poniatowski has said about the political importance of that country and of its relations with Europe. Zimbabwe is the second most prosperous country in black Africa after Nigeria, and it has the most diversified economy in black Africa. Moreover, from the political point of view, its fate will be exemplary for the whole of central and southern Africa. It could and will feed Zambia and Mozambique. It could act and will act as an economic dynamo for its entire region. And the development of a multiracial society under black majority rule could have a profoundly positive effect on the future of Namibia, and also ultimately, of course, of South Africa. But in this connection the Zimbabwe government will naturally be seeking to reduce its dependence on South Africa. It will aspire to the development of a central role in Africa north of the Limpopo. But all of this is accompanied, Mr President, inevitably and naturally, by a shift of focus in Zimbabwe's external relations towards Europe. This is, I think, a great chance for us and I hope and trust that we in Europe will not miss it.

(Applause)

President. — I call the Commission.

Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission. — *(F)* Mr President, the rapporteur and then the speakers have noted how very important this request by Zimbabwe to accede to the Lomé Convention is, a request which was made extraordinarily quickly because it was on Independence Day itself that the application for accession was signed by the new Prime Minister.

Then negotiations were not easy. They were conducted very quickly because, less than a year after its independence, Zimbabwe has already been able to ratify the accession treaty.

Mr President, the rapporteur has described the substance of the agreement in great detail, and so I will limit myself to highlighting two or three particular aspects.

One of these has not been raised by anyone, and that is that the Community has granted Zimbabwe a very important exemption from the general rule which forbids our partners to give other industrialized countries more preferential treatment than that granted to us. An exception has been granted in the case of Zimbabwe to this hard and fast rule in the Lomé Convention, as also in the case of the three small countries enclosed by South Africa, on account of the trade relations which currently exist between these

Cheysson

countries and South Africa. It has, however, been agreed that there can be no improvement in the conditions applied to South African products unless we are consulted first and that, on the other hand, if this special arrangement has adverse effects on Community exports, we shall discuss it together.

With regard to tobacco, this has had free access to the Community since the unilateral decision taken by the Community last spring, even before independence. Imports of quantities of tobacco — which may be considerable — from Zimbabwe has simply prompted the Community to decide to monitor all tobacco imports from ACP countries — (not just from Zimbabwe) — in relation to previous years, 1976 to 1980 for ACP countries other than Zimbabwe and 1980 for Zimbabwe itself. But, I would emphasize there is no obstacle to duty-free imports of tobacco to the Community. 25 000 tonnes is the tonnage quota granted to Zimbabwe under the Sugar Protocol; this figure has not been pulled out of a hat and is the amount which Zimbabwe, then Southern Rhodesia, was allocated under the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement a few years ago, before the unilateral declaration on independence. We have, then, for Zimbabwe as for all the other countries of the Sugar Protocol, taken as a base the very same figures as in the old Commonwealth Sugar Agreement. This has been done in difficult circumstances; I thank Mr Cohen for having spoken about the ingeniousness of the formula with which we came up. Ingenious or not, it has the very clear implications that Zimbabwe now has the same rights as the other parties to the Sugar Protocol to its 25 000 tonnes, a point which Mr Poniatowski emphasized very clearly, and this is over and above the total quota for the present members of the Sugar Protocol; we are not taking away a tonne, not even a kilo; they have rights arising from the Sugar Protocol, and the 25 000 tonnes allocated to Zimbabwe are in addition to these rights of each of the present parties to the Sugar Protocol.

With respect to meat, Mr President, the figure of 8 100 tonnes per year is the one suggested by Zimbabwe itself. Moreover, I must say that it is very unlikely that Zimbabwe will take up this export quota of 8 100 tonnes. In fact, the destruction of Zimbabwe's livestock as a result of the war has been worse than foreseen. Meat production in Zimbabwe is considerably lower than we — that is both Salisbury and Brussels — had hoped at the time of the negotiations and, what is more, the whole of Zimbabwe has been hit by foot and mouth disease so that it has been forced to limit its exports for obvious reasons. However, it has been allocated these 8 100 tonnes per year starting from the 1982/83 delivery period. We hope that by then it will be able, both from the medical point of view and as regards production levels, to take full advantage of this. Obviously, priority will go to small producers, as Zimbabwe has requested.

Mr President, what is there to report to the Parliament since the conclusion of the negotiations? Well, I can report that we have begun to look into the ways in which the grants to Zimbabwe under the Lomé II Convention will be used. I would point out that they involve 85 million EUA more than the original Convention signed at Lomé: 40 million from the EDF for national use; 15 million under the provisions of Stabex and all the other Convention facilities; finally, an important increase in regional credit for Southern Africa, that is, a sum of 30 million. The European Investment Bank for its part, is determined to act very promptly in Zimbabwe; let us hope that a minimum of 30 to 40 million can be expected there.

Under the Lomé Convention, therefore, an extra 110 to 120 million EUA is being allocated to Zimbabwe. The Salisbury authorities have decided that 55 % will go to rural development. Previously, during 1980, our projects were funded by emergency credits: 15 million ECUs were thus used for resettlement aid to refugees, 9 million for improving veterinary services, and especially for fighting foot and mouth disease. In 1981, we intend to allocate the same amount: exactly 14.5 million ECUs will be granted to Zimbabwe in 1981, before its accession to the Lomé Convention, and we have also just worked out with Salisbury a programme for a certain number of rural research projects. Our representative, having been approved by Zimbabwe, has now also taken up his post.

Therefore, Mr President, you can see that Zimbabwe is becoming more and more integrated into the overall ACP framework. Even before its formal accession to the Convention, steps are being taken: Zimbabwe participates actively in Community life through its ambassador, through the parliamentary delegation which Mr Poniatowski mentioned earlier, and in many other ways. In a few days, I will have the great honour, with the President of the Council of Ministers, to represent the Community at a large conference on reconstruction and development, to be opened by the Prime Minister of Zimbabwe on 23 March. Six countries of the Community will be represented at ministerial level, which is proof of the importance with which this is regarded by the Community.

I would not be giving anything away by saying that we are all trying to convince other friends of Zimbabwe of the need to commit themselves, and do so on a large scale, as Sir Fred Warner said, to supporting this country. How? Here is a country emerging from a terrible war, which has known horrific suffering and which, immediately after becoming independent, has shown realism, pragmatism, calm determination and a strength of purpose in its desire to develop! Here is a country which is building all its future on the vision of what a multiracial society can be like! Here is a country whose geographical situation we are aware of, a country, finally, which, proud of its immense natural resources, has told us that it will not need aid for very

Cheysson

long, that its aim is to do without it completely as soon as possible! But at the beginning, taking everything that has happened, into account, it needs a helping hand. So, if there is a way in which Europeans, Americans, Canadians, Japanese, and Arabs must show what development means, what the aim of development is, if there is a way in which we can give a practical demonstration of what we mean when we condemn racism and apartheid or when we condemn totalitarian regimes, it is by enabling this democratic Zimbabwe, which wants to be multiracial, to succeed spectacularly and as soon as possible.

President. — I call Mr Bersani.

Mr Bersani. — (I) Just a very few words, Mr President, as I agree entirely with the report presented by Mr Poniatoski, the influential chairman of our Committee on Development and Cooperation, as well as with the points made by other speakers and the statement we have just heard from Mr Cheysson.

I, too, would just like to underline the importance of the events in Zimbabwe, and the feeling that Zimbabwe is participating in the new liberation and development process on the African continent. By reason of its geographical situation and the history of its struggle, Zimbabwe has become for us all a symbol of the road which we must follow while strengthening and improving our cooperation. Looking at it in this way, I believe that every effort must be made to recognize the political significance of Zimbabwe's struggle for independence, and, at the same time, to assist this country not only to overcome its present difficulties but also to achieve complete freedom from its more burdensome economic constraints.

Zimbabwe is truly right at the heart of the transformation which is taking place in Southern Africa. We know how much this problem affects everything that goes in Africa, the relationship of the European world with the African world, and the very cause of peace with independence and with full recognition of the inalienable rights of people.

The solidarity which the European Parliament has expressed so unanimously today and which was recently emphasized by both the European representatives and all the ACP countries in Freetown demonstrates clearly our attitude to this event.

As for the ratification process, I know that Italy has not yet ratified, but I can assure you that we are making every effort to ensure that this happens as quickly as possible.

I therefore thank Mr Poniatoski for his work and express our complete solidarity with the Government

of Zimbabwe and with its people. This is the real meaning of our collaboration.

(Applause)

President. — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

5. Operation of STABEX

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-698/80), drawn up by Mrs Castellina on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation, on

- I — the communication from the Commission to the Council concerning the operation of STABEX in 1977 and 1978
- II — the special report by the Court of Auditors on the operation of STABEX
- III — the Commission's comments on the special report by the Court of Auditors on the operation of STABEX.

The deputy rapporteur has the floor.

Mr Poniatoski, deputy rapporteur. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the committee which I chair recently approved Mrs Castellina's report. I should like to apologize on her behalf and say how very sorry she is not to be able to be here today to present her report herself. After having been postponed several times from one session to the next, this topic was finally entered on the agenda of last Monday's session. Mrs Castellina had only just returned from being on mission abroad for two weeks and unfortunately she was unable to remain with us up to this moment.

It was not however Mrs Castellina's intention, nor that of the Committee on Development, to engage in a wholesale review of STABEX when presenting this report.

The report in fact refers only to a single period of the operation of STABEX: the 1977 and 1978 financial years. That is already ancient history now. What is more, with the second Lomé Convention, a new improved version of STABEX was introduced and has been in force since the beginning of 1981. This new version of STABEX was in fact already examined by the European Parliament when the motion for a resolution on Lomé II, presented by our colleague, Mr Wawrzik, was adopted. It is also true that we will only be able to make an exhaustive study of STABEX's record under Lomé I when the assessment to be undertaken by the Commission of the Communities becomes available. So the report which is before you

Poniatowski

today is merely an assessment of the way in which STABEX operated in a given period, three years ago now. Nevertheless, I should like to point out that its conclusions are on the whole favourable. We did witness an improvement in the running of the system under Lomé I in the last few years. We saw that it was possible to eliminate delays in the payment of transfers, which had occurred during the initial period when the system was in operation. We know that 67 % of all the transfers made under Lomé I were paid to the least developed countries and, finally, that about 70 % of the funds disbursed were paid out when falls in exports were due to local circumstances, most of them natural disasters. All of which goes to show that STABEX has operated successfully. Accordingly, Mr President, I do not feel that we should take up too much of the highly valuable time of this House by studying and adopting the motion for a resolution contained in Mrs Castellina's report.

President. — The Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group) has the floor.

Mr Michel. — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I have read Mrs Castellina's excellent report carefully and have found it most informative. We have discussed this report in the Committee on Development and Cooperation. I should like to make three points.

First of all, it is worthwhile recalling that the export earnings stabilization system for the African, Caribbean and Pacific countries was the main innovation of the Lomé Convention, and that the European Parliament also played a by no means negligible role in setting up this system. With the new Convention, the system has been both extended to cover a wider range of agricultural products and also limited more strictly to the agricultural, as opposed to other sectors. For example, from now on iron ore will not be covered by these compensatory payments which will henceforth be regulated by SYSMIN.

Secondly, STABEX marks the beginning of a considerable achievement which is part of a valid regional policy. By regional policy I mean the new international economic order which has been hailed as desirable, at so many UNCTAD and North-South Dialogue meetings. But we can point to STABEX as something which has actually been experienced and which is practical, laudable and realistic. We must of course recognize that the system is still being tried out and that we are not yet able, when commenting on the reference years of 1977 and 1978, to come up with more than piecemeal observations and inconclusive results on the administrative and technical levels.

My third and last point is this: the fact that we must apply STABEX more strictly does not mean that we should impose rigid and absolute provisions which do

not take account of the specific problems of each sector of production and of each ACP country. The purpose of being strict is only to reassure ourselves that our action is useful and effective, that it does not just help the balance of payments and trade of the countries concerned, but that it also and above all benefits the living conditions of their populations.

We therefore endorse the intentions of the system and the activities pursued so far. Nevertheless, I have three positive criticisms to make. Firstly, it must be said that there is no such thing as joint management of STABEX by the Community and the ACP countries. While I would not want to go so far as to suggest that we should set up a new joint management body, I do think it would be a good idea to have access to records from both sides for the purposes of comparison. It is becoming increasingly difficult to carry out a systematic and continuous assessment of the impact of STABEX on the development of recipient countries. In my capacity as rapporteur for Parliament on this question of assessment, I feel that I must insist on the necessity — which is imperative, in my opinion — of paying closer attention in the future to the effectiveness of our cooperation policies. We must be able to ascertain that we really are giving effective aid to the people whom we say we want to help. I am not advocating an abstract or negative system of control which would be interested only in accountability, but I am making a plea for a systematic assessment to be carried out jointly by the ACP countries and the Community. This would enable us to continually adapt our policies to correspond to the real needs of populations and to guarantee that our many operations have a greater impact in the field.

My second criticism concerning the operation STABEX, is that I do not think that we can pat ourselves on the back simply because 67 % of all transfers under Lomé I were paid to ACP countries and hence to underdeveloped countries. I feel such self-satisfaction is misplaced because, in 70 % of cases, funds were disbursed because the fall in exports was attributable to natural disasters such as drought or hurricanes, etc., which goes to show — to put it quite bluntly — that STABEX is in fact regarded as a kind of insurance against sickness. But we must gradually try to obtain guarantees that the STABEX payments will directly or indirectly benefit the agricultural sector affected by the fall in exports, and in turn benefit the agricultural workers concerned.

We do of course realize that the first Lomé Convention did not lay down any requirements with regard to STABEX transfers and sectors afflicted by events such as droughts, etc. This leads me to my third and final point: in Lomé II, it is specified that the transfers must be used in a way that adheres to the objectives of the system. I would say that this is vital. If we wish to strengthen and extend STABEX, we cannot allow ourselves to be satisfied with making transfer

Michel

payments which aim simply to stabilize the balance of payments of countries. Naturally, we must respect the independency of the ACP countries with respect to the administration of funds and the choice of which sectors to develop. But we must be able to study such developments jointly with them, on the basis of the thorough and detailed information they supply on how they have used the transferred funds. In this way, we will be able to examine objectively the effects of STABEX on the sectors and regions which have been hardest-hit. If we do not do this, we shall seriously undermine the ingenious system which we have set up.

In conclusion, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it would be easier for us to demand that delays in payments and transfers be eliminated if we could be sure that the money would be used to benefit the populations concerned. At present — and Mrs Castellina's report acknowledges this fact — we are more or less unable to judge whether STABEX is really having a positive influence on the economies of the ACP countries. There are some exceptions. On the other hand, we do recognize that there is a risk of perpetuating the excessively monolithic production of products such as groundnuts, sugar cane, cotton etc. If the system is automatically applied in this way, it could discourage the development of industries to process existing agricultural products. We ought to remember that less than 4 % of exports from ACP countries to the Community are manufactured goods.

To sum up, I believe that it is vital for the Joint ACP-EEC Committee — with its unique opportunities for dialogue — to familiarize itself with STABEX's record and for both sides to engage in a thorough review of its true socio-economic impact.

The opinions of ACP-EEC social partners, and particularly those of the qualified representatives of rural and agricultural organization would be of great assistance for such a review. We know that Mr Cheysson is mindful of these possibilities; we appreciate his keen interest and will support any approach he makes in this direction.

President. — I call the European Democratic Group.

Mr Christopher Jackson. — Mr President, like Mr Michel, I wish to congratulate Mrs Castellina on a well-balanced report that makes some sensible, practical suggestion. I wish to make three points.

First, despite its obvious merits in principle, there are some certain powerful reservations about STABEX in practice. For a start, we do not know if it really works; and I hope that the Commission will give the rapporteur's request for an assessment of the effects of STABEX on ACP economies an high priority. Only through such an assessment can we learn whether our

limited development funds are being spent to the best advantage.

Another reservation, from the Court of Auditors, is that the most vulnerable economies — that is to say, the least diversified ones — are the least protected by STABEX. This may be some exaggeration, but it occurs quite simply because the rules of STABEX include thresholds and if the commodity involved is a small part of a country's GNP then STABEX may be triggered by a small fall in the GNP, but if the commodity concerned forms a large part of the GNP then a relatively large fall in gross national product occurs before STABEX is triggered. Furthermore, of course, the threshold takes no account of inflation, so the real fall in earnings may be substantial.

A further reservation is that, fully according to the rules, STABEX funds are in many cases not used for the industries under pressure but as a general addition to government funds, which makes the threshold situation to which I referred even more absurd. I ask the Commission to take action with our Lomé partners to deal with these criticisms.

My second point is that the Community should, again as the rapporteur suggests, examine the possibility developing STABEX further, in particular to cover products semi-manufactured or manufactured from those materials to which STABEX would apply. At present there is a danger that STABEX may discourage certain countries from developing secondary industries, because this will not have the protection given to the original raw materials.

Now I know there are real problems in this suggestion, because checks on prices and volumes for manufactured goods are very hard, but the truth is that the greater the value that can be added in the country of origin the greater the protection that is given to that country from the effects of swings in raw material prices.

My third point is simple: if the Commission's further work leads to a proposal for increased expenditure on STABEX, we shall expect this to be referred to Parliament for its opinion. Our views on the budgetization of the European Development Fund are well known.

My Group will support this report. STABEX appears an excellent idea, and we to look the Commission to ensure that it works as effectively as possible for those countries that are in need.

President. — I call the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr De Gucht. — (NL) Mr President, now that the second Lomé Convention has come into force and STABEX transfers for 1980 are to be carried out in

De Gucht

the context of this second Convention, a number of conclusions should be drawn regarding the operation of STABEX. We should not lose sight of the fact that the new STABEX system, as set out in the second Convention has been set up on the basis of the many criticisms which were made of the STABEX system as it operated for the first five years. Under the first Convention, the system itself in fact operated fairly well since payments representing 375 million u.a. were made for the benefit of 37 of the 59 ACP States, compared with the allocation of 380 million u.a. originally planned. The most positive aspect of STABEX is that, unlike the GSP it has particularly benefited the poorest developing countries and since these countries are not obliged to repay the amounts they have received, they can be regarded as a gift. We also see that under the STABEX system, which provides a sort of guarantee against drops in export earnings, transfers were made predominantly because of unfortunate local natural circumstances and not because the economy of the area in question was going through a bad phase. We also see that if we take into consideration the transfers carried out for certain products and the export earnings for those products that the STABEX system was, relatively speaking, a great benefit to certain countries. Unfortunately, it is still too early to know what real effects these transfers have had on the economies of the ACP States.

However, it should be pointed out that STABEX has by definition no effect whatsoever on the trade of the ACP States since it is intrinsically neutral as regards this trade and in no way affects the laws of the free market. It is not possible under the STABEX system to anticipate the situation in the ACP States, since the financial transfers are only made after the year in which a drop in export earnings have been observed. The ACP States have very little chance of taking advantage of STABEX by pursuing a trade policy which would be prejudicial to exports to the Community because of the stringent checks carried out by the Commission. The main criticism which could be made of STABEX is that it does not necessarily compensate the sectors and producers involved for losses in export earning but the economies of the ACP States in general, and what this comes down to is converting ACP currencies into European currencies. The reason for this is that the EEC cannot impose any obligations whatsoever when making a transfer which means that the ACP States enjoy total freedom in the use of the funds and do not need to take any account of the objectives of STABEX. The ACP State needs only inform the Commission of the way in which the money is used. However, this criticism cannot be made of the new Convention, at least not to the same extent, since the ACP States must give the Commission indications of how the transfers will probably be used before the transfer agreement is signed. Furthermore, these transfers should be used as far as possible for the economic and social development of the populations of the developing countries.

As regards the funds available, steps must be taken to improve the possibilities for the allocation of the yearly tranches so as to facilitate intervention. In addition, the total amount available has been increased by 45 % in the new Convention with a view to enabling account to be taken of the lowering of the threshold, the increase in the number of products to which the system applies, trade between the ACP States and the various modifications which have been introduced.

Finally, STABEX should be regarded as an historical innovation since it offers the ACP States a guarantee that their export earnings losses will be compensated. Even if the system is not perfect, as we have already pointed out in connection with the use made of the transfers, it should nevertheless be given new impetus and extended in the context of the North-South Dialogue. We should not forget that STABEX is only one of the instruments included in the Lomé Convention and cannot take care of the industrialization of the developing countries single-handed, as it were. STABEX is just a drop in the ocean when we consider the needs of these countries, but its effectiveness is clear from the fact that it is particularly the poorest developing countries which benefit from it.

President. — The Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members has the floor.

Mr Skovmand. — (DK) Mr President, I would like to raise a problem which is liable to be overlooked here in Parliament. The Lomé Convention and its systems, including STABEX, are in themselves unfortunate, because they cover only a limited number of countries which account for barely 8-9 % of the total population of the developing countries.

It is a good idea to give assistance to the developing countries to help with the problems arising from the fluctuations in raw material prices, but aid should be given to all countries, and individual developing countries should not be given special advantages. The STABEX system therefore is fundamentally pernicious. It divides the developing countries and makes it difficult for the UN to implement systems which really would benefit these countries. For this reason it is not so important how the STABEX system has functioned or is functioning. What is important is that the EEC, in this as in other areas, is pursuing a policy which is detrimental to the poorer countries of the world. The sooner STABEX can be abolished the better.

President. — The Commission has the floor.

Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission. — (F) Mr President, I do not need to remind you how many times we have made arrangements with Mrs Castellina

Cheysson

to discuss this STABEX report, which has unfortunately been deferred so often that, now that we have finally got round to examining it, Mrs Castellina herself is unable to be present! Nevertheless, I should like to thank Mr Poniatowski for presenting Mrs Castellina's report.

The report begins by summing up STABEX operations under the first Lomé Convention. I should like to remind those present that, following the payment at the end of October 1980 of 2 640 000 units of account to the Sudan for the 1979 financial year, a total of 337½ million units of account had been disbursed in favour of STABEX under Lomé I. It has already been noted that these sums, which have benefited 37 ACP States and which have compensated falls in income from the export of 22 products, have aided — and we are happy that this should be the case — the least-developed countries. The payments were mainly made whenever local circumstances caused a fall in exports and hence a fall in the income from such exports.

All the speakers who have had the floor since the presentation of Mrs Castellina's report have emphasized the benefits to these least-developed countries. All the payments made in 1980 as compensatory amounts for the 1979 financial year were disbursed to underdeveloped — and *only* to underdeveloped — countries. The entire area of the sub-Sahara affected by drought received nearly 50 % of the STABEX funds — 46 %, to be exact — under Lomé I. In her report, Mrs Castellina asked why some products accounted for such enormous STABEX transfers: ground-nuts and derived products 40.5 %; next among the agricultural products came cotton, with 11 % of the total — well, the answer is that these products originate precisely in the least-developed areas with the most precarious economies and the greatest likelihood of being afflicted by drought. These products are poverty products — if I may describe them as such — and that is why they received the largest transfers. The report says that the system operated in a generally satisfactory manner and does not stint its praise for the speed with which payments were made. It is indeed quite remarkable that, with very few rare exceptions, cheques for compensation were all sent out before the month of July in each year to cover deficits for the previous financial year. What is more, we have introduced a system of advance payments, which I will talk about in a moment.

Mrs Castellina's report, presented by Mr Poniatowski, and the comments of subsequent speakers permit us to pursue the analysis a little further. STABEX has been referred to as a system of insurance by several speakers here today. That is precisely what it is and that is *all* it is. In my opinion, it is a mistake to want to give STABEX functions which it does not have. STABEX is insurance policy against the bad years and saying so answers all the questions that have been raised here today. Now, we are in charge of administering this

insurance company, which is only to be expected. If I may, I should like to caution Mr Michel against using the expression 'joint management'. It is quite out of the question. We manage each case with the relevant customer. Naturally, there is always a free discussion with each customer over his case, but we have no intention of inviting the other 59 ACP countries to discuss it as well! It is true that other methods must be used to assess the impact of STABEX, and I will speak about this in a moment; I must say right away that I fully concur with what Mr Michel said in this respect. For each individual case, then, we crosscheck the data with the country concerned. We crosscheck the basic reference data as well as the figures which give rise to the insurance payments in a particular year. I am happy to be able to report to Parliament that we have almost total agreement on cases these days. Sometimes discrepancies crop up between our statistics and theirs, but whenever a discrepancy does arise, the explanation can usually be tracked down from one year to the next. As the cutoff point for the statistical calculations is not always exactly the same, differences can arise but they will be detected the following year. There is therefore no serious disagreement between us.

As I said, this system is an insurance policy. Hence, the risks need to be clearly listed. It is quite normal for such a list to be reviewed and amended. You are aware of the fact that the list of primary products was extended on several occasions under Lomé I: vanilla, cloves, mohair, etc., were all added. Between the signing of Lomé I and Lomé II, some extremely important products were added: *all* oilcakes, without exception, rubber, peas and lentils, shrimps, etc. It must be possible to go on adding to this list. What the report has to say about this is quite valid and, what is more, corresponds to the intentions voiced by the partners of the Lomé Convention. The risks covered by the insurance policy are risks taken with us. We have no intention of compensating one of our partners for falls in income from exports as a result of a decision taken by an industrialized country which is not a member of our Community. As you are all aware, we have only granted exceptions for a few countries, the main bulk of whose exports was destined for countries outside the Community. Under Lomé II, what is more, there are provisions for exports to other ACP countries to be taken account of by Council decision. Lomé II also provides for compensation to be paid if exports to countries increase and exports to Community countries drop slightly, so long as the fall in income from exports to the Community is due to a drop in Community demand and not due to a fall in export potential on the part of the ACP countries.

Mr President, we have instituted a system of advance payments to deal with one of the problems emphasized just now by a Member of this Parliament; on several occasions during the course of a financial year, we have already paid an advance on the total sum due as insurance for that entire financial year. The calcula-

Cheysson

tions are by no means easy and straightforward, as the typical pattern of a country's exports needs to be determined — and exports may well fluctuate from one period of the year to another — in order to make a reasonable assessment of the advance to be paid. Care must be taken to avoid paying unduly large sums which might have to be reclaimed at some point in the future, if it turned out that the advance payments had been too generous.

As I have already said, Mr President, this is a type of insurance. Our partners have never ceased to remind us of this fact. In the same way that a policy holder uses the money refunded to him after an accident as he himself thinks fit — he may have had a car accident, for example, but decide to use the insurance money to repair his central heating system — in the same way, our partners have laid great stress on their freedom to use the payments we make to them under the STABEX system as they think fit. The Commission has always been in a quandary over this point, as we would have liked — in agreement with Members of this Parliament — STABEX funds to have benefited the particular sector hit by a disaster or difficulties. As far as this is concerned, we are likely to obtain some satisfaction from the way in which Lomé II has been drawn up, as was pointed out by Mr Michel. We cannot press this too far, however, without running the risk of making the system too rigid, which has rightly been denounced by Members here today. If a fall in income is due to the failure of a raw product, for example, it is vital that the corresponding compensation can be used to develop the processing industry dependent on this product. But we really do have to be flexible in this matter and I think our present approach is more or less the correct one.

Being a form of insurance, Mr President, it is not the purpose of STABEX to deal with other problems. After all, car insurance has nothing to do with accident prevention. Unemployment benefit has nothing to do with problems at work. In the same way, it is not STABEX's job to regulate prices; that can only be done on a worldwide scale and here agreements on raw materials are extremely useful. Nor is it the role of STABEX to guarantee an increase in income to producers; that is covered by the development programme as a whole. STABEX is only what it once set up to be. And given that it is what it is, I must confess I have difficulty in understanding the criticism often levelled against it that it perpetuates situations. I should like to remind everyone that recipients are free to choose how they spend the transfers; in some cases, this freedom is a bit too unrestricted. I should also like to remind everyone that a great number of processed products will henceforth be covered by STABEX, including sawdust and scantlings, cocoa butter and many others. 20 % of the STABEX payments were for processed products and there is no reason why others should not be added to the list.

Finally, what impact has the system had? The Commission will of course produce the reports which have been requested, beginning with a summary report of the first five years of operations to follow the annual reports which you have already had. This consolidated report will be ready in a few weeks' time. It will be followed by a much more substantial economic report which has been requested from experts outside the Commission and which will be concerned with the impact of the system on the economic development of the ACP countries. This report will be of great interest. I should however like to warn you that this subject is highly complex. Let me remind you once again that STABEX is a kind of insurance. To what extent can insurance have direct economic impact? It is vital for workers to be insured in case they should fall sick or become unemployed, but to what extent is the income of workers affected by insurance, and what is the impact of such insurance on the economic statistics relating to each worker; all this is very difficult to determine. We have however at least been able to establish that in many cases now STABEX has played a significant economic role, even though its impact is difficult to quantify. I should like to quote just one example which was reported to me by the Prime Minister of Fiji. This gentleman, as you probably are aware, is a native of the islands at the Eastern end of the archipelago, and the people on these islands traditionally produce coconut oil; in other words, they grow coconut palms. A cyclone swept through the area every five to six years, destroying the year's crop and uprooting a fair number of coconut palms. As a result, there has been a steady reduction in the amount of coconut oil produced over the last 50 years. The inhabitants of these islands have tended to migrate to the main islands and have attempted to produce sugar in competition with citizens of Indian origin. Since STABEX was set up, not only has this wave of migration halted, but people have begun to replant coconut palms once again. It is a fact that coconut oil is a much sought after product in the world. Now that the peasants know that they will receive compensation in the year out of every five or six when the inevitable cyclone appears, they have begun to put their faith in this crop again, which is of great value to their country, both for local consumption and for trade with the outside world.

Mr President, I am sure that all this will be discussed further in a future debate to be held by this Parliament. I do not doubt that it will be confirmed that our STABEX system is of value, albeit limited. I do not doubt that the conclusion will be that it is extremely regrettable that the idea has not caught on elsewhere, that the system has not been copied in other parts of the world. The countries of South-East Asia were so impressed with our setup that they asked one of our experts to devise a similar system for them, which they intended to propose to the Japanese. We did in fact devise such a system for them. It does not cover entirely the same products as our STABEX, but takes

Cheysson

account of local conditions. So far, negotiations regarding the adoption of such a system between Japan and the South-East Asian countries have not yet borne fruit, much to my regret. At any rate, let us ensure that STABEX retains its position — without going beyond it — as part of our systematic will to make plans for the future, to guarantee secure trade between us and our partners, and to guarantee the income dependent on such trade. In all these respects, STABEX is to my mind a corner stone of what is indeed Community policy.

President. — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

The proceedings will now be suspended until 3 p.m.

The House will rise.

(The sitting was suspended at 1.10 p.m. and resumed at 3 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR: MR ROGERS

Vice-President

President. — The sitting is resumed.

I call Mr Enright on a point of order.

Mr Enright. — It is a point of order, Mr President that I have been trying to make since Monday. It does seem to me that according to the resolution that this Parliament passed, which I have here, we should be putting to a vote of the whole Parliament the special meeting that we shall be holding, which rumour has it the Bureau is recommending for Strasbourg.

President. — As I understand it, the Parliament has been informed of the special part-session to be held in Strasbourg toward the end of the month. As far as the calendar for the rest of the year is concerned, the decision of the Bureau was that proposals, as required by the Rules, would be submitted to the House. This will be done before the end of this sitting, as I am given to understand. The recommendation is that they will be held in Strasbourg. If the House wants to put any counter-resolutions relating to that, then it is up to Members to put them down.

I call Mr Enright on a second point of order.

Mr Enright. — Mr President, this is still the first point of order because you said that it was announced

to the House, which is quite true; but in fact the resolution which was carried by this Parliament specifically states that we resolve to submit it to a vote, and that has not happened.

President. — I am given to understand that the calendar will be submitted to the House for approval.

Mr Enright. — In that case my second point of order is that I understand that members of the Bureau are, quite rightly, conducting negotiations with the Staff Committee on behalf of Parliament as a whole. It seems to me that it is only right and proper that the House should be informed of what is happening. I quite understand the staff's anxiety and, indeed, I mentioned it in my original resolution.

President. — I can give you the information that I have. The Bureau this morning received a letter from the Staff Committee. I am sure you are quite aware of this and some Members seem to be more aware of things that are happening with the staff than are officials. They might well be more busy with the Staff Committee more than as Members of the Parliament, but that is beside the point. Anyhow, a letter was received from the Staff Committee from Mr Priestley, who is the chairman, asking whether the Bureau would discuss with them matters that are outstanding. The Bureau decided to do this and I understand that these negotiations are taking place. The outcome of the negotiations will be announced. I do not think it is possible to have a negotiating committee of 434 Members, or whatever we might be at this time. I do not think it is possible to negotiate in total with 2 000 staff or whatever they might be at the present level. I do not know whether we could get a chamber big enough. But the negotiations are proceeding and I am quite sure, Mr Enright, that the House will be informed. As you know I am a custodian of Members' interest as well as staff interests, and matters are proceeding.

I call Mr Pannella on a point of order.

Mr Pannella. — *(F)* Mr President, I want to make two comments which will be short and to the point. As you said, the calendar of ordinary part-sessions will be submitted to the House for approval. It is clear that the same thing has to be done in the case of the special part-session, in accordance with the same principle. We were informed of the Bureau's decision yesterday. The House must now decide.

If it is up to Parliament to decide where the rest of the part-sessions are to be held, it is obviously also up to Parliament to make up its mind on the special part-session. That is my first point of order, Mr President.

President. — Yes, Mr Pannella, you are quite right. You are a guardian of Members' interests and I am sure you are respected as the guardian and you have a very special role to play in the issue.

Last year the Bureau, in accordance with the wishes of the Staff Committee, decided on a schedule of meetings for this year. This was agreed with the Staff Committee. As a result of Mr Enright's motion, which I am sure was supported by you, Mr Pannella and certainly by the vast majority of the House, the agreement that had been arrived at with the Staff Committee was overturned by the plenary, by the same people who are now asking for the interests of the staff to be looked after. Instead of the sessions in February and July being held in Luxembourg, the House — not the Bureau or the enlarged Bureau or the political group chairman — decided that the Luxembourg sessions would be held in Strasbourg. So an agreement with the staff that was reached by the Bureau was overturned.

In view of what the House had done in overturning the staff agreement previously which was the responsibility of every Member of this Parliament and not the enlarged Bureau, the latter decided to bring forward proposals that the meetings be held in Strasbourg, but Members would be quite at liberty to put down amendments to those proposals. So when they are brought forward, you can put down amendments to them.

Proposals will come forward concerning the dates which have already been generally agreed, but also on where the sessions are to be held. Now if, like last time, the House decides otherwise, the House has the right to do so. It is as simple as that. It means that if anyone negotiates on behalf of the Bureau with the Staff Committee, then the negotiated position can be overturned by the plenary.

I call Mr Pannella on a second point of order.

Mr Pannella. — (*F*) I am not going to get personal, Mr President, because that will not help matters in any way. I just wanted to say that, as far as I am concerned at any rate, the whole affair seems to get more and more complicated every time you tell us something. Consequently, I shall forgo my second point of order.

President. — Good, that gives me a great deal of pleasure.

I call Mr Forth.

Mr Forth. — Mr President, I should like to point out, in a constructive spirit, Mr President, that what puzzles a lot of the Members of the House is why, in view of the fact that we know well in advance that there will be a special session for agricultural prices,

the entire business of the Bureau, the House and the staff is left so late, with so many things being left in doubt. This is what we find puzzling. This, I know, is what concerns the staff that things are not done well in advance and with time for preparation. Consultations with the House are not held in due time and here we are in a position of still being in doubt at this very late hour as to whether the session is taking place, or where it is going to be, or what and this Mr President, is what is causing the trouble. Surely knowing our calendar as we do, in terms of special budget sessions late in the year, special agricultural price sessions at this time of the year, we ought to be able to make our arrangements and our consultations much earlier. This, surely, is the point and my plea is that we learn a lesson from what is happening now in order to avoid it in the future. There should not be this much of a problem.

President. — I could simply take note and go on. I do take note, but what I am attempting to do is to explain that decisions that were arrived at with the Staff Committee have been overturned by the House. Those were decisions on where the meetings should be held. The House overturned this in Luxembourg. In November, I think it was, there was an attempt to remove the February and July part-sessions from Luxembourg. Because of the problems of altering the February part-session, it was decided to carry on holding it in Luxembourg but the July session was changed to Strasbourg. It really is in some senses a little hypocritical for the House to seem to be terribly concerned about the staff when they have previously overturned an agreed position with the staff in relation to holding meetings in Luxembourg. Now when the enlarged Bureau of the Parliament were faced with the fact of having to convene an agricultural prices session in order to conform with the time table, which every Member is aware of, the enlarged Bureau recommended, in view of a decision taken by the House, that it be in Strasbourg. The staff obviously then had difficulties because it is not only just that one agreement had been overturned but they felt aggrieved that a second situation was arising.

As a result of this negotiations are taking place. Now you can either have a dictatorial situation or a situation where everything is brought to the House and we then have really got to make our minds up exactly what we want.

So what is happening is that negotiations are taking place; when they have reached a reasonable point so that something can be put in front of the House to be resolved, it will be resolved. So Members certainly cannot complain. The calendar of the meetings and the location will be given to the House and if any one wants to amend it, he can amend it. It is as simple as that.

We will now proceed to the business that is in front of us.

6. *Financial and budgetary policy of the Communities for 1982 (resumption)*

President. — The next item is the resumption of the debate on the report (Doc. 1-936/80), drawn up by Mr Spinelli on behalf of the Committee on Budgets, on

the European Parliament's guidelines for the financial and budgetary policy of the European Communities for 1982.

I call Mr Baillot.

Mr Baillot. — (*F*) Mr President, I regret that time does not permit me to enlarge on the criticisms we have put forward of the report presented by our colleague, Mr Spinelli, on behalf of the Committee on Budgets. These criticisms do not refer to questions of form, that is, relations between Parliament, the Council and the Commission, or even to the way these budgetary problems are brought up for discussion here — as we heard yesterday in the course of the debate. They refer to questions of substance: it is in fact the guidelines laid down in the draft resolution that we take issue with. Hence the explanations of vote for drawing attention to these criticisms which are the reason for our opposition to the resolution.

President. — I call Mr Colla.

Mr Colla. — (*NL*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, at the beginning of this 1982 budgetary procedure I should first of all like to invite you to consider a number of suggestions regarding our procedure since I think they are important for the success of the budget of the European Community.

Firstly, I should like to make an appeal to the Council of the European Community, which, unfortunately, is no longer present, since I am convinced that many difficulties could be prevented and that it would be much easier for agreement to be reached between the two institutions which together make up the budgetary authority if the Council would not leave its President to his fate in the final decisive moments and stopped letting him conduct so-called discussions with Parliament while he is still tied down by strict instructions. I must say that I found these encounters rather sad the last two years. It was a depressing sight to see the President of the Council sitting there all by himself with very little freedom to negotiate. The result of this situation is that Parliament gets the impression that the Council has already made up its mind so that Parliament is up against a brick wall. It is not, therefore, surprising that it then takes a hard line.

This would suggest that the Council must realize that it is very important for the ministers to be present at

the debate so that a genuine dialogue can take place between Council and Parliament.

Remaining with the question of the procedure, I should also like to make an appeal to Parliament itself in connection with the statement made in paragraph 4 of Mr Spinelli's motion for a resolution. It is indeed vital, I think, that the Community budget should also be discussed in our ten national parliaments. It is of the utmost importance that a dialogue should take place in the national parliaments between the national government, the national members of parliament and the relevant members of the European Parliament. This can only be in the interests of a better understanding of the usefulness of and need for the European budget and hence better relations. It would enable the national members to keep a better eye on their national government and ministers. My third and final point on the question of the procedure consists of an appeal to the Commission since I think it is very important that Parliament — certainly at the second reading of the budget — should be informed more directly and perhaps more fully concerning the situation as regards the implementation of the budget for the current year for the very simple reason that during the discharge procedure it frequently has to protest that the funds have been underutilized. This could for a large part be avoided if Parliament and the Committee on Budgets could, at least at the second reading, have a better picture of planned transfers, for example, so that they can help to produce a budget more in tune with the facts.

These are, I think, three procedural suggestions which would make our task a lot easier if we manage to remedy the present shortcomings. The different sections of the budgetary authority would then also be able to reach agreement much more quickly.

Mr President, I should also like to go briefly into a number of substantive questions. Mr Arndt has already stated on behalf of our Group that we broadly speaking agree with the policy priorities as indicated in the Spinelli report. However, I should like to stress one particular point. I agree with the various priorities but I find it a little disturbing that we are perhaps giving equal importance for the umpteenth time to all the priorities we can think of. In the present economic situation which calls for urgent action to combat unemployment and in which that problem calls for particular attention in so many places, a double accent or a second accent, as it were, should be placed on each of the priorities mentioned. I am convinced that if we take each chapter at a time, and I should like to ask the Commission to take this approach even in drawing up its preliminary draft, it would be perfectly possible for us to make a particular effort in each chapter for those items which can be expected to produce a positive job-creating effect.

If I may give a few examples, we are all agreed that the chapter on energy is an important one. It would

Colla

then be possible to devote particular attention to those appropriations in this chapter which are connected with the employment situation. As I have done so often before, I should like to draw your attention to the idea of energy saving, which is not only important from the economic point of view in general, but is also an area in which jobs could be created. I hope that the Commission will include an item in the budget — and this year — providing for interest subsidies for loans in connection with energy saving.

Then there is the chapter on the environment. Here there is a possibility for establishing a link between, on the one hand, the protection of the environment, the importance of which people now generally realize, and, on the other hand, measures for creating jobs. If we consider the chapter on the environment from that point of view, we will be prepared for special efforts for the construction of purification plants, for example.

There is also the chapter on research. Research is very important for the Community but certain priorities could be established in this field too. First and foremost, we should promote research which can be expected to find an industrial application in due course.

We could go on in this vein. I should therefore like to urge the Commission to consider all the general priorities mentioned in the Spinelli report with a view to deciding which items in the chapters concerned could be expected to have a positive effect in the short or medium term on the employment situation in the European Community. This would enable us to arrive at a balanced whole much quicker and much more easily.

President. — I call Mr Robert Jackson.

Mr Robert Jackson. — Mr President, this debate at this stage of the budgetary procedure is an occasion for us to review the basic principles which should inform, or which we hope will inform, the work of the Commission which is currently under way in drafting the preliminary draft budget. In this regard there is I think a great deal to be welcomed in Mr Spinelli's resolution, on behalf of the Budget Committee, concerning guidelines for the budget — the resolution which we are discussing today. But because I propose to say something critical about the resolution in a moment, let me first underline some of the points in the Budget Committee's resolution with which I strongly agree.

First, I warmly commend the link which this resolution makes between the agricultural price fixing process and the budgetary process. We want to know what the overall budgetary cost of the agricultural price fixing is

to be, in good time to take account of it in our work in this House on the preliminary draft budget.

Second, following what Mr Notenboom said yesterday, I salute the assertion in this resolution that this House should set its face firmly against any supplementary budgets in the field of agriculture. We want to know in good time what the definite commitments for 1982 will be for guaranteed expenditure.

Third, although I find the wording somewhat vague, let me also commend the resolution's endorsement of the concept that an increasing share of the financial liability for excess agricultural production should fall on the producers.

So, Mr President, I welcome these very positive and very important features of the Spinelli resolution. However, there is one fundamental criticism of the resolution which I must now voice. That is its repeated insistence that the problem of agricultural spending is a problem of surpluses in some sectors. On the contrary, the problem of the agricultural budget is an overall problem of cost control in all sectors.

Let me cite only one area of farm spending where there is in fact at present no surplus — the tomato sector — a sector in which the costs of Community support have now become so excessive that the tomato processors are now receiving tomatoes at a negative cost to them. That is to say, the Community taxpayer is actually paying the processors to process these tomatoes for sale at their own profit.

Mr President, this is one example — perhaps only a very small one — of excessive cost in a sector in which there is in fact no surplus. But even in the sectors where there is a surplus, the problem in framing the Community budget is not so much the surpluses as the overall costs of the policy as a whole. Let me say again what I think is being increasingly recognized throughout the Community: that the price intervention approach to maintaining the incomes of marginal farmers is inherently an excessively costly and wasteful approach.

Mr President, it is simply not cost-effective to pay all farmers — no matter how prosperous — a price which is calculated to maintain the incomes of the most marginal farmers. Indeed there is mounting evidence that it is the better-off farmers who profit from the Community's price fixing more than the smaller farmers. That is why, Mr President, I regret that I must conclude that, until we have a budget that provides for a less wasteful approach to the financing of agriculture, I fear that I see precious little chance of our finding the finance to pay for the wide range of new and stronger Community policies which we all want to see. Mr Spinelli has made an excellent list in paragraph 8 of his resolution and I would particularly draw the attention of Mr Cheysson to clause (c) of paragraph 8. He has made an excellent list of the

R. Jackson

priorities for the Community. Let us now in this House and in this Community address ourselves realistically to finding the finance for those policies. Thank you.

(Applause)

President. — Thank you, Mr Jackson. Can I say it is a pleasure to preside over a speaker who not only speaks well but also adheres to the speaking time allocated by his group. Thank you for keeping perfectly to your time.

(Applause)

I call the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport.

Mr Kavanagh. — Mr President, the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport very much welcomes the Spinelli document. The early timetable will have the effect of bringing forward the deadlines laid down in the Treaty and setting a very detailed and complex schedule for the Commission and the Council, so that at long last the budgetary procedure will on the one hand be less hectic and chaotic, while on the other the conflicts waged and the rigid positions adopted during the final stages in the last two years will be avoided as far as possible through constructive collaboration between the Parliament and the Council. This timetable, which has already met with the general approval of the Committee on Budgets and to which no objections were raised by the committee chairmen, obviously cannot become official until the Council and the Commission have undertaken to adhere to it.

There is unfortunately one glaring omission in the Spinelli report, and we in the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport would hope that our Amendment No 8, seeking to add a new paragraph, paragraph (h), would be accepted by the House. Mr Pedini, the chairman of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport, has formally requested that education and culture be included in the priorities, since during the recently concluded 1981 budget procedure Parliament regrettably jeopardized the possibility of implementing measures in both sectors, particularly the education sector in which the decisions reached with such difficulty by the Council of Education Ministers last June have already been practically nullified, at least for the 1981 financial year.

Our priorities are unfortunately not included in the final text, as I have said, no doubt because the Committee on Budgets wanted to include only projects involving very heavy expenditure. However, it is essential to give priority to activities which, although they cost only a few million EUA, are of major polit-

ical and human importance to the Community. I wish to point out that the political and institutional basis necessary for the above-mentioned measures already exists in the agreements concluded on 22 June 1980 between the Ministers of Education of the Member States meeting in the Council of the European Communities. I also wish to point out that the time unfortunately lost during the 1981 budget procedure must now be made good through the entry in the 1982 budget of appropriations to implement the above-mentioned agreements.

In its preliminary draft budget for 1981 the Commission had proposed appropriations of 4 385 million EUA under Item 3920 to continue implementation of the educational programme already under way. The Council subsequently reduced this amount to 2 300 000 EUA. Since the European Parliament on 6 November 1980 rejected the amendments seeking to reinstate the preliminary draft budget appropriation for 1981, the Commission has had to abandon — and I think this is really deplorable — the implementation of measures covered by the above-mentioned agreements, which include a pilot project for the education of children of migrant workers. This is all the more deplorable, as the funds needed amounted only to 2 085 000 European units of account.

I readily accept the argument advanced by Mr Arndt that fighting unemployment, creating employment and reducing regional differences throughout the Community are of the utmost importance. Nevertheless a proper cultural and educational policy is essential for this Community. I would point out the extreme importance of Community action in the cultural and educational sectors. The aim of the Community's educational policy should be, by representing the characteristic strengths of each Member State's educational system, to guarantee mutual recognition of diplomas and the admission of students from other Member States to institutes of higher education. This is essential if we are to eliminate the obstacles that still hamper the complete freedom of movement of persons laid down in Title III of Part II of the EEC Treaty.

I would also like the House to take note of the need for measures to promote equal educational opportunity for girls, the teaching of foreign languages and classes on the European Community and the European institutions in our schools. The first objective is of extreme social importance and reflects the resolve constantly expressed by the European Parliament to bring about complete equality between men and women. The other two aims are of profound political and human significance, in that their purpose is to bring the citizens of Europe closer together by facilitating interpersonal contacts and promoting knowledge of matters and problems that are of common interests to the peoples of Europe.

Kavanagh

I would stress that the situation is even worse in the cultural sector. The appropriations for 1981 under Article 393 of the budget were as follows: Item 3930, expenditure on cultural action — 330 000 units of account; financial contribution to cultural events of European importance 140 000 units of account. For contributions to financing the conservation of architectural heritage only a token entry was put in the budget. The total is thus a mere 470 000 European units of account, which is not only an infinitesimally small percentage of the overall appropriations entered in the budget but even a reduction in absolute terms of 100 000 units of account as against the corresponding appropriations in the 1980 budget. We ask whether this is worthy of a Community, some of whose Member States have done a great deal to create the cultural and artistic patrimony that is the heritage of the entire world.

I would also stress in particular that a Community cultural programme is not only of considerable human significance but may have important economic and social repercussions, as in the case of Community financing to safeguard the artistic and architectural heritage of the most deprived regions. Such funds in the form of direct payments of contributions or interest rebates on loans granted by the European Investment Bank can in fact promote the development of tourism, which is often one of the main resources of the least developed regions and is attracted by the existence of artistic masterpieces. A budget heading already exists for cultural measures, namely Item 3932. Only a token entry is entered against this item for the 1981 financial year. The time has therefore come to enter the necessary appropriations.

I would ask this House and the rapporteur, Mr Spinelli, to accept Amendment No 1, tabled in the name of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport, and to support this amendment when it comes to the vote later on.

President. — I call Mr Seligman.

Mr Seligman. — Mr President, I support the whole concept of the Spinelli report, but I do want to mention clause 8, which to my mind is quite inadequate. It only mentions the need for energy research and development. There is much more to it than that. There is much more that the Community can do, and should do, by joint action in the whole field of energy, things that the Member States cannot do on their own; and that is the whole point. Only 4 % of the Community GDP is spent by nations on energy, and only 2 % of that small 4 % comes out of the Community budget or from the European Investment Bank and other institutions. Mr President, this is peanuts. We agree with Mr Spinelli that there must be a new assessment of energy investment to go into the projects which can best be dealt with by the Community as a whole —

such things as controlling oil prices in the Rotterdam spot market or harmonizing energy prices. How ridiculous it is for individual countries on their own to try and harmonize energy prices! We have got to do it jointly. Most important of all, however, is something which has already been mentioned, and that is helping capital-intensive projects such as nuclear power-stations with interest rebates. This is something that does not cost a great deal of money, but it is of great help to the poorer nations of the Community, and to the poorer nations of the Third World. So let us help them if we can by giving them interest rebates, because the Third World is our market for the future. Let us look after them in that way.

So, by joint action the Community can do things that we cannot do alone. That is a real common energy policy, and I think this should be financed, as Mr Spinelli says, by transfer from national budgets to the Community budget. It does not mean more expenditure: it means expenditure conducted in the best possible way, jointly.

(Applause from the European Democratic Group)

President. — I call the Committee on Budgets.

Mr Lange, chairman of the committee. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it is somewhat difficult for me to present my views on this subject after the large number of contributions which we have had occasion to listen to yesterday and today. What is more, my views will not be to the liking of all the Members of this House.

My first point is that Mr Spinelli did not yesterday deliver his own opinion, but spoke as the rapporteur for the Committee on Budgets. Other Members ought not to act as if they were unaware that in this case it is a committee's duty to deliver a report — this is in any case true for all the other committees and their rapporteurs — and that there was no question here of his expressing a personal opinion. This is the opinion of the Committee on Budgets, which is submitting it to you for your approval.

Secondly, it is not our intention, in spite of the fact that not a few details have already been brought into the discussion, to include specific details in these general political guidelines, but our aim was to define Parliament's political views on the 1982 budget, on the basis, firstly of the budgets for 1980 and 1981 and secondly on the basis of the decisions which this House took in connection with the latter. We should therefore not act as if it was not we ourselves who took the decisions which have in practice filtered through into these guidelines.

Thirdly, we ought to have one fact clear in our minds, which is that the Community as such, can only start to

Lange

perform in sectors in which no explicitly Community policies are as yet pursued, if the Member States are prepared to cooperate and to set up the preconditions for Community activity. This is in my opinion a fundamental point which must impinge itself on our consciousness but also on that of the Council and the Commission.

The next, and in my view decisive, point is that we must have the strength of our own convictions. When we note specific political necessities, we cannot draw back from the need for action and simply let the Commission put a proposal to us by a given date. As far as the mandate given to the Commission on 30 May of last year is concerned, this House fully realized months ago — that means as early as last year — that the date of 30 June of this year decided upon by the European Council for the solution of the problems was too late.

In this connection, the Committee on Budgets wishes to make perfectly clear as I wish to stress this via its rapporteur that it considers this date to be too late. As Parliament, we ought not to settle for the deadlines which other people have fixed for us, but rather stand by our own views on the matter.

Fourthly, we ought not to attempt to stuff these guidelines full of specific details for one or other area of policy, which would merely lead to anticipating decisions which must definitely be taken during other debates, for example during the debates on farm prices, on reforming the CAP or restructuring the Community budget.

Lastly, ladies and gentlemen, these guidelines are an expression of Parliament's political will which has validity not just for the Commission and the Council but also for Parliament itself, and we have a collective duty to work together according to these guidelines. This will only take place inasmuch as the rapporteur of the main committee stays in close contact with the members who have been appointed as draftsmen of opinions by the other committees in order to sift out where the major points of emphasis really lie for Parliament and to draw the necessary financial conclusions within the corresponding financial framework. This is the only possible way to go about it if we really wish to set up a self-supporting basis for this House which will last until the end of the budget procedure, and if we wish to avoid seeing this House, as was the case for the 1980 budget, more or less disintegrating during the final vote, no longer keeping to its original decisions, a similar thing having taken place during the adoption of the 1981 budget. We ought not therefore to be watching the Commission and the Council, but ought to take ourselves in hand in order to give the appropriate form to the budget! This can only happen if we maintain close contact with each other, so that all the committees play an even greater part than they tried to do during last year and the year before last in decisions on the budget and on its main points of emphasis. Under these circumstances, we all have a

good chance, even when opposed to the other two institutions, of coming through together.

I should be grateful if the decision which Mr Spinelli has brought before us today on behalf of the Committee on Budgets could, for the above reasons, be adopted, and if all the other types of problems, such as that raised by Mr de Ferranti, might be included in the specific debates which have to be conducted and if we could avoid including such details in these guidelines.

This, Mr President, brings me to the end of my speech, and I think I am right in saying that I have precisely come to the end of the five minutes which the Bureau of the President in its wisdom saw fit to allocate to me as chairman of this committee.

(Applause)

President. — I call the rapporteur.

Mr Spinelli, rapporteur. — *(I)* Mr President, I thank Mr Lange for having reminded the Assembly that the report which I have had the honour to present is the report of the Committee on Budgets itself, which as such asks you to approve it. I am only its spokesman.

Without going into detail on the points which have been raised, I would like to answer the main questions, and particularly the criticisms.

I am very sorry that Mr Tugendhat was not able to remain with us longer, but I would like to say to him that, in his answer, he stated that he agreed with everything, with the exception of the various details making up the whole! In fact, during his detailed examination of points with which he had already expressed his agreement, he at best gave evasive answers, and otherwise stated quite clearly that he could not agree or could not commit himself.

While we understand the difficulties which the Commission faces, we must stand firm on our demand for more effective interinstitutional collaboration during the drafting of the budget. Essentially, we want the Commission to give us some indication of the rough figures in order to know what exactly we are dealing with. It may be replied that the Commission said last year that they agreed to this, on condition that they could give these indications orally. But 'orally' means that we are forced to waste one or two days transcribing Mr Tugendhat's speech to the committee in order to extract the figures which interest us. If we had these figures directly, right from the beginning, we would undoubtedly save a lot of time. In fact, we only have the right to speak of 'priorities' when we are discussing figures, even though they are produced as guidelines only. The Commission must tell us: 'We believe that expenditure on this item

Spinelli

must be increased by such and such an amount with regard to last year', or 'Expenditure must remain as it is or must be cut'. Only then will 'priority' have any meaning.

We also wanted to know from Mr Tugendhat what was the relationship between our budget and national budgets, and whether the Commission was able to establish it. The Commissioner answered by saying that he would 'draw the attention of his colleague to this.' For God's sake, surely the members of the Commission had time to discuss this beforehand and to tell us whether it was or was not possible! This is why we have to insist on an answer. The Commission ought to realize that it must think of these things if it really wants to collaborate with us.

The various criticisms in the speeches made have been given concrete form in a series of amendments. At the appropriate time I will give the opinion of the Committee on Budgets concerning each of these. Broadly speaking, I can say, however, that three or four amendments are aimed at adding certain clarifications or supplementary definitions to the list of priorities to be found in paragraph 8 of the motion for a resolution. I have nothing against this. However, we must remember that the more specific the definitions, the less important becomes the list of priorities. On the other hand, we must not give this list of priorities too much weight at this point, because it will only become important when it is attached, as a guide, to the pertinent figures. I repeat, however, that I have nothing against additions and further clarifications.

With regard to the request for the introduction of a new kind of tax, Mr Lange and I would like to ask the proposer, Mr de Ferranti, to withdraw this proposal. This had and has its own place in the debate on own resources, but it cannot be inserted like this at the last moment into a policy debate on the budget. Mr de Ferranti wants to be able to enter this horse for the race too. I do not know very much about horse racing, but I don't think you can enter a horse at the last moment, just before the start, and that is why I am asking him again not to insist on this.

I would like to explain two further fundamental points which, if they are retained, give the report a certain character, but which, if eliminated change it completely.

Firstly, we ask for collaboration between the Parliament, the Commission and the Council in order finally to formulate a policy of agricultural pricing which will lead to clear and unambiguous financial commitments, and include mechanisms to cope with the expenditure if it should rise above the commitments, but with the proviso that the methods chosen should be outside the specific scope of the budget. We must say this quite clearly, as an invitation to ourselves and to others to

plan this year's budget in such a way that each policy costs what it is stated to cost. We shall not escape the problem by refusing to adopt a clear position! This is the reason why we oppose the amendments aimed at quashing or changing this position which anyway we discussed in the committee stage.

It is likewise important that the Commission should present its proposals for increasing own resources. We know very well that this is not something which can be approved this year, but it must be done in order to break this vicious circle whereby there can be no new policies because there are no resources and inversely no additional resources because there are no new policies.

We have stated our desire to see the VAT rate raised to 2 %. We have said that only then can we begin to talk seriously about the policies that we wish to carry out. The Commission cannot answer that the time has not yet arrived, because in discussing the 1982 budget we will have to take into account the payment appropriations, while our resources will be reaching the 1 % VAT ceiling.

Added to this are the commitments and programmes for the following years. How can we carry them out? This is why the Commission must answer properly. There is a connection between these problems because if we give the wrong answer on agricultural prices, we will never be allocated new resources, because of the fear that they will end up in the deep well of indefinable agricultural expenditure; if, however, the problems are tackled together, we shall be able to control agricultural expenditure and to develop new policies with adequate means. We must start doing these things immediately; if we do not do so, we will lose the chance of using this debate to improve substantially the entire range of Community policies.

Ladies and gentlemen, let us concentrate on these essential problems! I do not doubt at all that there are other very important matters, but a debate on the Community budget is not the place for them.

For this reason I believe that we cannot vote for amendments which change the actual substance of the report, and this is why I am inviting you to approve in its present form the document which I have presented on behalf of the Committee on Budgets.

(Applause)

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be held at 6 o'clock this evening with the amendments which have been tabled so far.

7. *Youth activities*

President. — The next item is the report by Mrs Pruvot, on behalf of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport, on youth activities (Doc. 1-826/80).

I call the rapporteur.

Mrs Pruvot, rapporteur. — (*F*) Mr President, I want to begin by making a small correction to the text. In paragraph 7 of the motion for a resolution there is a mistake, at least in the French version, which should be corrected. It says: 'anxious that the Council Directive of 25 July 1977 on the education of children of migrant workers', and the French version goes on 'who are not nationals of the Member State'. In fact, the original text reads 'who are nationals of the Member State'. I just wanted to make this correction.

Before getting to the heart of the matter, I would like to follow the present trend in Parliament of exposing scandals by asking you if the real scandal of the European Parliament is not the time it has taken us to include in our agenda a report about young people's problems proposing a voluntary policy to help young people. This report has been ready now for four months. It has been postponed from sitting to sitting because there were other 'priorities' and because we had other, allegedly more important, things to discuss than young people's problems. It has been delayed so long that the seventh indent of the preamble of the motion for a resolution is no longer valid. It mentions a preliminary draft report of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe. Since last autumn this draft report has actually become a report and has been adopted as Recommendation No 902.

Today I shall have the opportunity of presenting this report to you very briefly. Do not worry, ladies and gentlemen, you won't waste much time over young people's problems. You won't have time because each group is only given a very limited time to speak. After this report you will be discussing the problems of the agreements with Rumania. I wonder what value agreements can have which are signed with a European Community which is only that on paper and which lacks life and soul because the young people of Europe are not concerned by what our Parliament does.

However, young people are raising many major questions of all sorts of their own; there are about 90 million young people in Europe under 35 years of age, 60 million of whom are below the age of 15. Young people need the moral support of certainties and hope in order to attain the personal fulfilment to which they ultimately aspire. Working for young people means working for the future.

I shall try, I do not deny, to convince each one of you of how important these problems are and how the Community must take action. I want to prevent a recurrence in the 1982 budgetary procedure of what happened last November, when the majority of our committee's amendments were rejected. All, or at least almost all of these amendments were rejected by our Parliament even though they were very moderate and requiring very little finance. This could indicate that many European parliamentarians are far more interested in short-term profitability than in problems of education. However, if we do not manage in the years to come to make European citizens out of all the voters in Europe and if, in the course of our mandate, we cannot show our fellow countrymen and voters in each Member State how important it is for the future of all of us to build a united Europe, then do you think we shall have more voters in 1984 than we had in 1979? However, that is not the most basic or important issue. I strongly believe that the only possible future for our countries lies in a thoroughly integrated and united Community. I do not think that any Member State could alone compete with, or defend itself against, the whole continents which we refer to today as 'developing' but which, I believe, will surpass us in future unless we are united in a continent of Europe.

We have been corrupted by the material comforts we enjoy in industrialized countries. We want more and more economic progress and comforts but have lost sight of what we really need to achieve them. We want a lovely house, but we refuse to bother about how good the foundations are. Developing countries such as the ACP countries or Latin American countries have to struggle daily against poverty and famine, but they know and will tell you, as they have told me, that culture and education are the basis and essence of development. I am asking you to listen to the lesson they are teaching us.

The European Community was set up some 30 years ago. Let's all admit that it is becoming increasingly uncertain and that its future is being increasingly doubtful. If we don't change our methods but carry on working in the same fashion and in the same direction, I am convinced that we shall not have progressed any further 30 years from now. I even believe that, with things as they are at the moment and when one considers the world crisis and the economic difficulties which are facing all our countries, the building of Europe will regress rather than progress in the years to come.

Unless of course we do something about it. The best remedy to help us to progress would be, in my view, to adapt the education systems in the Member States. Contrary to what you seem to think, the basic problem of Europe's future can at present only be solved through education, and this must be our principal concern. I shall not give a dry account of each para-

Pruvot

graph contained in the report. Each paragraph is important.

I want to convince my contemporaries that they are working today for their children, and tomorrow and the day after tomorrow for their grandchildren. I think it essential for young people to feel at home in every Member State in our Community. And the only way this will happen is if children in France, for example, have the opportunity from an early age of seeing how children in Denmark, Germany and other countries of the Community live. The chapter of the report dealing with youth exchanges is therefore very important, and I would like to draw attention to the work being done by the Council of Europe, in particular Recommendation 897 of 3 July 1980 on educational visits and exchanges for school pupils throughout Europe.

I would like to point out that research into improving technology to help integrate handicapped people into professional life and life in general would cost far less and would be far more rewarding if it were done at Community level. We don't want to deprive each Member State of its prerogatives in all these fields including education. But we must stress how advantageous it would be to back up national action by Community action.

You want common policies, we all want common policies, for example a common energy policy. Let's all admit that you are having great difficulty setting one up. Some say we should make a common energy policy and find ways of financing it afterwards. Others say we should find the finances first and then set it up. I think that even if everyone in every Member State of the Community were talking the same language and even if we had harmonized the education systems, the problem of semantics still remains — what we ought to do is to start, it seems obvious to me, by trying to give the same meaning to each word we use, whatever language we are speaking or whatever language we use.

Do you not think that the major problem of unemployment which faces us today, in particular the problem of the many young people out of work, should be studied in depth by the Community with a view to finding a solution. Do you not think that we have failed in our efforts to tackle this scourge because of a lack of coordination in the policies of the Member States? What we must do, therefore, is set up a Community policy on education geared to young people and their problems, especially the unemployed, the handicapped, those working in every sector of industry, and students who have got their degrees and who want to settle down in a country other than their own. They are still not able to do so despite the progress which has been made towards the free movement of people, for this involves a problem specifically dealt with in the Treaty of Rome. Do you think that the free movement of people will become a reality

unless we improve the language learning in the Community countries and unless we create the necessary conditions for promoting mutual understanding between the peoples of the Community? The first policy which we can and must set up and strive to expand is an education policy and real cultural cooperation directed at young people.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I am grateful to you for having listened to me but I shall be even more grateful if you show your resolve in this matter, for example when we come to discuss the budget, and if you show that I have convinced you by the way in which you vote, and I suggest that we meet again in a year's time to take a look at what we have been able to accomplish. In conclusion, I would like to read you these words spoken by the President of the French Republic in 1979: 'Youth knows no hatred but thirsts for justice, and is ready to proclaim truth to the point of sacrifice. Young people need a faith to give direction to their lives; and when they have found it, there is no greater sin in their eyes than patience. Thus youth is irresistible.'

So I beg you, ladies and gentlemen, let us lose no time.

(Applause)

8. Welcome

President. — I would like to welcome to the official gallery Mr Walter Scheel, former President of the Federal Republic of Germany.

(Applause)

Herr Scheel is here in his capacity as President of the German Council of the European Movement to chair a working meeting. I welcome you, Sir, on behalf of the House. Your presence is a pleasure to us and adds dignity to the House.

(Applause)

9. Youth activities (continuation)

President. — I call the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport.

Mr Pedini, chairman of the committee. — *(I)* Mr President, allow me, after your welcome addressed to our distinguished guest, to express my own personal emotion in speaking in the presence of our dear colleague, President Scheel, to whom credit for so many projects valuably pursued by this Parliament is due.

Pedini

I wish to thank Mrs Pruvot for her very effective introduction and while she remembered a phrase spoken by the President of the French Republic, I, rather sadly, want to recall a recent article in one of your nation's great newspapers, Mr President, on the causes of youth unemployment: well, this says that about 40 % of the reasons for youth unemployment relate to a phenomenon known as 'apathy', that is a complete disillusionment with life by young people, and the lack of meaning in young peoples' lives. Looking at this comment of the current year, my thoughts go back to 1969, when in The Hague, at the Summit meeting which was going to revitalize European integration, at the initiative of the Heads of State and Government themselves, and in particular President Pompidou, the Youth Forum was created with the aim of involving young people in the building of Europe. Later, in the 1972 Summit in Paris, President Pompidou with the support of other Heads of State and Government and the then Minister Scheel launched a series of initiatives concerning the European citizen and above all the 'young' citizen. Was that the last ray of light? Unfortunately so. Since then, Mr President, the problems of young and old in the Community have been pushed into the background, and this cannot fail to worry us.

This is why we are happy to fulfil our duty and to put forward here, as the Committee, this Pruvot report, in the first instance in order to inform the Parliament that we have re-established effective contact with the Youth Forum, which is in the process of organizing a series of worthy activities which we must support with our approval. And in this debate we are saying that, with youth unemployment figures rising to a very dangerous level, we must improve promotion of the exchanges of young people spoken about by Mrs Pruvot, exchanges which do not just mean further experience of different job markets, but also involve gaining a deeper cultural knowledge so that, together with the essential knowledge of languages, they may become aware of shared values perceived on national cultural levels.

Honourable colleagues, apathy is not just threatening British youth but the youth of all the Community, and we stand here as a unanimous committee to tell you that the presence of young people in voluntary and social programmes is as necessary as youth exchanges. There is a paragraph in the Pruvot report, which is particularly close to my heart and to which, honourable colleagues, I would like to return: this is a section concerning more effective means of promoting voluntary service. I feel this is especially important in view of the disenchantment young people are feeling with the present structure of military service, and their greater interest in voluntary work, where this symbolizes Europe's presence in the developing world or simply where it demonstrates the commitment of young people to increasing the welfare of the poor throughout the world; and that does not exclude

Western society, which is materially developed but increasingly lacking in social awareness.

And we would also like to recommend increased collaboration between universities for the good of the young; this would not just be beneficial for scientific research, it would above all, Mr President, promote in young people an awareness and pride in the scientific and technical progress of our times which could eventually overcome intrinsic natural problems and improve the conditions of human life everywhere.

We, Mr President, are witnesses to a world which could exist if we regarded the vote which brought us here as a vote which should make us aware of 'human conditions'. We used to speak about class structure; many now believe that it is better to talk about 'position', human condition, the position of women, the position of workers, and the intellectual position. And why cannot our Parliament talk about the position of young people too? We want therefore, to focus your attention on the need to discuss the problem of the youth of Europe, with a full awareness of its importance. It would be, honourable President, quite pointless to dwell upon all the other aspects of Community life if we do not try to formulate a proposal in the Community relating to young people too. So what shall we do about it?

I wanted to be brief in order to leave some time for a younger colleague, who will speak in the name of my group about the problems of 'the position of young people' which I am sure, will be of ever-increasing importance for all our Community.

(Applause)

President. — I call the Socialist Group.

Mrs Viehoff. — *(NL)* Mr President, it is symptomatic of the importance this House attaches to the problems facing young people that we have to debate Mrs Pruvot's and Mr Prag's reports in a single hour. None the less, I shall have a stab. Mrs Pruvot has put in a phenomenal amount of work, and our thanks must be due to her despite the fact that she really made the members of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport put their shoulders to the wheel. Her report brings out the very wide range covered by youth activities. It is an excellent basis on which to continue the good work, and shows clearly in what fields more detailed reports are needed. The Socialist Group is delighted that, thanks to the cooperative attitude shown Mrs Pruvot and her readiness to accept other people's proposals, all our amendments have been accepted. Our only reservations concern the fact that our proposal on the Kreyszig Fund was not accepted — I shall be coming back to this point later — and that, in our opinion, the report makes too little mention of the problem of unemployment among

Viehoff

young people, one of the main problems — if not *the* main problem — we are facing today.

Mr President, I should like to go into rather more detail on a few points, beginning with the European Youth Forum. We are reasonably satisfied with the final text incorporating our amendments. From the very beginning, the Socialist Group has supported and encouraged the setting-up of this Youth Forum. In its brief history so far, the Forum has, with a minimum of staff, made a useful contribution to looking into the whole range of youth activities. For instance, it has organized a meeting about young women in employment and has investigated the problem of illiteracy and the problems facing the children of migrant workers, to mention just a few points. The structure of the Forum guarantees that as many youth organizations as possible from all the Member States are involved in the work, either by way of their national youth councils or via the European coordination bureau. Some people feel that the Youth Forum is not representative of all groupings of young people, but to our mind, this criticism is unjustified. If the structure of youth groups is such that they are not even recognized in their own countries, how can you expect the Youth Forum to recognize them too?

Then there is the problem of young people who do not belong to any organization — often the most disadvantaged young people in our society — a group which it is difficult for the Forum to reach. The Forum is doing all it can in this respect, and has declared its readiness to continue the good work. That being so, it seems to me that what it needs from us is encouragement rather than criticism. Amendment No 4 tabled by Mr Brok and Mr Hahn on this subject adds nothing to what is already in the report, and is superfluous. Amendment No 5 was rejected by the committee, and the text before you now is a compromise reached by all those who have been working on the report.

Moving on to the question of exchange programmes, although Article 50 of the Treaty of Rome provides for such exchanges, little use has been made of the available facilities so far. Something like a thousand young people have benefited from the first programme and, notwithstanding our pleasure at the second programme which is now getting under way, we do have a number of critical comments to make. Firstly, we are not happy with the choice of organizations with which the Commission has entered into agreements. All too often, these are large organizations which are in a position to use the programme for their own internal training requirements, and will probably do just that. That is, however, not the purpose of this exchange programme, and will lead to discrimination against other groups of young people, probably precisely those groups which have a rather more idealistic view of such exchange programmes.

A second criticism is the lack of written rules at a time when unwritten rules, which can be changed as and when required, are being applied.

Thirdly, the social security provisions for the young people involved in these programmes are inadequate. We have tabled Amendment No 1 to point 18 to deal with the social security question, and I hope that this House will give due consideration to this amendment and give it its support.

Moving on to the question of the Kreyssig Fund — dealing with information for young people on the Community — I would point out that this is one of the aspects which is not mentioned in the report. The fact is that it is one of the most important aspects of a Community youth policy. The Fund must be used correctly, and the Committee should go into this point in more detail. It has been agreed that the Commission will draw up a report on the Kreyssig Fund, and we hope that the new Commission will come up with suitable proposals in the near future.

There are a few other points I would like to make, Mr President. The report mentions the education of children of migrant workers. This House has been discussing this problem for five years now, and we hope that this year, the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport will come up with a report on this subject. That is all I wish to say on that point for the time being.

Secondly, there is the matter of the effects of our proposals on the exchange programmes, with the extremely important point of social security for young people — and I make no apologies for raising this point again. I should like to address an urgent appeal to the Commission for its cooperation on this point. Perhaps this does not really come under the heading of the exchange programme, but yesterday I put in writing an oral question which did not receive an oral reply. However I have today received a written answer — something which has never happened before. Allow me to read out my question: 'In view of the urgent need for rapid building and repairs to housing in southern Italy, and the considerable amount of unemployment in the construction industry, will the Council call on the Commission immediately to draw up proposals for a scheme under which construction workers unemployed in their own countries can be employed where they are needed?' My idea was to enable young building workers to be sent down to Italy — voluntarily, of course. The Commission's reply — and I hope the Italian Members here in this Chamber will listen carefully to this, because this will probably give them a chance to do something about the situation — was as follows: 'An essential condition for the Commission to put forward a support scheme is that the Member State concerned request assistance. Up to today the Commission has not been approached by the Italian Government for assistance in any direct

Viehoff

reconstruction and rehabilitation programme following the earthquake of November 1980 in southern Italy. The Commission is however ready and willing to take into consideration any initiative such as suggested in the present question or of an analogous nature'.

The ball is therefore in our Italian friends' court.

Returning to my list of points, I should now like to turn to the problem of young disabled people. I am pleased that our committee will be devoting the necessary attention to this question and that a report will be produced, because what happened with the amendments to Ms Clwyd's report was far from satisfactory.

Finally, the most important question we are faced with — and this situation will continue for the time being at least — is the immense problem of unemployment among young people in the Community, a problem which probably lies at the root of many of the problems we are facing with our young people at the moment. We shall have to do everything in our power — not only in the committee — to fight for resources to be made available to solve this problem. If the Community is incapable of finding an answer to this problem, young people will simply not be prepared to make any effort to establish a genuine Community. We must therefore give top priority to tackling the problem of unemployment among young people, and I would ask the Commission to give us its support.

(Applause)

President. — I call the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

Mr Brok. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the European People's Party I would like to thank Mrs Pruvot for her report. It will certainly inspire us to look more closely at the position of the younger generation in Europe, perhaps in as much depth as we have already done so in, for example, the *ad hoc* committee on women's rights. What we want is to improve conditions for young people and win their support for the democratic institutions of a united Europe. There are various reasons why Europe's young people are in the position they are in, but we must be careful not to generalize. We cannot speak about young people in general since young people come from many different backgrounds and have different views on life. Let me just indicate briefly, therefore, a few of the main problems affecting some groups of young people.

At the end of her speech, the last speaker referred to the worsening problem of youth unemployment in Europe, which we shall be discussing separately later on. Numerous trends which we see in today's young people arise from the fact that 40 % of the total unem-

ployed in the European Community are young, and the resulting despair they feel about their future prospects naturally affects whether or not they have faith in democracy and the European Community or whether they turn to anti-democratic right-wing or left-wing extremist movements. It must also be said, I think, that we, politicians and scientists alike, have failed so far to overcome young people's fear of dangerous or apparently dangerous future developments: They are afraid that we shall become soulless automatons in a world run by computers, and that it will be possible to manipulate human life by interfering with the genetic structure. We must answer these fears, not merely with economic and technical arguments but with a spiritual response as well. For many young people George Orwell's and Aldous Huxley's visions are no longer merely novels, but a foretaste of what will befall us unless we act.

Thirdly, I would say that the destruction of coherent bonds in environment, town, society, family and work is also a source of great anxiety. While the demand for job mobility is certainly reasonable in itself, it does mean also that young people are afraid they might never be able to settle down permanently. They are afraid of losing their roots. These problems involve deeper levels of consciousness. We must not close our eyes to them.

Fourthly, I would mention that young people have certainly not been encouraged to participate in a system which is characterized by a lack of openness in the political parties and parliaments and a lack of transparency in States which have become increasingly bureaucratic.

We simply must take young people's arguments seriously and talk to them fairly. We must not, as politicians indulge in tactical opportunism by saying 'you're right' just to win them over in the next election. Instead we must argue our opposite viewpoints as equals, and not agree blindly with each other.

Finally, I would mention that this imbalance between environmental factors and economic growth, and the inability of those in positions of responsibility to offer any real justification for the compromise between ecological and economic needs or to discuss the moral issues raised by young people are also a source of anxiety to the young. The result, which we often bemoan, is that young people retreat very dangerously into political apathy and resignation or into the fantasy world of drugs, or reject the democratic parties and sympathize with anti-democratic organizations of the radical right or left — when those which do not shrink from violence.

It is my view that we must take this seriously. Therefore I ask you on behalf of my Group that when you come to vote, you support the amendments which Mrs Gaiotti and Mr Pedini have tabled on our behalf. By

Brok

so doing we shall make it clear in this report that we accept this spiritual challenge, that we understand the cultural crisis in Europe, and that we do not wish this to be a purely technical report treating only specific organizational problems — as alas seems to happen all too often these days as a result of decisions taken by the Committee on Culture — and that, in addition, we are actively supporting the Youth Forum.

The relatively recent European Youth Forum, in which I have participated for a long time as chairman of a European youth confederation, has done tremendous work in a short time. But a youth forum which is regarded as the Youth Forum of the European Community, and which is financed by the Community, must concentrate on Community problems. While this also implies no doubt that it must be ready to listen to organizations outside the European Community it does mean that it must concentrate on the Community as far as cooperation and decision-making are concerned. Otherwise we do not need a European youth organization financed by the European Community, and would do better to hand this job over to the Council of Europe.

The European Youth Forum must therefore concentrate on such problems. We must also bear in mind that a European Youth Forum which is not solely concerned with matters which help to promote the European ideas certainly no longer conforms to our original concept of a European Youth Forum. Therefore the European aspects which we have highlighted in an amendment must be stressed much more clearly in the European Parliament. The European dimension must also be included in education policy. Since this European emphasis in education in schools was written out of the report we are re-introducing it in our amendment. I think it crucial that the concept of a united Europe should underlie the teaching of every subject in our national schools, and that this should be discussed with our Education ministers.

The Commission, the European Parliament and the Member States should set up a European committee on school textbooks, to eliminate past prejudices, national antagonisms and biases, and to make the younger generation more receptive from the start to the idea of a united Europe. We also ask that, in addition to the good work being done by the European Youth Centre of the Council of Europe, a European youth organization be set up to help promote understanding between young people, in particular between young workers in Europe, to a greater extent than is at present the case.

But Europe and its young people need objectives. We cannot win the support of our youth by only handing them things on a plate and asking nothing from them. Therefore I applaud the suggestion Mrs Pruvot makes in her report that we should concentrate on voluntary European social and cultural service and that we

should set up a European peace corps. The European Democratic Youth Confederation has already made specific proposals thereby demonstrating that the younger generation is interested in these matters and are waiting for us to present them with challenges which will shake them out of their indifference or even hostility.

Let me conclude. In my opinion the movement for a united Europe which will be a model of peace, freedom and justice, can be not merely an end in itself but also a means of reawakening the interest of the younger generation in close participation in democratic institutions. An active European policy such as we envisage would offer, I think, an opportunity to counter the two dangers in Europe — resignation through political apathy or escapism, and extremism.

Let us try to win young people over from their passive resistance. Young people must feel that we are not only building a Europe *for* them but also *with* them. In this way I believe we can achieve great progress for young people and for Europe.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MR JAQUET

Vice-President

President. — I call the European Democratic Group.

Mr Hutton. — Mr President, on behalf of my Group the European Democrats, I would like to applaud Mrs Pruvot on the immense amount of hard work that she has put into the preparation of this excellent report. We approve of it and we approve of the way in which she has in the committee sought to obtain the approval of all shades of political opinion represented in the Committee on Youth, Culture, Information and Sport for the report which you see before you and I hope that the efforts that she has already put in will secure the unanimous support of this Parliament.

The speakers who have gone before me have already made the point about the importance of youth in Europe so may I just for the Commissioner underline three points which I regard as being particularly important in this report.

I think the first one would be the exchanges of young people through voluntary, social and cultural service. I think that this is a first-class way of harnessing both the compassion and the energy that young people in Europe and around the world, place at our disposal and which at present, as Mr Brok has so eloquently told us, is going to waste. I think it would allow young

Hutton

people to understand not only their own societies but also the societies of the greater Europe in which they live. If the Commission is able to take this point on board and to bring it to a practical conclusion so that we can see exchanges of young people across the boundaries of the Community this will be a first-rate legacy to flow from the International Year of the Handicapped.

The other exchanges proposed in the report are equally laudable and, as Mrs Pruvot pointed out, will help young people to understand the broader Europe in which they live.

The second point, Mr President, is the concern we have about the rising dependence among young people on alcohol and drugs. We are terribly anxious that a real effort should be made to educate them about the long-term dangers they face from both. There is evidence beginning to appear that young people are turning away from drugs. Excellent. They are turning, unfortunately, back to alcohol and that, I am sorry to say, is perhaps even more serious. That is why we support very strongly the call in this report for education to try to prevent abuse ever starting at all, rather than waiting to shut the stable door after the horse has bolted.

In conclusion, Mr President, we also see sport as being one of the best ways in which young people can mix and meet the members of the different nations of our Community. We would like to see some recognition of this in the redrawing of the regulations for the Regional Fund later this year. I appreciate that we are running ahead of the game here but somebody has got to follow the trail we blaze. I am quite convinced that if we can obtain some kind of recognition of the value of sporting facilities in enhancing the quality of life for young people in some of our industrial and rural areas, we will have taken a step along the right road.

In conclusion, Mr President, we believe this report contains many constructive and helpful suggestions for greater Community participation in getting the very best out of our most precious asset — our young people.

(Applause from the European Democratic Group)

President. — I call the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members.

Mr Vandemeulenbroucke. — *(NL)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Pruvot Report is the European Parliament's first stab at formulating a general youth policy, but in my opinion, the result is somewhat disappointing. The first disappointment is that the problem of unemployment among young people has not been made a central issue. For another thing, the report has set out on a very artificial quest for

what it calls a European education policy. Surely, if there is one thing that is first and foremost the concern of the regions of Europe rather than the Community as such, it is education, although I would make three exceptions to this rule. The first of these concerns the reciprocal recognition of diplomas, on which there is little likelihood of any progress being made anywhere. Let me just cite the example of the German-speaking community in Belgium, who are dependent on the Federal Republic of Germany as regards higher education, but where graduates have to wait two years before receiving their diplomas. This is a scandalous situation after thirty years of the European Community. A second exception is cooperation on advanced technology graduate courses, and the third and last is the need for the Community to work out a policy on the education of the children of migrant workers. I am thinking here, for instance, of the guideline of 25 July 1977 on bicultural and multicultural education. In this respect, the Netherlands and France have really blazed a trail, whereas in my own country, Belgium, we still have everything to do. What I am concerned about here is the interests of workers originating from countries which are not Member States of the Community. In Brussels, for instance, we have a quarter of a million immigrants, mainly Moroccans and Turks. The largest ethnic group in the Federal Republic of Germany are the Turks, while the North Africans are most numerous in France. Their culture is the furthest removed from our own and they are the least integrated group. For the children of migrant workers, school is the main factor of social integration, and if this chance is missed, it is highly likely that lasting damage will be done to the children's subsequent careers. The result will be not only a permanent ethnic proletariat, but a dissatisfied and disaffected one to boot. It is, in fact, one of the most serious problems facing the European Community, and I therefore very much regret the fact that it does not figure prominently in the Pruvot report.

President. — I call the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

Mr Israel. — *(F)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, 'Happiness is a new concept in Europe'. With these words the French revolutionary, Saint-Just, summed up the significance of the upheavals besetting France and Europe in 1789. Today it seems to me that Europe is a new idea in Europe, and everyone is aware of the force of all new ideas. Immediately after the Second World War young people in this continent began to realize that by the laws of history ideologies must come to an end. Fascism and nazism came to a sad end and the Communist revolution, despite the courage of the USSR in its struggle against nazism, led to deadlock and atrocity. We who were young in those days have learnt to mistrust political systems, doctrines and people with doctrinaire views. Today's young people are of the same mind, but that does not

Israel

mean that they do not expect anything from life or have deep convictions or ideals. Young people will never be concerned merely with material comforts and successful careers. They need to believe in something. It was Aristotle who wrote: 'Youth loves to love'. That is why we are witnessing a certain religious revival or, to be more exact, why young people in every religion are insisting upon the message of social justice and progress which is basic to every faith. Naturally, the consumer society has changed our outlook drastically and we are witnessing the so-called 'ecological' ideal amongst young people, by which they seek to make fundamental changes to the environment in which they live. Likewise human rights as an individual doctrine are the very basis of the love of freedom felt by every young person in the European Community, and no longer content with the purely individual concept of freedom, they are seeking to give justice an international dimension and achieve an international conception of the defence of human rights, which inspires us all.

Unfortunately the young people of the Community are a target for the evils which you are all aware of and which Mrs Pruvot's report describes so well, i.e. unemployment and uncertainty for the future. Even the sexual freedom which young people enjoy nowadays does not necessarily bring the renewal of hope which one would expect, since it is often the romantic aspect which loses out. In short, our consumer society does not leave the young people of the European Community much room for hope, unless we, in particular the European Parliament, can open up the way to a great new idea for them — the idea of Europe.

Our ailing consumer society has little of interest to young people except perhaps the idea that freedom is within their grasp and that social justice and respect for human rights can be achieved in Europe itself. That is why, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, although Mrs Pruvot's report was, quite understandably, unable to treat in depth all of these problems I have just mentioned — that would have taken a whole book — we shall give our enthusiastic support to the report when we come to vote, and we thank Mrs Pruvot for drafting it so well.

President. — I call Mr Pasmazoglou.

Mr Pasmazoglou. — (*EL*) Mr President, I should like to congratulate Mrs Pruvot most sincerely on her exhaustive and extremely valuable report, which is a major contribution to the work of the European Parliament. I would go on to say that, as Mrs Pruvot herself pointed out, all her proposals are interdependent, and no single one can be given special emphasis.

I should, however, like to comment on three points in the proposals which are of particular interest to Greece. The first point concerns an amendment tabled

by Mr Brok and Mr Hahn and which expresses the wish that the young people of Greece should participate fully in the work and activities of the European Forum. This is something which we sincerely hope for and on which we place great importance. My second comment relates to the equality of opportunities for education. There are a large number of people in Greece who do not have the necessary resources even for free education. For free education to become a reality, it is necessary for special financial support to be given, and I would emphasize how important this is — it is one of the proposals of our party — with particular regard to the rural population, which does not have the financial resources to support even free education for the young people of our country. The third remark concerns Greek migrant workers living and working in the other countries of the Community and particularly in West Germany. In such cases it is particularly important that Greek children should receive an education which is equivalent to the general education received by the young people of Europe, but which also upholds the continuity of the Greek cultural tradition. I stress this because it is important that these children, once they have completed their school education, to be able to return to Greece to study. My last comment concerns the need for Mrs Pruvot's valuable and important proposals to be incorporated in an overall draft Community social and regional policy. In this context I must stress the pressing need for an impulse to be given to development, to economic development, in Europe. The problem of unemployment in Greece is extremely acute. The unemployment rate among young people is about double the average in our country — and these are the official figures which, in my view, do not tell the whole truth. It is our conviction that the level of unemployment among young people in Greece is extremely high, and as a result, special programmes for the developing countries on the periphery of Europe will benefit all the peoples of Europe and the Community as a whole.

(*Applause*)

President. — I call the Commission.

Mr Richard, Member of the Commission. — Mr President, I think anybody who has listened to the debate and read the report will recognize that it is a very wide document: it raises a number of very different issues and can be approached in a number of very different ways.

For some Members, as we heard a few moments ago, it raises profound issues of almost philosophical importance, while for others, and I suppose particularly for the Commission, it raises some rather more immediate problems of policy. Therefore, if the honourable Members will forgive me, I will not follow some of our contributions this afternoon into the

Richard

higher realms of Western philosophy, nor indeed the desire for European unity, but rather, since I gather that my time also is strictly limited, concentrate upon immediate issues of policy, where I think I may be able to assist the House.

The Commission is grateful indeed to the Parliament for having taken this initiative. I think it is right that we should consider in a global way the development of Community policies on behalf of young people, and I particularly welcome the positive tone of the report and the stress it places on the need for specific and innovatory actions at Community level. I would like to identify the Commission with the two themes that run through this document: the concern for less-favoured young people, and for equality of opportunity. I regret that the constraints of time this afternoon oblige us all to be very brief and prevent us from giving the attention that the report and the motion for a resolution clearly deserve. I will therefore concentrate my remarks on two specific issues: the European Youth Forum and youth exchanges.

The Forum we regard as a most important manifestation of youth activity in the Community. The creation in 1978 of a political platform for young people at Community level brought to a successful conclusion the efforts deployed over ten years by this Parliament and by the youth organizations themselves to establish a proper rôle for young people in the construction of the European Community. On behalf of the Commission, I would emphasize this afternoon our full support for the Youth Forum. We believe that in the last two years a very constructive partnership has been established between the Youth Forum and its standing committee on the one hand, and the Commission and its services on the other. I am glad it has been possible to have representatives of the Youth Forum present at very many of the seminars and the meetings organized by the Commission and by the European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training. I look forward personally to developing this relationship further and to associating the Youth Forum even more closely in the different activities coming within my portfolio. We should, however, recognize that not all young people are members of youth organizations, and it is therefore difficult sometimes for the Forum to take account of the views and aspirations of all young people. This does not diminish the importance of the activities of the Forum; on the contrary, it means that we support particularly the efforts of the Forum to pursue information activities tailored to the broad mass of young people and to establishing contact with young people in the applicant countries. I very much welcome, therefore, on behalf of the Commission, the recommendations made in the motion for a resolution.

The section of the motion, however, which in my view is the most significant concerns youth exchanges. This is a theme on which the Youth Forum itself has placed much emphasis. I should perhaps make it clear to the

House — although I am, regretfully, sure that it is clear already — that the Commission has no general mandate, let alone adequate resources, to play the rôle that we believe to be necessary in the field of youth exchanges. With great respect to those who call upon us to do so, we have neither the legal competence nor the finance. The initiative to be taken by this House, therefore, is of crucial importance.

The Commission welcomes the invitation to develop specific proposals in this field. The programme of young worker exchanges represents only a modest response to the enormous need to promote contacts among young people across national frontiers in the Community. Community activities in this area should be vastly expanded to enable young people of all ages and backgrounds to benefit from the experience of living, studying and working in another country.

The Commission shares the concern of the rapporteur to give especial priority to exchanges by young people who are more disadvantaged. This has been the theme of our work so far with regard to educational exchanges, particularly under the 1976 action programme in the field of education. The first ever European Community handbook of educational and youth exchanges, to be published towards the end of this year, will include a set of case studies of innovatory exchange schemes, showing the importance of both formal school exchanges and less formal youth activities, particularly for the 16+ age-groups. As Mrs Pruvot has said, the Community must develop a variety of instruments in this field to promote activities at different levels: better technical information and guidance from the organizers of exchange programmes, together with stronger exchange agencies at national level, are quite as important as setting up specific exchange programmes at Community level.

The Commission will be pleased, if I may put it this way, to take up the challenge which the Parliament is making in this whole section of the resolution.

Many other points in the resolution relate to more fundamental questions of education and of training policy which have been, or will be, debated by this House on other occasions. For instance, on Tuesday of this week, we had the extremely useful debate on the excellent report by Ms Clwyd on the situation of disabled people, and that culminated in very precise recommendations for action at Community level. Similarly, many of the questions raised about the training of young people will be considered during the course of the next debate this afternoon on the report by Mr Prag on linking work and training.

With regard to the education of the children of migrant workers and other measures taken to promote equal educational opportunities, I am sensitive to requests for further information about our activities. I can tell the House that full information on the pilot project is now being made available, and I shall be

Richard

glad to consider other ways of keeping this House fully informed on the measures being taken on the implementation of the directive.

The promotional rôle of the Social Fund in this field, as in others, is, of course, severely limited, as I said a little earlier, because of the restricted financial resources available. I have already announced to the House that I shall be seeking a major increase in the Fund's budget for 1982, and in that respect the support of the Parliament will be vital.

With regard to the development of European Schools, the Commission has, I think, already made its position clear in its earlier communication on the teaching of languages in the European Community. I can, therefore, entirely agree with the point of view made in the motion concerning long-term strategy. In my view, it is right to focus on the adaptation of existing schools in Member States to meet the requirements of both native and migrant children rather than to press for an increase in the number of special European Schools.

Finally, as regards the academic recognition of diplomas, a subject which has been taken up on different occasions by this House, I should like to inform you that the Commission will be producing a new communication on this subject very shortly. I can also tell the House that there are some positive signs of interest on the part of education ministers in an early discussion of this issue in Council.

Mr President, I regret again that my remarks on the specific points of the motion for a resolution have had to be kept to a minimum. I hope I have made it clear where we consider that the essential importance of this motion lies. May I say again that I welcome this motion particularly for the support it gives to the development of new initiatives. With regard to youth exchanges, I look forward to preparing proposals in this field as requested and to discussing them again in greater detail with this House when they have been produced.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Coutsocheras.

Mr Coutsocheras. — *(EL)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, Mrs Pruvot's report concerns various matters relating to young people, but I shall restrict myself to a few remarks. Let me start with young people's education, which must be based on equality of opportunity, on a sound teaching system, on vocational training, on the alternation of work and training and on further education. In particular, I would emphasize these requirements with regard to underprivileged children and the children of migrant workers, whose education poses certain problems.

Furthermore, as regards the children of migrant workers, I would draw attention to the need for special education and training, particularly nowadays when they are facing the spectre of unemployment. I would also point out that the young wives of migrant workers are in dire need of specialized vocational training and education.

In this context, Mr President, I would remind Members that migrant workers have always played, and will continue to play, a major role in contributing to the development and prosperity of the industrialized countries of Europe, and that these migrant workers include a large number of Greeks.

Finally, as regards the educational sector, I should like to propose that a study be carried out to answer the following questions.

Firstly, in which countries of Europe is general education compulsory and free?

Secondly, which countries of Europe apply the international conventions forbidding the employment of children before they have reached a certain minimum age?

Thirdly, what system of education or teaching is applied in the countries of Europe with regard to the children of migrant workers?

Fourthly, how are backward children educated and, fifthly, whether or how are gifted children selected?

As regards exchanges of young people, this is another field which has been neglected, despite the fact that modern means of transport and communication offer lots of opportunities for such exchanges on the widest scale. This would promote the mutual acquaintance of young people, since the fact is that they are open to mutual understanding and think in international terms. Encouragement must therefore be given to exchanges of young people, pupils, students, workers and others. And when I refer to exchanges, I do not mean that these should be restricted to the Community or to Europe — they should take place on a wider scale.

Sport is another field which must be encouraged, essentially because it forms an integral part of education and culture.

In conclusion, I regard the level of the expenditure devoted to young people, culture and training as being far too low and inadequate. This expenditure accounts for only 0.6 % of the Community budget, whereas other sectors of lesser significance receive much greater sums of money.

President. — I call Miss Brookes.

Miss Brookes. — Mr President, I wish to thank Mr. Richards very much indeed for his remarks: I regretted that because of shortage of time they were brief, but they were very encouraging and heartening for the future.

This report is most welcome, particularly paragraphs 14, 17 and 27, also the aims of creating closer links between the young people of Europe. It does deal with education, in paragraphs 6 and 16, and at this present time the education of our young people is of immense importance. The concern about education was demonstrated yesterday by the European teachers' lobby. At this time of high unemployment of young people — and my constituency of North Wales has a higher-than-average rate of young unemployed — it is vital that young people make the best possible use of any opportunities to find jobs. Over 4 million young people in Europe complete their education without qualification and I am not referring to university education only. The EEC should remedy this with financial and practical support. We must not mortgage the future of the Community by neglecting the education of children. I therefore fully support paragraphs 6 *et seq.* of this report and would like to see schools adapted to emphasize vocational training as well as technical education. Meeting other young people from the Community and learning another language is such an important fact in a person's overall awareness of Europe, and in fact paragraphs 17 *et seq.* in the report are designed to encourage this.

Finally Mr President, as time is short, the future of the European Community will be more harmonious and productive if young people from all the Member States learn of other countries. As the Commissioner said, exchange and cultural visits of youth clubs, schools and towns create greater interest and participation in our Community and are therefore to be encouraged.

President. — I call Mr Kappos.

Mr Kappos. — (*EL*) Mr President, we are unable to agree with the contents of the motion for a resolution, despite some positive proposals and despite the embellishment indulged in by the rapporteur in her presentation. The approach chosen does not safeguard the real interests and rights of young people. First and foremost, the motion is inspired by the ideal of a united Europe. We are opposed to this approach, and we are obliged to stress that the ideal of a united Europe is false and reactionary, with the result that it is unlikely to mobilize and inspire young people. Moreover, the motion attempts to strengthen efforts to distance young people from the organized struggle. This was also mentioned by another speaker when he said that young people are aligned with the extreme left. We

proclaim that young people are on the right lines when their lives and struggle are organized. Furthermore, the fact that young people are aligned with the extreme left, as the earlier speaker said, is only natural, since the Communist parties are the parties of the future, they represent the youth of the world, and it is natural that young people should follow them. What is more, there is no provision for measures needed to safeguard the workplaces of young people, who are being particularly hard hit by unemployment. Young people were the first to feel the effects of unemployment and will be the last to be freed from it — and we do not know when that will be. Nor are there any provisions for concrete measures against infringements of basic provisions. In Greece, for instance, 140 000 children under 15 years of age are employed in the production sector. Finally, and again on the subject of education, there is talk of ensuring equal opportunities, but there is no mention of what the situation is at present. In our view, the situation is constantly getting worse.

Nor are any measures proposed for the essential democratization of both the organization and content of the educational system. We will therefore continue to have the situation such as the one we have in Greece, where the teaching staff in secondary education are essentially deprived of the right to strike. The result is, as happened in the latest strike, that 200 strikers who had been employed by the State on special terms were dismissed after the strike. The government is resorting to court proceedings and to violent measures to end the strike of the teachers — who, it must be pointed out, were fighting for an improvement in their situation, so that they could genuinely fulfil their tasks.

Finally, the report speaks of programmes to combat drug addiction and alcoholism, and this is certainly something positive. However, this is not enough — there must be measures to ensure proper entertainment, for which young people are crying out, and to ensure an infrastructure for artistic, cultural and sporting events, and of course nothing concrete has been proposed along these lines. We maintain that the necessary measures to provide proper entertainment for young people must be taken by the Member States themselves and by local government, youth organizations and artists' organizations. For these very reasons, Mr President, we reject the motion for a resolution.

President. — I call Mr Bøgh.

Mr Bøgh. — (*DK*) If well meaning and moralistic pronouncements could solve problems then I think this House would long since have redeemed the world. Unfortunately the fact is on the contrary that uncritical, non-binding rhetoric about mankind's eternal problems, has, as we have seen from Parliament's unceasing activities, the opposite result: using big

Bøgh

words without really meaning them has a deadening effect.

I feel that the present report is typical of how Parliament bandies about big concepts, big words — that big concept 'youth' which is in no way defined or seen as comprising different groups. What is being done here is to concoct a collection of older, superior persons' views of what youth needs, or what it should realize it needs. And the situation is even more dangerous than this, because it uses artificial methods to attempt to get youth to agree with these remarkable views of us older people.

Thus the report encourages high expectations about the body representing youth views, created and paid for by the EEC itself, the so-called European Youth Forum. Now the fact is that when a body is set up to influence public opinion and is paid for by a particular party, that party usually wants it to come forward with answers which are in line with its own views. That also appears to be the case here. Apparently the whole range of extremely critical youth thinking has no voice in the European Youth Forum. I can only say that by far the major portion of Danish youth consider the EEC as a threat to their future and this is particularly true of those who have big educational, social and employment problems. I therefore take the liberty of questioning the representative nature of such views at European level.

For this reason I strongly oppose the report's views on involving the Youth Forum as a consultative body on youth issues. It is not up to this House to introduce new elements into the decision-making process within the Community, and, furthermore, it is not at all up to the Community to engage in cultural and educational policy since these fields clearly fall outside the scope of the Treaty of Rome and are and shall remain the realms of national governments.

President. — I call Mr Buttafuoco.

Mr Buttafuoco. — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, contrary to what has been said by other Members who have spoken before me, I have no hesitation in expressing my approval and that of other Members representing the Italian Right for the approach adopted by Mrs Pruvot when tackling the problem of youth activities. We are proud to declare our approval because we believe in the existence of this Parliament and, above all, we believe in a united Europe, that very Europe over which doubts were cast a short while ago. We have no faith however in visions which claim to be forward looking but which to us are just Utopian fantasies.

We are very concerned with these problems. The statistics tell us that the Community of the Ten has about 270 million inhabitants, of whom 60 million are

under 15 years of age and of whom 54 million are still undergoing compulsory education. Now unemployment — which is a theme which perhaps was given less prominence than the others — affects on average about 1·8 % of the working population in the EEC, reaching a level of 1·11 % among young people under 25 years of age.

The problems of youth are absolutely crucial to the Community because young people constitute a large part of its population and represent its hopes for the future in all respects. The transition from school to working life, in an office or factory is no simple matter and the problems have multiplied in this period of mounting and widespread unemployment, especially for the less well qualified young people who have never attended any training courses after leaving school or who have never undergone an apprenticeship on completion of their compulsory education.

The person seeking his first job is faced with myriad psychological and practical problems. One need only think of the difficulties encountered by youths in their first job and those of underprivileged groups such as immigrants. Paragraph 8 of the report makes a useful point with reference to this group in that it requests that appropriations from the Social Fund for special courses for immigrant workers' children should be increased. We must remember that there are two million migrant workers under the age of 18 in the Community and that Community law guarantees or should guarantee to families of migrant workers the right to accompany heads of family to the country in which they are working, with the right to social security and to occupational training, under the same conditions as those laid down for the citizens of the host country. As migrant workers still meet with barriers to their complete integration in host countries, the Community must step up its efforts with study programmes and pilot projects to improve teaching methods, so that account can be taken of the educational environment of young people and of the working environment in which they must be integrated in the country to which they have moved. Disabled people constitute another disadvantaged group who could be assisted in ways outlined by the provisions of the Clwyd report, dealt with recently.

Through the Social Fund, the EEC has tried to devise a policy for the future which will help young people to prepare themselves for working life and to increase their awareness, and in so doing, it has made a considerable contribution to solving the problem. But the links between education and working life for young people ought to be forged by the Community mainly through training and pretraining programmes, the creation of jobs which confer skills and experience which are of lasting value, student exchanges, promoting the knowledge of languages, and facilitating the admission of students from any Member State into the higher education system of any other Member State. The overall aim should be to foster an educational

Buttafuoco

environment which is supranational in character and which allows young people to move freely within the Community, and from which exclusion on the grounds of quotas or restrictive entrance qualifications would not be allowed.

In the social and educational fields, the Community must give the same equal opportunities to all young people in Europe. It will be recalled that the Community set up the Youth Forum, which was to be a focal point for the various youth organizations, grouping them together under its auspices. Unfortunately, however, hopes will to a large extent remain unfulfilled unless the Community perfects its general development plans to focus on infrastructures, employment and social structures, including sports facilities, the construction and improvement of which should be partly financed by the Community.

I should therefore like to stress the importance of paragraph 15, which is the crux of any serious political definition of the problem in this vital sector. For paragraph 15 supports the need to substantially increase the available appropriations. Unless more funds are made available, Mrs Pruvot's motion for a resolution and our analysis in this debate on the position of young people will be thought of as nothing more than hot air and will only forestall the construction of the united Europe in which we so fervently believe.

President. — I call Mr Peponis.

Mr Peponis. — (*EL*) I have asked to speak, Mr President, in order to express the misgivings and points of serious concern which struck me as I was reading the motion for a resolution before us and the report accompanying it.

From our point of view, that is from the point of view of a Greek who is a member of his country's Socialist Party, this motion for a resolution is merely concerned with young emigrants and the children of adult emigrants. It is not by chance that this resolution refers particularly to unemployment — and it is surely no coincidence that the problem of unemployment is connected with that of emigration. Unfortunately, it is characteristic of the peoples of southern Europe to solve the problem of unemployment by emigrating. The resolution gives the impression that the only problem is how they can be assimilated by the social environment in which they live and work and how they can accustom themselves to that environment.

This is undoubtedly one of the problems. We do not deny that these people must also learn the local working language and accustom themselves to the social environment. For us, however, there is another problem which is just as — if not more — important, and it is the very opposite of the problem which the resolution before us presents. It is the problem of pre-

serving the national characteristics, national language and national culture of migrant workers' families. I personally regret that the motion makes no reference at all to this problem and, if I am not mistaken, this important problem has not previously been raised in today's debate. We must get one thing clear: the Greek people — and I think the peoples of other countries with the same problems — do not feel inclined to abandon sections of the working masses who move to countries in northern or central Europe to any other country. We demand that these people should have the possibility of preserving their national consciousness and their national customs and traditions and to return to the country from which they came. If this problem is not solved and if we regard the problem of their education merely as one of adaptation to employment needs and of assimilation by the environment into which they were forced by unemployment and poverty, we shall perhaps be setting up mechanisms for producing people without national consciousness and without national identity, people who correspond not to a sound and genuine internationalist ideal but to a notion of cosmopolitanism which we reject.

I also noticed as I was reading this draft resolution that although it makes very frequent reference to education and training, at the end it merely underlines the need for training of a dryly, exclusively and restrictively vocational nature. I do not know what such an aim has to do with what we call European culture, which for us has a source and area where it has developed and continues to develop, namely the whole of Europe and not only a part of it. In any case, what is certain is that this report makes no mention of the need to give working-class children access to and the possibility to acquire and assimilate the spiritual values and spiritual wealth of European culture. And if this statement is correct, it means that this text bears the stamp of an aristocratic and class-ridden concept according to which the wealth of spiritual culture is the privilege of an aristocratic minority, an elite. For our part, we reject this view. We also reject the idea that there should be a European Centre which is somehow supposed to create a uniform education system. Every people and every country remains, and must always remain, solely responsible for deciding what its education policy is to be. Of course, whenever a country and a people and its government are drawing up an education programme, they will take account of the country's international position, its international orientations and the requirements attendant upon the entire complex of its international relations. On no account, however, do we accept that anyone should be able to set up a supranational or extranational centre to lay down guidelines for education policy. I must remind you, Mr President, that the Greek Socialist Party, PASOK, to which I have the honour to belong, has formulated very serious and decisively important reservations as to the appropriateness of Greece's entry into the European Community.

Peponis

One of the very reasons for these reservations was that through the efforts of this Community there is gradually being set up a decision-making centre which knows nothing of the just, legitimate and obviously honoured national tendencies of the various nations, national tendencies which must be honoured because it is only on that basis that any concepts and any policy of peaceful co-existence can be founded.

In conclusion, therefore, I should like to stress that from the standpoint of a citizen of a southern European country the text before us does not provide a satisfactory answer to the many misgivings and problems and that we are against any education of migrant workers which is not based on their national consciousness and that of their children.

President. — I call Mr Dalakouras.

Mr Dalakouras. — (*EL*) Mr President, I fully agree with the spirit and the proposals of the excellent report by Mrs Pruvot. Young people represent the future of the world, and thus the future of our Community also. I fail to understand why the Community devotes so little funds to youth, culture and the education and training of our young people. The 0.6% of the Community budget — even less than 1% — must make us weep and the enemies of the Community laugh. As long as we have freedom of movement and employment, we must improve our organization of the vocational education and training of young people in order above all to fight youth unemployment, which not only creates economic and social problems, which is also the case with older people, but is also emotionally and psychologically harmful to young people. We must also be concerned at the level of funds which our countries devote to combatting alcoholism, drug addiction, criminality and lawlessness among young people, while with the same amounts or even less we can endeavour to prevent young people from getting caught up in such things. It is still urgently necessary for us to overcome the language barriers between young people in the Community. I would remind you that since the time of Noah the Tower of Babel has been the symbol of chaos and lack of communication, where anyone speaking his own language was unable to contribute anything to the community in which he lived.

We Greeks are also particularly concerned about the problems involved in educating the children of Greek migrant workers in the Community. Personally I do not think that the governments of any host countries want to deprive even the second generation of Greeks working there of their national culture and heritage. I think rather that they cannot want to do so. But what is tending to happen, more from lack of determination and resources than by design, is that they are simply paving the way or helping to pave the way for a generation of bad citizens.

I also believe from personal experience that exchanges of pupils, students, young workers and unemployed young people make a very positive contribution to the Community idea, and I think we would be making a great mistake not to provide funds generously for this.

Finally, I am particularly concerned at what we have to show in the way of progress in enabling young people to study in the countries of the Community. Let us take as a typical example the United Kingdom, which one year before my country officially joined the Community — an event which did not happen unexpectedly — doubled the matriculation fees for Greek students, thereby causing problems for very many young people, for the sake of obtaining a few economic advantages. And I think that in the field of secondary education things are even worse, because in the Community there are schools which are inaccessible because they are fee-paying, schools with language barriers and schools with nationality barriers.

I shall dwell for a moment on the subject of sport for young people, a subject on which I agree entirely with Mrs Pruvot's proposals. We must gear our efforts towards basic sport which, however, should not seek to make champions or professionals of the participants but should be a means of making every young person healthy and well-balanced in mind and body.

To achieve all this, Mr President, I am afraid we need more than just intentions, determination, fine words, resolutions and pious wishes. We also need money — not much in relation to the Community budget, but many times more than we actually spend. I believe we must make this money available not because we can afford it, but because we cannot afford not to, because with it we shall build the future of the Community.

President. — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

10. *Linking work and training for young persons in the Community*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-460/80), drawn up by Mr Prag on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, on linking work and training for young persons in the Community.

I call the rapporteur.

Mr Prag, rapporteur. — Mr President, the European Community is no longer young. The heroic days of the 1950s are behind us. Our young people are no

Prag

longer fired with the ideal of a united Europe, as many of us were in our youth — but how can they be, if the Community has little to say to them in the most vital matter every young person has to deal with — a job? And the training which will help them to get a job? We now have in the Community some 8½ million unemployed. Their numbers are rising rapidly. When I wrote my report last summer — and it has been some time, as you may know, getting into the agenda — it was around 6 million; today, I repeat, it is 8½ million, and over 40 % of those unemployed people, nearly 3½ million of them, are young people under 25.

At the same time, we have a structural problem. The whole structure and organization of work, the very basis of work requirements are altering at a speed never before experienced in our industrial history. What we are experiencing is not just a development of previous technological advance; the new technology, and above all the integrated circuit and the micro-processor, bring with them a fundamental qualitative change in which the basic concepts of vocational training are all thrown into the melting-pot. More and more, then, at all levels vocational training has to concentrate on developing the ability to manage change. Unless our young people are given the flexibility, the attitudes of thought and action which enable them to adapt themselves to the rapidly-changing work requirements of the micro-electronic era, Europe will fall by the wayside, unable to compete with Japan and the low-wage, newly-industrialized countries.

There can never have been a time when a coherent positive policy for training our people was more essential. The European Community today has a unique opportunity to revolutionize the content of vocational training for young people. The field is wide open for a whole new conception of vocational training, based on developing the potential to manage change and the need to take young people off the labour market in this present time of economic contraction. The Community, with its unique opportunities for comparing knowledge, experience and practice, should be taking the lead. It should be playing a major part in bringing about the fundamental reorientation we need in the training of our young people.

If there is a crying need for a Community rôle in adapting the content of vocational training to the needs of the micro-electronic era, the Member States can also learn much from each other in the structure and organization of vocational training for young people. Germany, with its impressive system of 455 different apprenticeship courses, expects to provide systematic apprenticeship training for 97 % of school-leavers by the end of this year, and it already provides part-time education at least for everyone up to the age of 18. Italy, following a dramatic expansion of its *istituti professionali* and its *istituti tecnici*, has the best full-time vocational training system in Europe,

and 50 % of all school-leavers go into it. At the other end of the scale are Britain, Ireland and Denmark. They have some excellent training courses, but nearly half the young people between 16 and 18 in Britain, Ireland and Denmark receive no education or training at all.

The whole experience of vocational training for young people in all our countries shows that reliance on voluntary effort by industry will fail. As I say in the report, the well-trained apprentice today may well no longer retain the same loyalty to the firm that trained him and may move to another company when he completes his training. It is not the task of industry to finance basic vocational training for young people. Most governments make very substantial financial contributions to vocational training. They may pay public-service apprenticeship into company training centres, full-time vocational training schools. That happens in Germany. In both Denmark and Germany, the government meets the full cost of a basic vocational-training year. In France, the government has paid the employer's contributions for apprentices' social security since 1978.

So while we face on the one hand the urgent need for a fundamental reorientation, a fundamental reorientation in the content of vocational training for young people, there are also in the extent, effectiveness and financing of training very great variations between one Member State and another. Here, then, is a field crying out for Community action.

What has actually happened? We know the Commission has long been aware of the urgent need both to ease unemployment among young people and to improve and extend vocational training for them — and perhaps, in doing so, to narrow the wide disparities between the extent and quality of vocational training in the different Member States. Accordingly, in October 1979 it presented to the Council of Ministers a communication and draft resolution setting out a flexible scheme of linked work and training — *alternance* in France, sandwich-training in Britain, *Berufsbildung in Dualsystem* in Germany. The Commission scheme would have involved Community support, Community guidelines, minimum standards and coordinated programmes. The Council degouted the proposals. It voided it of virtually all its substance. It ignored the question of financial support and the Commission's recommendation for more apprenticeships in the service sector. Minimum standards were cast aside. Nothing was to be said about the question of remunerating trainees, which is fundamental to any efficiently running system. The Council merely asked the Commission to

examine the conditions under which the European Social Fund might be associated with action by the Member States by means of small-scale experimental projects.

Prag

A curious reaction, one might think, to the present level of unemployment among young people! The Council ignored both the magnitude and the urgency of the problem. An excellent chance of using the Community to help build the industrial future of Europe and to deal at one and the same time with the vast and urgent joint problems of youth unemployment and training was thrown away. A chance for the backward countries of the Community in this field to benefit from the exchange of information and experience and from joint effort was turned down. The detail is in the resolution and the explanatory statement, which all Members have, and I do not propose to repeat it here; but I do want to stress that the resolution was adopted unanimously by the Social Affairs and Employment Committee, with one abstention. We deliberately kept it simple and practical and I hope Members will bear that in mind when voting on amendments.

I ask this House to support our call for renewed efforts by the Commission to persuade the Council to reduce youth unemployment and improve the qualifications of our young people, along the lines set out in paragraph 13 of the resolution. Only by technical excellence can high-wage Europe maintain its living standards in face of the growth of industrial production in low-wage developing countries.

The Community can play a unique role through its exceptional powers of decision and action, all too infrequently used in recent years. Is it really too much to expect the governments to show imagination and vision in facing up to the problem of training young people for this difficult time of economic recession combined with ultra-rapid technological change? If it is, we are due for a frightening level of youth unemployment in the coming years. For the Commission, this is a time for starting, an opportunity for fundamental renewal. I say to them, try again! For the governments, it is time to show that not despite but because of the recession they are ready to put substantial resources into training our young people and thereby helping to build a competitive future for our industry and commerce. For our young people, unemployment is the major issue of our time. If the European Community has nothing to say to our young people about jobs and their future, it has nothing to say to them at all.

(Applause)

President. — I call the Socialist Group.

Mr Boyes. — There is little doubt, Mr President, that the greatest challenge to the governments of the EEC is to find a solution to the problem of the high level of youth unemployment. Young people are becoming more and more disenchanted with an economic system

which is not providing them with jobs after their period of compulsory education. Many adults, too, are beginning to ask themselves whether this particular crisis for the capitalist system is not indicating that it might be necessary to create a different economic order.

I welcome this report by Mr Prag. I have here evidence submitted to the European Social Fund Select Committee of the House of Lords, where the TUC said that it was in favour of measures similar to those which are being advocated in this report and to go on to say that it is very close to the last Labour Government's document, 'A Better Start in Working Life'. However, I also have to say that the same document — I should hate to be associated too much with the House of Lords — observes that the Social Fund was totally inadequate for the job we are expecting from it and that that way there is no possibility of a solution. So perhaps the Commissioner will be looking for more cash for the Social Fund to help solve that problem.

My second point is to ask who should do this training. My trade-union colleagues are insisting that the training must be done in the public and not in the private sector. I have a briefing note from HM Government which says that the private sector must be responsible to a large degree for training but that at the same time, because of the present recession, there are not the resources available to carry it out. So I hope that we take this responsibility away from the private sector and put it into the public sector.

What concerns me about Mr Prag's report — and I cannot support it in its present form — is that it is far too optimistic, or there is a misunderstanding on his part about the relation between training and jobs. He seems to imply that if we train people better, they will have better opportunities of finding jobs for the individual, but we do not create one extra job. In its second paragraph — and I had only got as far as the second paragraph when I realized I could not support it all — the report speaks of

difficulties experienced by employers in filling many of the vacancies for skilled labour at a time when there are substantial reserves of unsuitable labour.

What he seems to be saying is that there are jobs available but that the labour is in exactly the wrong position, which is crazy, because in the Community as a whole there are about 10 million unemployed and in Britain there are at least 3 million unemployed and maybe more. So an early reading of Mr Prag's report made me realize that I could not support it. There are, however, a series of amendments, and if many of them are carried I think they will make the report one which I hope all people will begin to support. For there is no doubt about it, he is correct in saying that unemployment, and especially amongst youth, is a major problem, but I am afraid that to suggest more training or more money for social funds, will not solve the

Boyes

fundamental problem. And what we should be looking for in this Parliament are solutions to the fundamental problem.

Now it is unfortunate that in my country, Mr President, the problem lies in the hands of the people over there. That is where the problem is. It is dead easy for Conservatives to stand up in this Chamber and pontificate about unemployment, to say how sad they are that 46 % of the kids in the Community are unemployed, when their own government is deliberately, as a strategy, as a policy, creating unemployment. What kind of double talk is that? I have already talked this week about the noble lords and the noble knights and all the other people over there who come here and hypocritically talk about social problems. As I said before, they talk about them in this Chamber but nought about them in their own Chamber at home, where they are the government! In fact I will go as far to say that they do it deliberately — they create unemployment quite deliberately — to weaken the power of the trade unions in my country.

I have to conclude now by saying to Mr Prag, I am sorry, I cannot support your report. I hope the Commission will try to increase appropriations to the Social Fund. I, the TUC and my party at home are in favour of training for youth, but without measures by home governments — by all the right-wing governments in Europe — to create proper opportunities for employment, an economic system that says to all kids: you study at school and you will get a job, all the rest of it is pure absolute waste of time.

President. — I call the Group of European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

Mrs Gaiotti de Biase. — (I) Mr President, the Committee on Social Affairs was quite right to tackle the question of linked work and training as part of the campaign against unemployment; for it is quite clearly as important a part of that campaign as the question of the length of the working week or the question of the ratio between the supply and demand for labour, the quality of labour and its suitability for the requirements of the market. And we agree with the report of the Social Affairs Committee in its condemnation of the Council's cutbacks in the valuable proposals put forward by the Commission.

On the other hand, the aim of the Committee on Youth and Culture was to highlight other aspects of the same problem which, it seems to me, should not be underestimated. The question of linked work and training is not merely interesting because of its effect on youth unemployment; but represents an educational challenge of enormous significance. 'Education of the masses' has meant that for the last 20 years or so millions of young people have been through the rather artificial experience of spending hour after hour on

benches, wrestling with words, at the very time when they are at their most aggressive and need most to confirm their own individual abilities. The move from school to work has a psychological and educational effect which can be measured in the attainment of security, in self control, in learning about the ways of the world and how to organize things, and in the development of communication skills through working with other people; there is something to be gained from the synthesis of technological culture and verbal culture which has its own value, the experimental confirmation of one's own knowledge, a concrete approach to the problems of social organization in community life which cannot be hurried over. From this point of view the development of a wide-ranging series of linked work and training studies is perhaps the greatest incentive there is today to innovation in the educational systems of this Community: they are all in a critical state and their various teaching methods are failing to give the youth of today the education — the knowledge, the social and the personal skills, and the real experience of work.

We were talking only a few minutes ago about young people, about their problems and about their apathy, and I would like to raise the question again. The real problem today is that the lack of employment for young people will never be overcome unless we develop systematic self-discovery experiences for them through the experience of work.

It is my belief that training through linked work and training also deserves our support for another reason. The last speaker said that other policies do not create jobs. That may be true, but only up to a point. Of course training policies cannot combat unemployment just because they work to the new specializations which the system demands; but these policies must at the same time be considered independently variable by incentives to inventiveness, to initiative and the entrepreneurial spirit of individuals and of groups which they are capable of injecting into the system and more especially into the less-developed areas and the areas of regional imbalance.

These brief considerations are the background to the amendments to the motion for a resolution by the Committee on Social Affairs proposed by the Committee on Youth and Culture, amendments which first of all call for greater effort by the ministries of education in this area, since we are talking about not only 'short-term' training or the training of school-leavers, but of a new impetus which should have its effects throughout the educational system. So this too becomes part of our demand — our continuing demand since the 1976 declaration — that we should launch a common educational policy.

The second point is that it is not only the demands of technical innovation which drive us this way but also the demands of a system of complex knowledge which will aid the social and political development of

Gaiotti de Biase

working people and the training of entrepreneurial classes.

Thirdly, linked work and training must not be privileged only in the area of industrial work, but also — as it already is in my country — the area of agricultural training, which is a very special case and particularly suitable for this kind of experience — and craft trades, the service industries and the voluntary services both within and outside this Community — for the participation of women in such a programme, as we were reminded by the honourable gentleman.

There is a lack of balance, Mr President, as we are all too well aware, between these amendments, our own demands, and what the Commission can and will do. We believe, though, that the effect of a vote by this Parliament lasts longer than the few months which any one budget has to run. A resolution approved by this Parliament also means a stimulus and an incentive for future budgets to take account of the orientations needed for the creation of a coherent European policy.

(Applause)

President. — I call the European Democratic Group.

Mr Kellett-Bowman. — Mr President, Mr Prag's excellent report is on a subject which is vital to the well-being of our Community. Young people must be able to see that the Community offers hope for the future; and we must not fail them.

In the field of vocational training, as in so many others, we are in danger of falling into the technology trap. The rate of change is undermining young people's faith in democratic institutions. Of course it must be demoralizing to leave school and find oneself unemployed, apparently unwanted by society; but how much more demoralizing and dispiriting it must be to train for a job only to find that technological change means your expertise or skill is no longer required. In many of the Member States, training has not changed fast enough to prevent this happening. The governments of the Member States should be making sure that the training they provide is for the new technologies. We in the Community can be of help to them. We tend to forget that we have the Centre for the Advancement of Vocational Training working away in Berlin. This is a semi-autonomous institution, part of the Community. It is almost a case of 'out of sight, out of mind'. For that reason, I have drafted Amendment No 12, which was kindly sponsored by my colleague Mr Price. This seeks to add a new paragraph after paragraph 13. It requests the Commission to ask the Centre, in conjunction with vocational training bodies in the Member States, to prepare recommendations for the development of linked work and training courses along the lines set out in paragraph 13, looking

forward to the future needs of industry and the new opportunities opening up for young people.

Mr President, I commend this amendment to the House in the hope that the Commission will act upon the suggestion.

IN THE CHAIR: MR DANKERT

Vice-President

11. *Date and place of part-sessions*

President. — At its meeting of 10 March 1981 the enlarged Bureau drew up the calendar of part-sessions of Parliament for the current year and decided that they would all be held in Strasbourg.

(Applause from various quarters of the European Democratic Group)

Leaving aside a possible additional part-session which it might be decided to hold in connection with the budget timetable for the current year, the Bureau has proposed the following dates:

- 23-26 March
- 6-10 April
- 4-8 May
- 15-19 June
- 6-10 July
- 14-18 September
- 12-16 October
- 16-20 November
- 14-18 December.

The enlarged Bureau has yet to decide on the date of the possible additional part-session, which could be held from 26 to 29 October, as it is waiting to hear the position of the other institutions on the budget timetable.

This block proposal from the enlarged Bureau will be put to the vote at nine o'clock tomorrow morning. Parliament has already decided that the July part-session will be held in Strasbourg.

(Applause from various quarters of the European Democratic Group)

The voting on the Bureau's proposal is a direct consequence of the adoption of the Enright resolution.

President

I have received from Mr Enright a proposed amendment to the enlarged Bureau's proposal, providing for the part-session of 23-26 March to be held in Brussels instead of Strasbourg.

(Laughter)

Mr Enright's proposed amendment is inadmissible for two reasons.

Firstly, the enlarged Bureau's proposal is a block proposal which the House must adopt or reject as a whole, in accordance with the Enright resolution. It is clearly impossible for the House to be aware of or even to discuss all the technical aspects involved in organizing a part-session of Parliament. If the House does not agree with the enlarged Bureau's proposal, it will be referred back to the Bureau and a new proposal will be laid before the House after the enlarged Bureau has discussed the matter further.

Secondly, Mr Enright's proposal should be submitted in accordance with the procedure laid down in Rule 2(2) of the Rules of Procedure. In other words, he should table a motion for a resolution which must be adopted by a majority of current Members of Parliament.

I call Mr Enright.

Mr Enright. — It seems to me extraordinary, Mr President, that the Bureau should suddenly be given the privilege of introducing an overall amendment which is a package we either accept or reject. Anywhere else it is quite possible to vote paragraph by paragraph and I would suggest to you that the Rules of Procedure demand that.

(Applause from various quarters)

The second thing is that you appear to be somewhat inconsistent because if it is the case that Brussels requires an absolute majority, then it would also be the case, since we are moving from Luxembourg, that Strasbourg should require an absolute majority of this House. The Rules of Procedure cannot apply in one case and not in the other.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr von der Vring.

Mr von der Vring. — *(D)* Mr President, in view of the importance of the comments you have just made regarding the Rules of Procedure and considering the risk that a precedent might be set, I should like you to set aside for the time being the first reason you gave for rejecting Mr Enright's proposed amendment and instead have distributed a written statement by the

Bureau which will serve as a basis for further discussion. I agree with your second argument against Mr Enright's amendment in any case, and so I would go along with your decision. But I am sure you appreciate, Mr President, that a procedural point of this importance cannot be dealt with by a brief remark from the Chair. I ask you to submit a formal written explanation to the House so that we can consider it and if necessary have a vote by the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions.

President. — Mr von der Vring's proposal will have to be put before the Bureau. Clearly, in view of its responsibility for organizing the part-sessions, the Bureau must be given a chance by Parliament to decide on things like the dates if the plenary sessions are to be properly organized. Parliament cannot take over responsibility for this task from the Bureau. The question of the package proposal is something entirely different. If we were to go along with Mr Enright's proposal, however, we should run into problems precisely because of the Bureau's direct responsibility for organizing the part-sessions. The mere fact of Parliament deciding tomorrow to meet in Brussels from 23-26 March would present us with all manner of serious organizational problems. These kind of factors must of course be borne in mind in reaching any decision.

I call Mr Forth.

Mr Forth. — May I just ask for your clarification, Mr President? Are you saying that the Bureau can come to this House and submit a resolution to confirm the location of the special part-session here in Strasbourg but that you will not accept Mr Enright's amendment to have it in Brussels? There is a logical nonsense here. If you can come as late as this to locate it in Strasbourg, why can you not come equally late to locate it in Brussels? I do not see how you can separate the two. If you are prepared to submit it to the House for the one, can you not submit it to the House for the other?

President. — Well, Mr Forth, if you could tell me today where we could organize a meeting within ten days in Brussels perhaps the situation would be comparable, but to my, or perhaps your regret, the situations are not comparable, and therefore I have to consider Brussels as one of the meeting places under Rule 2 (2).

I call Mr Estgen.

Mr Estgen. — *(F)* Mr President, on behalf of all the Luxembourg Members, whatever group they may belong to, I must inform you that we strongly object to this decision by the Bureau, in view of earlier

Estgen

pledges to the staff and of the savings which have been mentioned so often recently. Before the vote is held tomorrow, I would ask you to give us some details about the extra cost of holding part-sessions scheduled for Luxembourg in Strasbourg or Brussels.

President. — Your request will be communicated to the Bureau and the relevant department. I shall endeavour to have the information by tomorrow morning.

12. Votes

President. — The next item is the vote on the motions for resolutions on which the debate has closed.

We shall begin with the *motion for a resolution contained in the Bocklet report (Doc. 1-839/80): Common organization of the market in sugar.*

(Parliament adopted the first four indents of the preamble)

After the fourth indent of the preamble, I have Amendment No 7 by the European Democratic Group.¹

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Bocklet, rapporteur. — (D) I am in favour of this amendment.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 7 and then paragraphs 1 to 5)

President. — On paragraph 6, I have Amendment No 8 by the European Democratic Group.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Bocklet, rapporteur. — (D) I am against this amendment.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 8)²

President. — I call Mr Sherlock on a point of order.

Mr Sherlock. — Mr President, why cannot our resident electronic system demonstrate its results to us immediately?

President. — I should be delighted if the result could be displayed. Unfortunately, because of the oversight of a number of Members who have forgotten their cards and who have to give their votes orally, the results on the screen do not tally with the actual vote.

(Laughter — Parliament adopted paragraph 7)

On paragraph 8, I have Amendment No 29 by Mr Vergès and others.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Bocklet, rapporteur. — (D) I am in favour of this amendment.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 29,¹ paragraph 8 as amended and paragraphs 9 and 10)

President. — On paragraph 11, Mr Papaefstratiou has tabled Amendment No 26 and Mr Dimopoulos Amendment No 27.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Bocklet, rapporteur. — (D) I am in favour of Amendment No 26 and against No 27, because in the whole report there are no figures quoted whereas Amendment No 27 quotes a figure and the aim of Amendment No 26 by Mr Papaefstratiou is the basic method whereby the quota is fixed. Amendment No 27 would run counter to the argument and thinking of the report. As a result, I am in favour of Amendment No 26 and against Amendment No 27.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 26 — which meant that Amendment No 27 fell)

President. — I call Mr Dimopoulos.

Mr Dimopoulos. — (EL) It was I who tabled Amendment No 27 and you have not told us whether it was approved or not. You did not put it to the vote. Amendment No 26 does not render the other amendment null and void; both amendments can be voted on. I therefore ask you to put Amendment No 27 to the vote.

President. — The two amendments are in fact mutually incompatible. Either you accept the system based on the existing criteria — as the rapporteur rightly pointed out — or else you devise a specific system for Greece. A majority of the House has selected the system advocated by the rapporteur. If we

¹ The texts of the amendments will be found in the Annex.

² By electronic vote.

¹ By electronic vote.

President

were now to adopt Amendment No 27, it would mean that we had two quite contradictory passages in the same text. I therefore maintain my view that Amendment No 27 falls as a result of the adoption of Amendment No 26.

I have three amendments on paragraph 12:

- No 9 by the European Democratic Group;
- No 53 by the Committee on Development and Cooperation;
- No 30 by Mr Vergès and others.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Bocklet, rapporteur. — (D) I am against all four amendments.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 9¹ — which meant that Amendments No 53 and No 30 fell)

President. — I have four amendments on paragraph 13:

- No 42 by Mr Woltjer and others;
- No 57 by the Committee on Development and Cooperation;
- No 31 by Mr Vergès and others;
- No 10 by the European Democratic Group.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Bocklet, rapporteur. — (D) I am against all four amendments.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 42¹ — which meant that Amendments No 57, No 31 and No 10 fell)

President. — I have three amendments on paragraph 14:

- No 28 by Mr Hord;
- No 43 by Mr Woltjer and others;
- No 11 by the European Democratic Group.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Bocklet, rapporteur. — (D) I am against all three amendments.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 28 and adopted Amendment No 43¹ — which meant that Amendment No 11 fell)

President. — I have two amendments on paragraph 15:

- No 12 by the European Democratic Group;
- No 32 by Mr Vergès and others.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Bocklet, rapporteur. — (D) I am against Amendment No 12. The German version of Amendment No 32 contains a linguistic change. I do not know what the situation is with regard to the other languages.

President. — You are right. Since this is simply a linguistic amendment, it can be considered withdrawn on the understanding that the text will be changed.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 12 and adopted paragraph 15 and then paragraphs 16 and 17)

On paragraph 18, I have Amendment No 33 by Mr Vergès and others.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Bocklet, rapporteur. — (D) I am in favour of the amendment.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 33 and then paragraph 18 as amended)

President. — On paragraph 19, I have Amendment No 13 by the European Democratic Group.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Bocklet, rapporteur. — (D) I am against the amendment.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 13 and adopted paragraph 19)

President. — On paragraph 20, I have Amendment No 14 by the European Democratic Group.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Bocklet, rapporteur. — (D) I am against the amendment.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 14 and adopted paragraph 20)

¹ By electronic vote.

President. — On paragraph 21, I have two amendments:

- No 15 by the European Democratic Group;
- No 34 by Mr Vergès and others.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Bocklet, rapporteur. — (D) I am against Amendment No 15 and in favour of No 34.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 15 and adopted Amendment No 34 and then paragraph 21 as amended)

President. — After paragraph 21, I have Amendment No 1 by Mr Clément.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Bocklet, rapporteur. — (D) I am against the amendment.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 1 and adopted paragraphs 22 to 28)

President. — On paragraph 29, I have Amendment No 16 by the European Democratic Group.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Bocklet, rapporteur. — (D) I am against the amendment.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 16 and adopted paragraph 29 and then paragraph 30)

President. — I have two amendments on paragraph 31:

- No 17 by the European Democratic Group;
- No 6 by Mr Ligios and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Bocklet, rapporteur. — (D) I am against Amendment No 17 and in favour of No 6.

(Parliament rejected Amendments No 17 and No 6 and adopted paragraphs 31 and 32)

President. — I have two amendments on paragraph 33:

- No 58 by the Committee on Development and Cooperation;
- No 18 by the European Democratic Group.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Bocklet, rapporteur. — (D) I am against both amendments.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 58¹ — which meant that Amendment No 18 fell)

President. — On paragraph 34, I have Amendment No 44 by Mr Woltjer and others.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Bocklet, rapporteur. — (D) I am against the amendment.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 44)

President. — On paragraph 35, I have Amendment No 45 by Mr Woltjer and others.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Bocklet, rapporteur. — (D) I am against the amendment.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 45 and then paragraphs 36 to 41)

President. — I have two amendments on paragraph 42:

- No 23 by Mr Arndt on behalf of the Committee on Budgets;
- No 21 by the European Democratic Group.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Bocklet, rapporteur. — (D) I am in favour of Amendment No 23 and against No 21.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 23 — which meant that Amendment No 21 fell — and then paragraphs 43 and 44)

President. — I have two amendments on paragraph 45:

- No 24 by Mr Arndt on behalf of the Committee on Budgets;
- No 22 by the European Democratic Group.

¹ By electronic vote.

President

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Bocklet, rapporteur. — (D) I am in favour of Amendment No 24, since it follows on logically from the last decision, and against Amendment No 22.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 24 — which meant that Amendment No 22 fell — and then paragraphs 46 to 49)

President. — On paragraph 50, I have Amendment No 19 by the European Democratic Group.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Bocklet, rapporteur. — (D) I am against the amendment.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 19 and adopted paragraph 50)

President. — On paragraph 51, I have Amendment No 59 by the Committee on Development and Cooperation.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Bocklet, rapporteur. — (D) I am against the amendment.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 59¹ and then paragraphs 51, 52 and 53)

President. — On paragraph 54, I have Amendment No 46 by Mr Woltjer and others.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Bocklet, rapporteur. — (D) I am against the amendment.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 46 and adopted paragraph 54 and then paragraphs 55 and 56)

President. — On paragraph 57, I have Amendment No 20 by the European Democratic Group.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Bocklet, rapporteur. — (D) I am against the amendment.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 20 and adopted paragraph 57 and then paragraph 58)

President. — I have three amendments on paragraph 59:

- No 25 by Mr Arndt on behalf of the Committee on Budgets;
- No 47 by Mr Woltjer and others;
- No 4/rev. by Mr Tolman on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Bocklet, rapporteur. — (D) I am against Amendments No 25 and No 47 and in favour of Amendment No 4/rev.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 25 — which meant that Amendments No 47 and No 4/rev. fell)

President. — On paragraph 60, I have Amendment No 48 by Mr Woltjer and others.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Bocklet, rapporteur. — (D) I am against the amendment.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 48 and then paragraph 61)

President. — I have two amendments on paragraph 62:

- No 49 by Mr Woltjer and others;
- No 35 by Mr Vergès and others.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Bocklet, rapporteur. — (D) I am against both amendments.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 49¹ — which meant that Amendment No 35 fell)

President. — After paragraph 62, I have Amendments No 36, No 37, No 38, and No 39 by Mr Vergès and others.

What is the rapporteur's position?

¹ By electronic vote.

¹ By electronic vote.

Mr Bocklet, rapporteur. — (D) I am against Amendments No 36 and No 37, in favour of No 38 and against No 39.

(Parliament rejected Amendments No 36 and No 37, adopted Amendment No 38¹ and rejected Amendment No 39¹)

President. — I have two amendments on paragraph 63:

- No 40 by Mr Vergès and others;
- No 50 by Mr Woltjer and others.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Bocklet, rapporteur. — (D) I am in favour of Amendment No 40 and against No 50.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 40 — which meant that Amendment No 50 fell — paragraph 63 as amended and paragraph 64)

President. — On paragraph 65, I have Amendment No 51 by Mr Woltjer and others.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Bocklet, rapporteur. — (D) I am against the amendment.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 51 and then paragraph 65 as amended)

President. — On paragraph 66, I have Amendment No 52 by Mr Woltjer and others.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Bocklet, rapporteur. — (D) I am against the amendment.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 52)

President. — On paragraph 67, I have Amendment No 5/rev. by Mr Tolman on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Bocklet, rapporteur. — (D) I am in favour of the amendment.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 5/rev., paragraph 67 as amended and paragraphs 68 and 69)

President. — After paragraph 69, I have Amendment No 3 by Mr Ligios and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Bocklet, rapporteur. — (D) I am in favour of the amendment.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 3)

President. — On paragraph 70, I have Amendment No 41 by Mr Vergès and others.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Bocklet, rapporteur. — (D) I have spoken to the author of the amendment. The essential difference where the committee is concerned is simply that sugar cane gets a separate mention from sugar beet. The committee would agree to a vote solely on whether the words *and cane sugar* should be added. I am in favour.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 41 as modified and paragraph 70 as amended)

President. — After paragraph 70, I have Amendment No 2 by Mr Clément.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Bocklet, rapporteur. — (D) I am against the amendment.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 2 and adopted paragraphs 71 and 72)

President. — Explanations of vote may now be given.

I call Mr Georgiadis.

Mr Georgiadis. — (EL) Mr President, despite what I stated in my speech on the substance of the motion, we Greek Members of PASOK recognize the need for a common organization of the market in sugar in order to control surpluses. I should like to state on behalf of my PASOK colleagues that the amendment adopted to paragraph 11 of the resolution expresses nothing more than the original paragraph did. In other words, if the Commission applies this amended para-

¹ By electronic vote.

Georgiadis

graph 11, the A quota for Greece would be 250 000 tonnes of sugar, while the same Commission has, according to an official report, fixed this amount at 290 000 tonnes. But we Greek Members request that it be fixed at an amount corresponding both to the consumption and the production of Greek sugar, which is approximately 320 000 tonnes. For this reason, Mr President, I should like to state, also on behalf of my PASOK colleagues, that we shall vote against this motion.

President. — I call Mr Dimopoulos.

Mr Dimopoulos. — (*EL*) Mr President, perhaps the rapporteur did not understand the two amendments. There are two amendments, No 26 and No 27, to paragraph 11. My amendment does not automatically cancel out the other. My Amendment No 27 complements No 26, but in any case if the rapporteur is of a different opinion, it does not follow that he will decide on it, since Parliament must decide on it. I do not think that the rapporteur's adopting a different view will induce you to change your mind, Mr President, and not put Amendment No 27 to the vote. I think that Parliament must decide on it. I repeat that my Amendment No 27 complements No 26 and ask for it to be put to the vote so that Parliament can decide on the matter.

President. — I thought the President's ruling was clear enough. Partly in view of what the rapporteur had to say, I think I must stick to my ruling that the two amendments cancel each other out and that, if one is adopted, the other is automatically rejected. I do not therefore propose to have a fresh vote taken on this amendment.

I call Mr Tolman.

Mr Tolman. — (*NL*) Mr President, as a result of what has happened during the vote, we can unfortunately no longer support this motion for a resolution, mainly because of the adoption of Amendments No 42 and 43 amending paragraphs 13 and 14. For one thing, these amendments mean that production will be lower, and for another, we believe that they testify to a somewhat unrealistic view of actual conditions on the sugar market. Thirdly, we feel that, all in all, these amendments run contrary to a good sugar policy in the Community, and for all these reasons, Mr President, we can see no prospect of being able to support this motion for a resolution.

President. — I call Mr Papaefstratiou

Mr Papaefstratiou. — (*EL*) Mr President, Amendment No 27 in no way conflicts with Amendment

No 26, and so I think that it too could quite easily be put to the vote, since the two amendments complement each other. But in any case, as pointed out earlier by my colleague Mr Georgiadis, the conclusion concerning the quota amounting to 250 000 tonnes is completely arbitrary. According to adopted Amendment No 26, the A quota for Greece calculated on the same basis as that used for the other Member States of the Community in the past, amounts to about 320 000 or 330 000 tonnes.

President. — I shall explain matters again for the benefit of the Greek Members. Amendment No 26 sought to reword paragraph 11 as follows:

Asks that the A quota for Greece should be fixed according to the same criteria as apply to the other Member States of the Community.

It is quite straightforward: Amendment No 26 seeks to delete the original text in paragraph 11 and replace it with a new text. As for Amendment No 27, the aim was to add something at the end of paragraph 11.

If Parliament decides to substitute a new paragraph for the original one, it cannot add to the new paragraph something which is related to the deleted paragraph. I maintain that this is the correct interpretation.

I call Mr Frangos.

Mr Frangos. — (*EL*) Mr President, my name is Frangos. Despite our great esteem for the Presidency, we consider that the Presidency is in no way infallible and that in very doubtful cases the matter should be decided by the House as a whole. Therefore it could be decided by the House whether or not Mr Dimopoulos's amendment should fall, and I would remind you that its author is a former Greek Minister of Trade and anything he puts his name to is bound to have some sense.

President. — Parliament has made its decision. It cannot be changed now.

(*Applause from various quarters*).

I call Mr Vergès.

Mr Vergès. — (*F*) Mr President, when you look at the Commission proposal on sugar which was submitted to the Council of Ministers for a decision on 23 February, you have to admit that Mr Bocklet's report represents a genuine improvement in the situation, since his views differ on a number of major points from the Commission proposal and contradict the decisions which the Council took on 23 February. I may be particularly aware of this matter but it seems

Vergès

clear to me that in connection with the problems affecting the ACP countries different and even contradictory attitudes were adopted which are not going to calm the serious fears of these countries at the moment. One or two amendments have been made but the proposal in itself is a real threat.

Another point — perhaps because of where I come from — is that I fail to understand the voting. Here we are in the Common Market and when we table an amendment to remove a discriminatory practice, when we point out that sugar from the overseas departments is Community sugar which has to get the same price — and I mean the same price — the amendment is rejected. This was the thinking behind our amendment and it was also the thinking behind Mr Clément's amendment. It is beyond me how the House can decide that certain sugar producers, because they happen to be in the tropics, should not get the same price as in Europe and that the price they get should be lower than European prices. I shall not go so far as to say this is racist but I feel the people of Réunion and the French West Indies are being taken for a ride in a discriminatory way.

With the cutbacks in national aid, too, there is inconsistency and contradiction. We are voting here in favour of plans to boost production and at the same time we are voting in favour of cutting back on national aid. As a result, on account of the rejection of a single price for the sugar refineries, cutbacks in national aid and everything which continues to make the ACP countries dependent, I shall be voting against this motion. I think the report marks a step in the right direction but it has balked at making decisions, on the European producers who are getting a bad deal, on the ACP countries and on the overseas departments which are the victims of shocking discrimination practised by the majority in this Parliament.

President. — I call Mr Louwes.

Mr Louwes. — (NL) Mr President, on behalf of my Group, I should like to give an explanation of vote, beginning with the point that Mr Bocklet's good report has been completely mutilated by the vote in this House. My Group deplores the adoption of amendments calling for a drastic reduction in the production of sugar and exports of sugar from the Community. We do so because it is an unrealistic view to take. It is a well-known fact that there is currently a shortage of sugar in the world and that shortage will only be exacerbated by the pressure being exerted on energy consumption. You may recall the point I made yesterday that both sugar beet and cane sugar are the only crops which can extract so many calories per hectare from solar energy. We also deplore the fact that, in its majority decisions, this House has a tendency to ignore the facts totally. It is a fact that the regulation governing the sugar sector over the last

12 years has not cost the taxpayer a penny. It is a fact that exports from the Community have forced prices down on the world market to the benefit of those impoverished developing countries which produce no sugar of their own, and which are therefore very grateful to us. Nor has the Community ever declined to accede to the International Sugar Agreement. The fact is that the international sugar organization has made it utterly impossible for the Community to take steps with a view to acceding to the agreement. We therefore deplore this House's unrealistic attitude and we deplore the fact that people refuse to face the facts. My Group will therefore be voting against this report.

President. — I have received a request from the Socialist Group and the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group) for a roll-call vote on the motion for a resolution as a whole.

(Parliament rejected the motion for a resolution as a whole)¹

*

* *

President. — I put to the vote the *motion for a resolution contained in the Poniatowski report (Doc. 1-834/80): Accession of Zimbabwe to the Convention of Lomé.*

(Parliament adopted the resolution)

*

* *

President. — I put to the vote the *motion for a resolution contained in the Castellina report (Doc. 1-698/80): Operation of STABEX.*

(Parliament adopted the resolution)

*

* *

President. — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution contained in the Spinelli report (Doc. 1-939/80): Financial and budgetary policy of the European Communities for 1982.*

(Parliament adopted the preamble)

On paragraph 1, I have Amendment No 13 by Mrs Scrivener on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

¹ See minutes of proceedings.

President

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Spinelli, rapporteur. — (I) I am against, Mr President.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 13 and adopted paragraph 1 and then the introductory part of paragraph 2)

President. — I have two amendments on subparagraph (a) of paragraph 2:

- No 7 by Mr Ansquer and Mr Flanagan on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats;
- No 14 by Mrs Scrivener on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Spinelli, rapporteur. — (I) I am against both amendments, Mr President.

(Parliament rejected Amendments No 7 and No 14 and adopted subparagraph (a) of paragraph 2)

President. — On subparagraph (b) of paragraph 2, I have Amendment No 8 by Mr Ansquer and Mr Flanagan on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Spinelli, rapporteur. — (I) I am against, Mr President.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 8 and adopted subparagraph (b) of paragraph 2)

President. — After subparagraph (b) of paragraph 2, I have Amendment No 9 by Mr Ansquer and Mr Flanagan on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Spinelli, rapporteur. — (I) I am against, Mr President.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 9)¹

President. — On paragraph 3, I have Amendment No 15 by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

¹ By electronic vote.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Spinelli, rapporteur. — (I) I am against, Mr President.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 15 and adopted paragraph 3 and then paragraphs 4 and 5)

President. — I have two amendments after paragraph 5:

- No 2 by Mr J. M. Taylor on behalf of the European Democratic Group;
- No 5 by Mr De Ferranti.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Spinelli, rapporteur. — (I) I am against both amendments, Mr President.

(Parliament rejected Amendments No 2 and No 5 and adopted paragraph 6)

President. — On paragraph 7, I have Amendment No 10 by Mr Ansquer and Mr Flanagan on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Spinelli, rapporteur. — (I) I am not in favour, Mr President.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 10 and adopted paragraph 7)

President. — On the first part of paragraph 8, I have Amendment No 11 by Mr Ansquer and Mr Flanagan on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Spinelli, rapporteur. — (I) I am against, Mr President.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 11 and adopted the first part of paragraph 8)

President. — I have two amendments on subparagraph (a) of paragraph 8:

- No 12 by Mr Ansquer and Mr Flanagan on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats;
- No 16 by Mr Delatte on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Spinelli, rapporteur. — (I) I am against, Mr President.

(Parliament rejected Amendments No 12 and No 16 and adopted subparagraph (a) of paragraph 8)

President. — I have two amendments on subparagraph (b) of paragraph 8:

- No 17 by Mr Galland on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group;
- No 3 by Mr J. M. Taylor on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Spinelli, rapporteur. — (I) I can accept the Galland amendment, Mr President, but I have to point out that the other amendment is covered.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 17 — which meant that Amendment No 3 fell — and then subparagraphs (c) and (d) of paragraph 8)

President. — After subparagraph (d) of paragraph 8, I have Amendment No 4 by Mr J. M. Taylor on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Spinelli, rapporteur. — (I) I accept this amendment, Mr President.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 4 and then subparagraphs (e), (f) and (g) of paragraph 8)

President. — After subparagraph (g) of paragraph 8, I have Amendment No 1 by Mr Kavanagh on behalf of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Spinelli, rapporteur. — (I) I accept this amendment, Mr President.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 1)

President. — After paragraph 8, I have Amendment No 6 by Mr Price and Mr J. M. Taylor.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Spinelli, rapporteur. — (I) This amendment was rejected in committee.

President. — I call Mr Price on a point of order.

Mr Price. — Mr President, I think there must be some confusion. This amendment was not before the committee and has only been put forward subsequently. It differs considerably from the amendment earlier put before the committee and also earlier rejected by this House.

President. — If you want to explain, Mr Spinelli, you have the right to do so.

Mr Spinelli. — (I) The amendment was rejected in committee and the original text was endorsed.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 6 and adopted paragraph 9)

President. — Explanations of vote may now be given.

I call Mr Baillot.

Mr Baillot. — (F) We intend to vote against the motion in the Spinelli report, Mr President.

Firstly, on a point of common sense. We have twice rejected budgets in 1980 and 1981 on account of their basic tenor. What this report proposes is essentially the same thing again. There is no doubt it follows on and this is reflected in the motion, and it was also clearly spotlighted by Mr Lange, chairman of the Committee on Budgets, during this morning's debate. The fact of this continuity is enough to explain the way we are voting.

Secondly, the rapporteur's proposals again centre on the common agricultural policy. Once again it is the farmers who are the scapegoats for the Community's budgetary difficulties, when we have to look at the serious crisis affecting it for the real causes. We are also against the more general use of the co-responsibility levy which had been mooted in an earlier budget. Another reason for our voting against the motion is this idea of raising the levy automatically, with the rise in agricultural prices which always go up some time after production costs, with the result that the farmers' purchasing power is constantly going down. Making the farmers themselves pay for the price rises they want is unacceptable, in fact. The whole thinking behind this budget is doubtful.

Thirdly, the motion calls for industrial policy to be given priority among the budgetary alternatives. But in accepting these alternatives we endorse the thinking of the Commission in Brussels which is dismantling traditional European industries on the grounds that they are a drain on public resources. I am sorry but we cannot tolerate industries folding or going into decline

Baillet

for the benefit of the redeployment policies of the multinational enterprises. If you are going to say we have to give priority to the industries involved in advanced technology, you are pulling the wool over the public's eyes in Europe. The fact is that these industries are subject to fierce competition from Japan and the United States, and nothing is being done against this competition for the sake of market freedom. We can see with every day that passes where this freedom is getting us.

Fourthly, the consequences of our industries going to the wall — there are eight million unemployed in the EEC — would be borne by the victims alone and the capitalist bosses would get away with it again on the spurious grounds that they need the resources for investment. Subparagraph (f) in paragraph 8 says so much.

Fifthly — and this was to be expected — this report comes up with the old idea of boosting the Assembly's powers through the budget, and this runs counter to the letter and the spirit of the Treaties.

President. — I call Mrs Scrivener.

Mrs Scrivener. — (F) Mr President, we shall also be voting against this report. Our basic reason for doing so is that it is utterly inconsistent. There are also one or two specific reasons for the way we shall be voting and I should like to mention three as examples.

We tabled an amendment on paragraph 1. It was rejected, and it seems to us that this motion is quite unrealistic. The fact is that the task which was given to the Commission is supposed to be completed by the end of June. It is really unreasonable to ask it to bring the deadline forward to mid-April, barely a month from now. We know that this is impossible.

Second example and second reason: paragraph 2, without actually spelling it out, refers to the inclusion in the budget of a ceiling on EAGGF Guarantee Section expenditure. We know that this is impossible because it is not dependent on factors which are influenced by our decisions.

There is a third reason why we shall be voting against the report. It is an important reason because there is a certain amount of confusion in people's minds at the moment. The proposals on the new own resources have not yet been completed by the Commission. We also know that Parliament, for its part, has not yet made any pronouncement. It is therefore unreasonable to suggest that proposals could be ratified by the Member States even before we have had the preliminary draft budget for 1982, in the middle of May. It is for all these inconsistencies in the report — and I want to stress that word, ladies and gentlemen — that we shall be voting against it.

(Applause from certain quarters in the Liberal and Democratic Group)

President. — I call Mr Collins.

Mr Collins. — Mr President, it has been drawn to my attention that the European Parliament is essentially an institution that represents peace in Europe. Yet here we are this afternoon in this institution of peace with a Member who is actually carrying an offensive weapon in the Chamber. Is it in order for Mr Hutton, the Conservative Member, to be carrying a dagger in his sock?

(Loud laughter)

President. — It seems, Mr Collins, that it is not against the rules.

(Loud laughter)

I call Mr Pannella for an explanation of vote.

Mr Pannella. — (F) Mr President, I shall be voting in favour of the Spinelli motion, more because of the spirit of his report than for its actual contents. I think Mr Spinelli has achieved a true parliamentary tone here with his appeal to what is best in the Commission. My approach is that of a federalist on the one hand and on the other that of someone who is a little bit old-fashioned because he still believes in the separation of powers and in the spirit of legislation. I think I shall have to vote for this report, Mr President, because we behave like a real parliament here all too rarely.

For the rest, Mr President, I do not think that Mr Spinelli has gone as far as he would like to. He cannot, of course, because as rapporteur he is speaking for all of you. Anyway, where agricultural policy is concerned, it is clear that he has not come up with much. But even though there is not going to be much change in policy, Mr President, I shall vote for this parliamentary approach. Things are not going to change, and tomorrow we are still going to have a Europe which is badly off in the farming sector, a Europe where the multinationals oppose the farmers, and a Europe where everything takes second place to sabre-rattling big business.

President. — I call Mr Brøndlund Nielsen on a point of order.

Mr Brøndlund Nielsen. — (DK) Mr President, I should like to ask you in your capacity as the Bureau's representative in this Chamber whether the course the voting procedure has taken so far does not indicate

B. Nielsen

that revision of the rules of procedure should not be more realistic than the present one. I believe it would be damaging to Parliament's prestige if we were to adopt self-contradictory resolutions and get into the confused kind of voting situation we had with the Bocklet report. Fortunately, that resolution was rejected, but we might have run a risk of adopting an extremely self-contradictory resolution in Mr Bocklet's name. I believe that this vote also shows that either we dissociate ourselves from this resolution or support something which is completely unrealistic, as my colleague, Mrs Scrivener, pointed out. For the sake of the dignity of this House, I propose that we amend the rules of procedure to enable our work to proceed more effectively and more realistically. In my opinion, it is sorely needed.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)

*

* *

President. — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution contained in the Pruvot report (Doc. 1-826/80): Youth activities.*

(Parliament adopted the first two indents of the preamble)

After the second indent of the preamble, Mrs Gaiotti de Biase and others have tabled Amendment No 2 seeking to insert the following new indent:

- aware of the serious crisis which the young generation is going through, not only where ideals, culture and the quest for new patterns of behaviour are concerned but also from the economic point of view and the difficulties of finding employment.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mrs Pruvot, rapporteur. — (F) I am in favour, Mr President.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 2, the last six indents of the preamble and paragraph 1)

President. — On paragraph 2, Mr Brok and Mr Hahn have tabled Amendment No 4 seeking to reword the paragraph as follows:

Calls on the Forum to see itself, in its working methods, choice of subjects, membership and rights of participation, as a forum within the EEC, to remain open to all categories of young people, particularly the underprivileged, who do not belong to organizations.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mrs Pruvot, rapporteur. — (F) I am against.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 4 and paragraph 2 as amended)

President. — After paragraph 2, Mrs Gaiotti de Biase and others have tabled Amendment No 3 seeking to insert the following new paragraph:

Considers the Forum to be the proper place for the young people of Europe themselves to tackle the problems raised by the present crisis and the transformation of their cultural values inasmuch as they relate to the changing attitude of youth to work, the manifestations of maladjustment among young people, the growing mistrust in institutions and the emergence of new values of solidarity and a new relationship with nature.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mrs Pruvot, rapporteur. — (F) I am in favour.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 3)

President. — On paragraph 3, Mr Brok and Mr Hahn have tabled Amendment No 5 seeking to reword the paragraph as follows:

Calls on the Forum to familiarize young people with the European situation and through its own initiatives to win their support for the idea of European unification, to have in mind the young people of Greece and the two applicant countries and give them an opportunity to voice their opinions and participate fully in the Forum's activities.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mrs Pruvot, rapporteur. — (F) This was rejected in committee.

President. — I call Mrs Viehoff.

Mrs Viehoff. — (NL) Mr President, I wish to request separate votes on the first and second parts of this amendment. We are against the first part which reads:

Calls on the Forum to familiarize young people with the European situation and through its own initiatives to win their support for the idea of European unification.

But we are in favour of the second part where it says that the young people of Greece and the two applicant countries must be kept in mind.

(Parliament adopted the first and second parts of Amendment No 5 and paragraphs 4 to 11)

President. — After paragraph 11, Mr Brok and Mr Hahn have tabled two amendments:

— No 6 seeking to add the following new paragraph:

Considers that the European dimension should be incorporated in all disciplines on the curricula for all types of school in the EEC countries, in order to encourage the development of a European awareness by treating historical, cultural, linguistic and social policy matters and the problems of and need for European integration;

— No 7 seeking to add the following new paragraph:

Calls on the Commission and Council to appoint a European committee on school textbooks to make recommendations concerning textbooks and educational guidelines in order to overcome national prejudices and promote European unification.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mrs Pruvot, rapporteur. — (F) I am in favour of Amendment No 6 and against Amendment No 7.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 6, rejected Amendment No 7 and adopted paragraphs 12 to 17)

President. — On paragraph 18, Mrs Viehoff and others have tabled Amendment No 1 seeking to reword the paragraph as follows:

Welcomes therefore the second programme to promote exchanges of young workers, and requests the Commission to consider measures towards ensuring that young workers taking part in exchange programmes should be given reasonable remuneration, adequate social security, suitable training for the transition to working life and the opportunity to obtain the required knowledge of the language of their host country.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mrs Pruvot, rapporteur. — (F) I am against.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 1 and adopted paragraph 18)

President. — On paragraph 19, Mr Brok and Mr Hahn have tabled Amendment No 8 seeking to reword the paragraph as follows:

Calls on the Commission, after consultation with the Youth Forum, to put forward proposals for the creation of an EEC youth exchange organization to improve the promotion of exchanges of youth groups of all kinds . . . (rest unchanged).

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 8, paragraph 19 as amended and paragraphs 20 to 31)

Two Members have asked to give explanations of vote. I shall not call any other speakers.

I call Mr Coutsocheras.

Mr Coutsocheras. — (EL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I expressed many reservations about the exhaustiveness of the motion for a resolution, and as I said, I find it too timid, for when someone talks about young people his remarks should apply to them all without exception. And I did not have the impression that the proposals in this report does this, since as you heard, only 0.6 % of the budget is to be devoted to youth activities. We are abstaining for this reason.

President. — I call Mrs Viehoff.

Mrs Viehoff. — (NL) Mr President, as I said in my introductory remarks, this report brings out the areas in which further work is needed, but the reason why I have asked for the floor is to express my great sense of regret at the fact that a majority of this House has seen fit to reject our Amendment No 1 to paragraph 18, calling on the Commission to consider ways of ensuring that young workers who take part in exchange schemes are given a reasonable level of remuneration, adequate social security and training to equip them for the transition from education to work.

President. — Mr Pannella, the request was received after the list was closed. If you want to make a point of order out of this, I am bound to let you speak but I shall have to interrupt you if what you say turns into an explanation of vote.

I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (F) The situation is impossible like that, Mr President. It could be that when you made the announcement it was wrongly translated. I am not going to give any explanation of vote; I shall merely say that I shall be voting against the motion.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)

President. — The proceedings will now be suspended until 9 p.m.¹

The House will rise.

(The sitting was suspended at 8 p.m. and resumed at 9 p.m.)

¹ Referral to committee — Urgent debate: see minutes of proceedings.

IN THE CHAIR: MR MØLLER

Vice-President

President. — The sitting is resumed.

13. *Linking work and training for young persons in the Community (resumption)*

President. — The next item is the resumption of the debate on the Prag report (Doc. 1-460/80) on linking work and training for young persons in the Community.

The Communist and Allies Group has the floor.

Mrs Le Roux. — (*F*) I would like, Mr President, to add the support of the French members of the Communist and Allies Group for the view expressed by a previous speaker that the question of youth unemployment is certainly one of the most distressing, one of the most tragic questions we face today; as distressing and tragic for the young people themselves and their families as it is for the current and future state of the economy in each of our own countries. In such circumstances our only course of action is to condemn the neglectfulness of such an inadequate vocational training system and to condemn the fact that, in France for example, 250 000 young people leave school each year without any kind of job training.

We are witnesses to an enormous waste of human talent of which the principal victims are the children of modest families, and amongst whom girls remain the most seriously affected.

Of course, government and employers have done a little along the guidelines proposed by the European Commission, which are the same lines as Mr Prag adopts on linking work and training. What we are talking about is, quite clearly, changing job training to fit the crisis and to meet the demands of employers. What we are talking about first of all is hiding the real rate of unemployment and watering down the statistics, just as the report says in its explanatory statement.

The truth has got to be told though: we have had three years of plans like this in France and unemployment has passed two million and is still rising towards the three million some experts are predicting.

What we are talking about, from the other point of view, is a lucrative operation for the big employers and for the small and medium undertakings. The three plans of Mr Barre's Government have given away 15 thousand million francs of taxpayer's money to

them. What we are talking about is giving job training on the cheap to a labour force which can be mercilessly moulded and overworked, making them more ductile and more docile, and with the multipurpose programmes which are being recommended what we are talking about is training semi-skilled workers who will be good for any kind of menial task. All you need to do is ask the young people who have been through this training: most of them will tell you that the only jobs they ever did in business were filling in for someone else.

What we are also talking about is making sure that pay is as low as possible: Mr Prag's report admits that 'for the European economy it will raise competitiveness at a time when our high-wage economy faces increasing difficulties from competition by low-wage developing countries.'

You can't make things plainer than that.

Another point is that young people who are treated in this way have no certainty of getting a job when they finish their training because employers are not put under any obligation, mainly because of the rapid spread of unemployment throughout industry.

As for the promised solutions, what use would European harmonization be particularly in those regions where agriculture, iron and steel, coal, textiles, ship-building and now even car production are in such a dreadful state precisely because of the effect of directives and decisions made at European level?

Here, as elsewhere, the solution lies in putting an end to the politics of austerity, and in a policy of giving fresh impetus to the economy by increasing spending power, reducing the working week by heavy investment in job creation and by putting an end to the policies of redeployment. Properly monitored schooling and job training with some real-life purpose, aimed at the real needs of our society, and organized with the cooperation of trade unions and teachers would enable us to bring about real change, particularly for young people. Then and only then will the legitimate hopes of young people and all workers for a steady job in their own region, in their own country, and their hopes for a different, more dignified and more responsible way of working be satisfied. And since such considerations are totally foreign to the European Commission's draft directives and to the report we have before us, we are quite unable to give our support to either.

President. — I call the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mrs Nielsen. — (*DK*) Mr President, at a time when the number of unemployed in the Community has exceeded the 8 million mark, and when the forecast is

Nielsen

for even higher unemployment over the next year, it is very understandable that the Commission has tried to chart new courses in its desire to create a reasonable and meaningful life for those hit by the present crisis. It is extremely important to create more jobs and it is absolutely indispensable that those persons who fill them are qualified to do so. Likewise we must constantly be aware that competitively speaking it only pays to have a well trained labour force, persons who are well qualified not just for a specific job but who can also switch to another occupation without having to retrain completely.

That was what I wanted to say by way of introduction, and next let me say that in the report on 'alternating education' it is stated that the proposal was adopted unanimously with one abstention. I do not wish to make any secret of the fact that I am the member of the Committee who did not vote in favour of this report. I would also like to explain why because in that way I will avoid wasting Parliament's time later with an explanation of vote.

In my former political role, partly as education spokesman in my country's Parliament, partly as Minister of Education, I received what I consider was a very thorough insight into our educational system. I certainly do not think that we have the best system. There is always room for improvement but I believe that in the Community we have a lot to learn from each other. In my opinion our task in the educational sphere is to exchange views and experiences, to help wherever this is at all possible. But there is one thing we must respect — and I myself worked to promote this view in the Council of Ministers' office — namely the fact that it is quite impossible to create a uniform educational system or a uniform training system which would suit all the Member States. We are making a fatal mistake if we believe that this is possible.

The traditions within the respective countries' educational systems, the structure of education, its content, the whole question of who take decisions, who influences education, varies from country to country. While we must respect this fact, it is a situation which can also be enriching for us if we cooperate with each other. We must learn from these differences. The aim of the report is of course that we should be successful in our efforts and that this proposal should also be implemented. And here I have some misgivings which mean that I cannot vote in favour of this report.

I must confess that I feel that on this occasion it is the Council which is adopting the most realistic approach. The Commission proposal which is supported by the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment minus myself, advocates making it binding, making it a common policy for the Member States to introduce this 'alternating education'. But here I say that it is simply not possible to introduce a uniform system in all Member States. It is a pity to adopt such a course.

But I want to place on record that I am not opposed to alternating education. On the contrary I think it is particularly important to combine theory with practice and may I point out furthermore that alternating education of the kind we are discussing here is something which is particularly well accepted and respected in Denmark. There are great advantages to be gained from switching between theory and practice and let us learn from this.

In the report Germany is singled out as a pioneer in this field and I believe this is indeed true in many spheres. However, again there is one thing we must take into consideration here: Germany is characterized by having many large scale enterprises while Denmark is characterized by having many small enterprises. That alone means, as must be clear to all, that it is not possible to create uniform educational systems when the structures differ from country to country.

For this reason I am apprehensive about the trend towards harmonization which I perceive in this report. Harmonization in itself is no advantage and that has never at any time been the goal: I want to stress this very clearly. I am very, very much in favour of working jointly in the educational sphere within the Community, but we must have a sensible approach to such cooperation and indeed that applies in all spheres. I just wanted to say this so that no one will misunderstand me.

President. — I call the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members.

Mr Bøgh. — (DK) Mr President, in a pluralist parliament such as this it is important to adopt a certain ideologically critical approach to the documents on which we have to express an opinion. We must always first ask what interests are directly or indirectly served by the proposal? This is particularly necessary in the case of topics which touch on both humanitarian and economic issues, as for example education. Education can be viewed either from an educative angle where the focus is on the interests of the individual, or from an occupational angle where the focus is on the interests of the economy.

In the Prag report on the training of young persons, it is stated quite openly that the aim is the vocational adaptation of young people rather than their cultural development. It adopts a line directly opposed to the Council, because the Council combines the terms education, i.e. 'preparation for life', and vocational education, i.e. 'preparation for work'. In the context of preparation for work the magic word is 'alternating education' which will apparently solve all our problems; but the wide range of pedagogic and psychological material which exists on this problem has not been taken into consideration in any way. For this reason it

Bøgh

appears to me that from an educational viewpoint this report is somewhat amateurish.

The philosophy underlying it is that at a time when the person at work is constantly faced with new challenges, teaching modules permitting speedy and effective retraining should be prepared. I would like to caution against this simple rationalization of the problems. One cannot make man into a function of technological development. On the other hand, a person who has been made aware and motivated through a broad general education and maturing process will often have a human resilience in meeting new challenges, whether these be professional or political.

In my country we have set a goal for the educational process which is called 'the school for life'. One of our greatest educationalists has defined the school's role as 'starting the young person off so that he never again stops'. But the school which is presented in the Prag report is not this 'school for life'. It is the school for industrial life and this is why this document appears so tremendously out of date and remote to a Danish educationalist.

It is not only education which has been turned into a system of interchangeable modules. It is also the human life which is being chopped up into episodes dictated by technological development.

The only reason I could accept for the EEC tackling educational problems would be that as a big economic unit it might succeed in taking the edge off competition which otherwise would force us to develop along inhuman lines. But here on the contrary man's working life and education is being made a mere function of the cut-throat competition. We are familiar with the horrifying dehumanization of the production cycle, where man must tolerate being pushed around at the mercy of labour market forces just because everybody else tolerates it.

If the EEC's strength is not to be used to modify the inhuman effects of competition then it is only a matter of prestige for the EEC to want to intervene in this purely national domain. There is nothing in this report with its paucity of educational ideas which cannot be carried out better and cheaper in a national and familiar framework than on an EEC basis. Pedagogy, education and training always have a historical dimension and harmonization in these spheres is 100 % guaranteed to be a fiasco. The only reason for using the EEC apparatus in this problem area is that appropriations are more available in the EEC than in national governments. When the monies first began to flow into the multinational coffer, all were eager to implement even the most absurd schemes in order to get hold of some of the money. In this way the EEC became a necessity which even the meanest state wanted to join. But we in the various countries should be mature enough to take the tragic and alarming youth unemployment in the EEC

seriously without having to be tempted by this carrot, without this pressure. This is not done by inventing a new catch phrase 'alternating education' which in reality does not introduce anything very new.

President. — I call Mr Pasmazoglou.

Mr Pasmazoglou. — Mr President, speaking as a Greek Member, I wish to state that the report by Mr Prag contains most valuable information and analysis and a comparative analysis of the systems applied in various countries. Therefore we must and shall support it. But I wish to say immediately that the proposals in this context should be associated with more general lines of policy. And I wish in this connection to state first that the programmes of alternance work and educational arrangements are particularly interesting in periods of technological change, such as our own.

The second point is that they are particularly interesting in periods of economic crisis like our own but they cannot be a substitute for policies to overcome those symptoms of economic crisis. Therefore I believe that the suggestions in the report should be associated with a more general line to overcome the present economic and monetary difficulties.

My third point is that we in Greece face structural problems, as you all know, and these are associated with the inadequate development of our country. Therefore the proposals in this report can lead to very positive results only in the context of more drastic and more generous policies of regional development within Greece, together with more drastic action by the European Social Fund. Therefore I would refer in particular to the observations we made during the debate on Mr Thorn's statement. Finally, I wish to congratulate Mr Prag on his very valuable report and recommendations.

President. — I call the Commission.

Mr Richard, Member of the Commission. — Mr President, I shall be as brief as I can in replying to this debate. I am conscious of the time and the fact that there are other debates to come immediately afterwards.

May I say just one thing, however, by way of comment on the speeches that have been made by, I think, two Danish Members, in the last ten minutes or so. They seem to be expressing a concern — indeed an almost explicit worry — that somehow or other as the Commissioner in charge of education, I saw it as my duty to harmonize educational systems, to have a tremendous *mélange* of the whole educational activity of the Community, so that one would lose regional and national diversities, and introduce a much more

Richard

homogeneous and moulded type of approach. May I assure them very clearly — and this is the first opportunity I have had of doing so — that nothing, frankly, could be further from my thoughts. It seems to me that my function, and indeed the Commission's function, is to look at those specific areas where Community action makes much more sense than national action, and in those specific areas to put the weight of the Commission and the resources of the Community behind policies which, I hope, we would all agree were sensible ones. As far as diversity is concerned, I have no problem. Indeed, coming as I do, from a minority race in my own country, which has so far preserved its educational system, its literature, its culture and its language, I have no problem whatsoever in trying to preserve them in other parts of the Community too.

The Commission, Mr President, particularly appreciates the effort that has been made by the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment and its rapporteur, Mr Prag, on the one hand, and the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport, and its rapporteur, Mrs Gaiotti on the other hand, to discuss in depth the whole question of the links between education and employment. This is, of course, a most crucial issue. It has a bearing, not just on the quality of vocational training and the problems of youth unemployment. It must also be a central theme of future Community policy of economic and social development. After all, education and training together are vital as agents of change in our society.

I entirely agree with the last speaker who spoke about alternance being particularly necessary in a period of intense technological change and indeed in a period of intense economic difficulty. I sometimes feel that the fundamental role of education, training and development is perhaps better recognized in countries of the third world and in our policies for aid and development than it is in some of our own Member States. The teachers' action here yesterday in Strasbourg sought, I suppose, to draw attention to the need to protect our future generations of citizens from the effects of the economic crisis. I must say, Mr President, I cannot but support their argument. We must emphasize, I think, on each and every occasion, that by cutting back on education today we are reducing the quality of the human resources available to our society tomorrow.

It is therefore, I think, to be regretted that so little time is available for the House to consider these issues in detail. I very much hope that a full debate on education and training policy in the Community can be held in the not too distant future and, dare one hope, at a more convenient hour for all concerned.

We must, I think, question seriously whether existing education and training systems are really able to promote qualities of initiative amongst our young people and indeed amongst the adult working population. It has to be admitted that the vast majority of

vocational training programmes are still designed to prepare people for salaried employment offering training in specific skills on the hypothesis — and in many cases it is only a hypothesis — that one day an employer will come along with an appropriate vacancy for which that individual has been trained. On the other hand, general educational programmes in schools and adult education provisions have tended to restrict their objectives to the broader cultural and intellectual development of the individual with perhaps little attempt at specific job training. The Commission is particularly sensitive in this respect to the idea submitted initially by the Parliament's Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport and now presented in the form of draft amendments by Mrs Gaiotti and Mr Pedini.

I hope that it will not have escaped the notice of the House that the new Commission has decided to group together the responsibilities for education and vocational training within my own portfolio. I see this as a significant development which, I hope, will enable the Commission to play the role more of an exemplar, a sort of pace-setter, for the Member States in elaborating guidelines for an integrated approach to education and training policy. This approach should be based on the principles of lifelong education and this takes much more account of the very rapid social, economic and cultural changes which our society is likely to experience for the next decade.

Mr Prag referred specifically to the impact of new information technologies.

I share his preoccupations on this particular subject. The Commission is preparing specific proposals for action in this area, which I hope we can discuss on another occasion.

Mr President, the resolution on 'alternance' training is admittedly a small first step in this direction. It concentrates on improving the quality of the initial training of young people, whether employed or unemployed. Mr Prag referred to some of the difficulties that the Commission has had in this field vis-à-vis the Council and left us at the end of his speech with a message which was: try again! Well, perhaps we will try again, but I hope that next time we will have the support of Parliament in our efforts. Indeed we hope that the Member States, who are, of course, represented so clearly and firmly on the Council, may then perhaps take more note of some of the representations that have been made in this Parliament.

I now turn very briefly to some of the specific issues raised in the resolution. I have got time to deal with only two of them — the use of the Social Fund and secondly, incentives. On the use of the Social Fund, I should perhaps explain that under the Article 4 interventions for young people the Fund has for years been supporting linked work and training schemes, or 'alternance' training as it is now called, even in

Richard

English, insofar as they concern young unemployed people. The aim now will be to establish a number of demonstration projects to show how the concept of alternance can be developed and refined in response to specific local conditions, taking account also, as I said a little earlier, of the diverse education and training systems in the Member States. We hope that these initiatives can be closely related to the existing programme of pilot projects on the transition from education to working life established by the Ministers of Education in 1976.

Let me turn finally to the matter of incentives. Frankly, I don't think most young people need incentives so much as reasonable conditions under which to train for a job. They want to learn. Most of them, in my experience, want a job. We, for our part, should aim to try and provide a framework of social and material conditions appropriate to them in their halfway stage, that is, halfway between their status of full-time school student and that of full-time worker. The European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training has just completed for us a survey of the legal, financial and social security situations applicable to young people in the Member States, whether they are apprentices, other young workers, students or unemployed. I am at present studying that survey and considering what proposals the Commission might make to try and ensure a minimum level of provision for young people in these situations in the Member States.

One final remark about girls and young women. I should perhaps add that the Commission is very conscious of the fact that there is crucial need to develop 'alternance' training for girls and young women. The fact of the matter is that in the present situation girls are far more vulnerable to unemployment than boys. Now the Commission considers that provisions for equality of treatment as regards access to vocational training will not be sufficient to correct the enormous imbalance between young men and women in this area. The implementation of the Community directive on equal treatment would, of course, be carefully monitored. I would like to say to the House, however, that it is my intention to look particularly at the possibilities of positive action, what the Americans call affirmative action, to promote alternance training for girls. This action indeed would coincide closely with the recommendations made by this House early last month.

Mr President, this has been a somewhat truncated and perhaps rather brisk debate, interrupted as it was, however, by some three hours of voting procedures. On the other hand I think it has been both useful and valuable. It has certainly been useful for me, on behalf of the Commission, to hear the views of Members of the House. I hope they will feel that we are approaching this subject with sympathy and urgency and that within the limits of our resources we will indeed try to achieve what the House would wish.

(Applause)

President. — I call the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport.

Mrs Viehoff, deputy draftsman of an opinion. — *(NL)* Mr President, I hope it will not become a habit for me always to follow Mr Richard in the list of speakers. It may also appear that our views are always remarkably similar, but although I may appear to be repeating some of the things he said, that is not really the case, because I am not such a spontaneous speaker — I have to commit my thoughts to paper a day in advance.

Mr President, we take the view that the motion for a resolution tabled by the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment is too restricted to work and vocational training and neglects the principle which is at the basis of the view taken by the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport that education cannot be viewed separately from education as a preparation for life on the one hand and vocational training as a preparation for work on the other. It is very disappointing to find nothing of the Committee on Youth's opinion reproduced in the motion for a resolution. Of course, our opinion has been attached to the report, but it does not feature at all in the motion for a resolution. We are all the more disappointed inasmuch as this subject falls just as much within the terms of reference of the Committee on Youth. In our opinion, all the amendments tabled by Mr Gaiotti should be adopted on the grounds that they add an important and essential dimension to the resolution. Our society — and the kind of work available — are in a constant state of flux, and the number of jobs available is falling all the time. Indeed, it is expected that the number of unemployed in the Community will rise to 10 million in the near future. Almost half of these will be young people, with girls figuring more prominently than boys in the statistics. The prospect of almost five million young people emerging into an extremely complicated society without much hope for the future is a worrying one. For that reason, the kind of education and training young people receive should enable them to adapt to changing social conditions, not only from the jobs point of view, but also — and this probably a more important point — for social and cultural reasons. There is, after all, a danger of more and more young people in our society losing their sense of orientation, with all the attendant consequences. Our views are set out in the amendments tabled by Mrs Gaiotti and not — as I said earlier — in the motion for a resolution tabled by the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment. Apart from the fact that, in our view, there is a lot missing from the report, we are certainly not happy with what paragraph 2 has to say about there being substantial reserves of unsuitable labour. That may occasionally be the case, but there is no

Viehoff

evidence whatsoever that the numbers are substantial. It would be wrong to give this impression, as the high level of unemployment among young people and the anticipated increase in this level have many other root causes. Unfortunately, the amendment we tabled on this question was not admitted, either because of a misunderstanding or because it was tabled too late. We shall therefore be voting against paragraph 2, and we would advise this House to do the same. Let me repeat that we hope the amendments tabled by Mrs Gaiotti will receive a large measure of support.

Amendment No 10, pointing to the need for young women to be given equal opportunities in any experiments concerning linking training, should, in our opinion, have been given some element of positive discrimination in view of the discrimination against women. I also hope that Mrs Vayssade's amendment on this point will be adopted, and I understand that this amendment is in reliable hands with Mr Richard. I hope that the resolution, reinforced by the various amendments, will point the Council in the right direction. After all, the Council's cost-cutting policy on the education budget was not a very convincing reflection of its sworn concern for the problem of unemployment among young people.

President. — I call Mr Estgen.

Mr Estgen. — (*F*) Mr President, linked work and training was a highly fashionable topic of conversation amongst experts before it became a fascinating educational experience in every one of our own countries.

The excellent report by our esteemed colleague Mr Prag does not, of course, take sides in the dispute between the old and the new, but I am delighted that it is nevertheless valuable for all that. I am likewise delighted to find that his views are, so to speak complemented by the Committee on Youth and Education. It is however there that my views differ from those of Mr Prag — although they differ only very slightly — for I think that he makes too great a distinction between the concept of education as a preparation for life and job training as a preparation for active life, and that he regards alternative training perhaps not exclusively but a little too much from the utilitarian standpoint as a means of tackling rapid technological evolution and filling the many jobs in industry which require special qualifications, and of dealing with youth unemployment.

That is, however, strictly compatible with his role as rapporteur for the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment; they are points which I would be the last to deny and are, on their own, a perfectly adequate justification for linking work and training.

However, I have been and remain at heart a teacher and for that reason I am left with a slight feeling of frustration.

For there is no denying that alternance is first and foremost a challenge to education, and I agree entirely with what Mrs Gaiotti de Biase said in her report.

What is more, the Commission thought it appropriate to make only restricted proposals for linking work and training for young people. It is certainly true that the greatest need lies there. It is also true, however, that the principal advantage of alternance lies in its possibilities for general training: that is very clear to me and the Commission in turn stressed the same point; alternance is an additional means of reform and modernization in job training in the Member States and is therefore one answer to the constant need for improvements to worker training. What is more, alternance takes as axiomatic that job experience can be a training in itself, on condition that it is complemented and backed up by theoretical training.

It is easy to understand the attitude of the Council who regard alternance training simply as an answer to the requirements of the labour market and as a means of reducing youth unemployment, which undoubtedly results partly from the fact that a large number of young people are in search of jobs as soon as they have reached the minimum legal school-leaving age without having followed any vocational training.

Unemployment amongst young people is undoubtedly one of the greatest social evils of our time, through its psychological effects on the individual, and its economic, social and moral effects. And at the moment we have no reason to believe that there will be any reduction in the very high rate of unemployment amongst young people in our Community. It is therefore not only legitimate but essential that the Community too looks for efficient solutions to the problem.

The resolution we have before us points towards a teaching method which the rapporteur has described admirably as 'the coming-together of the Community's existing approaches to the youth unemployment problem'.

I would like in passing to pay tribute to the excellent preparatory work done by the European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training in Berlin which led to this initiative by the Commission, and who continue to support Community action in vocational training through alternance. This is the same centre as we were criticizing in this very Chamber, whose value we doubted and whose budget we wanted to reduce, and I think that this debate has given proof, if we needed it, of the usefulness — the necessity even — and the topicality of the research and study undertaken there.

Estgen

Highly topically, indeed, the Centre has just published first of all more than 200 pages of report on a conference on 'Youth unemployment and vocational training in the EEC' which was held in Berlin from 25 to 27 June 1980, and, more recently still, a special brochure, entitled 'Linked work and training for young persons in the European Community'. To anyone who would like to know more about the problem I warmly recommend reading both these documents. And I am also particularly grateful to Mr Price who has tabled an amendment which relates directly to the task of the Berlin Centre.

For there is a compelling need for us to improve both the quality and the quantity of vocational training available to young people who leave education early, regardless of the requirements of the labour market and regardless even of the question of unemployment. This is for very basic reasons: first of all because in many cases schools are unable to supply adequate information and experience to prepare young people effectively for working life; secondly, because young people get tired of school and their interest in being taught diminishes; and finally the need to make it easier for adult workers to return to vocational training systems, since it has been shown that basic training is less and less capable of giving preparation for the whole of one's working life.

To this we should add the fact that alternance is an incentive towards multidisciplinary, since in reality work is never of a monodisciplinary nature and alternance training implies a constant reappraisal of teaching, since teaching itself is then brought into line with the constantly changing needs of the working environment.

I know that serious criticisms can be made against linked work and training and that it can be regarded as 'the devaluation of general knowledge and theoretical teaching' in favour of "trade recipes". Such a danger does exist, and I am particularly grateful to Madame Gaiotti De Biase and Mr Pedini for their amendments which insist on weight made up with general, economic and social training, and which insist that it is essential not to be restricted merely to training for operational tasks.

Of course, nothing will be perfect as far as the vocational training of young people is concerned.

In that training we must be particularly careful that abstract myths are not replaced by concrete ones, and that the discontinuity of study which alternance represents does not lead to failing intellectual concentration; we must make sure that after school young people do not abandon studies for work which makes fewer and fewer intellectual demands on them, and we must make sure that young people from privileged classes do not become even more privileged because their training takes them to more interesting businesses.

As regards the businesses themselves, the main risk we have to face is disorganization within the working unit if we ask them not only to take on untrained people and use them without exploiting them, but to train them as well.

This list of obstacles must not lead us to think that it is impossible. For it is no less impossible for us to leave the present system of vocational training unchanged as it stands in certain of our Member States.

Having looked at the Council's resolution on linking work and training for young persons I am inclined to be a little less severe than the rapporteur. The Commission's text is, I grant, more precise in more than one way, and for that reason would certainly have been more practical, I must, however, say that the Council resolution, for all its occasional vagueness, is for that very reason flexible and would allow explicit action of the kind we are talking about. Its careful, hesitant and even academic approach reflects the need to maintain national and even regional sovereignty in the question of vocational training — regional independence. Generally speaking I am in favour of such sovereignty, just as I support wide educational liberties, and under no circumstances would I wish for a standardized, egalitarian schooling of the 'Einheitsschule' type. This, however, is certainly not what the Commission's draft resolution points towards, since it merely suggests a certain amount of coordination and cooperation on the question of units and I, too, would prefer the Commission's resolution to the Council's. I am in entire agreement with Mr Prag on all the main points of his report and on his conclusions, although I would ask him to consider favourably the proposed amendments, which add to his excellent proposals without contradicting them, but which add to them by highlighting the educational aspects of the question and consequently by bringing yet more human feeling to our resolution.

President. — I call Mr Boserup.

Mr Boserup. — (DK) Mr President and very honourable, even if not very numerous, members we were not obliged to draw up the report we are discussing here and it does not reduce the ninety reports we owe the Council. The Committee itself wished to comment on the Council resolution on alternating education. I am not a member of the Committee on Social Affairs and for that reason I have great difficulty in understanding why this self-appointed task has yielded such a meagre result. Since only nine members of the Committee were able to participate in all the work up to the adoption of eighteen points in the motion for a resolution, there are some proposals for amendments which, with a little bit of goodwill, could easily have been worked into the report. That is what we at home call bad workmanship.

Boserup

The motion for a resolution is not very constructive. It primarily voices complaints and criticism. For example criticism of the Council: the Council is inactive, the Council is lacking in imagination, the Council does not realize . . . and so on and so forth. Of course the nine from the Committee on Social Affairs have a right to think of this but they owe it to us to provide evidence that the actual teaching of young people will be improved, bring greater satisfaction, greater diligence and interest as a result of being planned and financed by the Commission. Admittedly we have problems in Denmark in revitalizing and improving vocational education but I know that efforts to piece something together which could be used only superficially in the ten countries will be wasted. Now I respect the Commissioner and assume that he does not wish to waste his time.

I disagree with the Danish government in its very half-hearted and accommodating EEC policy but I support their refusal to extend cooperation to include education. I do not think that the majority here in the House, or the Commission should have any illusions about this viewpoint changing. The Danish educational system may have its faults, but Danish voters can read, write and remember what they voted for and this does not include education.

And so I come to the distressing part: the attached opinion of the Committee on Youth, Culture etc. presents a nasty mixture of educational and employer interests. Here it is actually stated that there is a decline in young peoples' interest in attending educational establishments in all countries. Where on earth did the Committee get that from? May I point out to these benefactors of youth that in Denmark there is no question of a decline in interest, but rather of very stringent restricted admission and impossible economic conditions for students. And this is not all. The same Committee on Youth writes coolly in its conclusions that it would rather plan for a situation with a surplus of manpower. First I thought this was a linguistic error — it cannot mean that! Spokesmen for youth here in Parliament prefer a situation where there will be a surplus of young people, where they will stand cap in hands looking for work! Ladies and gentlemen, I am shocked!

President. — I call Mr Buttafuoco.

Mr Buttafuoco. — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the importance of the subject we are discussing is quite clear since problems relating to the young have occupied the sessions of the European Parliament in three different areas, as Mr Pedini pointed out in his speech during the debate on the Pruvot report.

At its meeting in Paris in 1979 the European Council asked the Council to look at the principle of linked

work and training as a means of improving the employment situation, and to establish some form of action in the field. Now during a period of real recession — which is what we are going through at the moment, as the new President of the Commission, Mr Thorn, has remarked — the greatest problem and the most important is that of unemployment in general and unemployment amongst young people in particular; a problem which is particularly difficult if, as is the case now, unemployment amongst young people has reached the rate of 41 % and if the overall figure for unemployment is somewhere in the region of 8 million.

Indeed, the Council, in a 1975 decision which was renewed in 1977, authorized the Social Fund to intervene in support of specific actions aimed at aiding employment and the geographical and professional mobility of young people under the age of 25 who were unemployed or seeking their first job. Furthermore in 1978 a Council decision added rules to the Social Fund which benefit young people seeking employment through various provisions aimed at creating additional jobs in which young people could acquire working experience, and aimed particularly at employment for young people aged under 25 through projects aimed at job creation in social sectors which had received few benefits from the Community structure. The present position is that the Fund intervention is 300 units of account per head per week for 12 months, and it is our view that such a contribution is an indication of no real will at all — certainly not good will — and we agree entirely with the views expressed in the motion for a resolution on the Council's policy which is most appropriately defined as one of total inactivity.

We also therefore join in the condemnation of the Commission for failing to use its own right to call for the withdrawal of its proposals after modifications by the Council which left it devoid of any meaning, and we join in the appeal to the Commission to exert itself and draw up and implement a wide range of programmes aimed particularly at the integration of our deficient national programmes which as present, as in Italy, despite Law 285 and other regional laws are aimed at popular appeal tend, instead of healing the wounds, to rub salt into them.

Our own position is to regard vocational training from the European point of view, and that is to look at the common elements which are likely to meet the wide variety of requirements set by different jobs, including exchanges of young working people between Member States, including programmes which would improve their chances of finding employment, giving them more and better chances and reducing the current very high levels of unemployment, bringing vocational training up to date in the light of technological progress and the restructuring which has followed changes in the economic and social scene.

Buttafuoco

We cannot therefore underestimate the importance of the question of youth unemployment, which is a primary element in future prospects of social justice and wellbeing, future prospects which we shall find it hard to achieve without solving such a problem. It is just as important that the Community's role must be all embracing, and not sectoral, and must offer help just as much to the far north as to the far south and the islands.

We agree particularly firmly with the point made at paragraph 15, relating to the children of immigrant workers with whom we were concerned in a previous debate only a short while ago, who have the greatest difficulty in obtaining any specialized vocational training.

Mr President, we appear to have established a precedent in the debates of this Assembly; the Commissioner now speaks halfway through and the rule would appear to be 'blessed are they that come first' for they shall have the benefit of a reply from the Commissioner during his speech. We would like our own views taken into account by the Commission too, and we would like to see real action started if we wish to attain the harmonious development which will guarantee a far better future for Europe. It is my hope that we have that as our common aim.

President. — I call Mr Hahn.

Mr Hahn. — (*D*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, considering the late hour and the short time available to me, I shall restrict myself to a very few remarks, even though I believe that we are dealing with an important subject which deserves to be discussed here at length. I should like to give my express thanks to Mr Prag for repeatedly asking that a proper length of time be made available for the debate on this subject in our Parliament, as befits its significance for young people in Europe. I should also like to thank him for submitting this report which I consider to be thoroughly topical and not in the least outdated. Nevertheless, as a member of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport, I am also of the opinion that it would have been much better if the two reports — the report of the Social Affairs Committee and that of the Committee on Youth — had been combined and in particular if the motion for a resolution could have been jointly formulated. I would justify this very briefly by repeating the argument that — as in effect Mrs Viehoff and Mr Estgen have already said for anthropological and for cultural reasons it is not possible to distinguish, in the way in which the Social Affairs Committee has done, between education for life and training for a job, that is, between general education and vocational training. This would be tantamount to splitting man and his culture into two parts, in other words implying that man lives on two different and unrelated planes. But

man, just as much as our culture, is an entity, and therefore general education and vocational training must be integrated.

My second remark is a warning against expecting that the introduction of this dual system — 'alternance' training, as we call it — could become a fast-acting miracle weapon for reducing youth unemployment. This is a structural transformation which works slowly and is a long time in coming to fruition, but which I consider to be highly desirable for many countries, because it leads to an improvement in the quality of training. The combination of vocational training in a firm, with its involvement in the competitive world of industry and technology, on the one hand, and education on the other, has an extraordinarily positive effect on training. The fact that in Germany this so-called dual or 'alternance' system is so widespread, is one of the reasons why we can point, firstly, to a minimal youth unemployment rate and, secondly, to a very considerable economic performance. It is based on the performance of the skilled worker in Germany, who has gone through this dual training, the 'alternance' system.

Ladies and gentlemen, as has already been mentioned, this system has been with us in Germany for an extraordinarily long time, in fact since the beginning of the century. We have wide experience in this field; it is no longer simply an experiment for us and we can already claim a number of successes. In the 60s and 70s, we had a major reform of vocational training colleges in Germany, and this was the most successful part of the educational reforms of the last 15 years, with some very positive achievements, whereas other aspects of educational reform cannot be so favourably assessed. I am not at all of the opinion that the German system should be simply transposed to other countries. I am also against harmonizing school systems which, after all, have grown up independently in individual countries. But it is this combination of training in a firm on the one hand and in school on the other (which must of course be related to one another) that I consider to be positive. The costs are covered — for, with us, the State pays for the costs of the training college, while industry pays for the apprentice and his training. Mrs Le Roux' claim that we exploit the apprentice is completely false. This is not the case; he receives a respectable wage, which is agreed with the trade union and is based on the outcome of collective wage agreements. In his third year, the apprentice will earn up to DM 900, that is some 400 EUA, and this is not exploitation, if he is also getting appropriate training at the same time. Ladies and gentlemen, I believe that we have good reason to look into this question, to improve the training and situation of young people and to help them to go into life prepared; but at the same time we must strengthen our economy — on which, after all, the social status of our Community depends — by providing good vocational training.

President. — I must point out that the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group) has used all its speaking time for this evening. This means that the group's Members who are down to speak on the remaining items will be deleted from the list.

The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

14. EEC-Romania relations

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-678/80), drawn up by Mrs Lenz on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, on

EEC-Romania relations with particular reference to

- the Agreement on the Joint EEC-Romania Committee, and
- the EEC-Romania Agreement on trade in industrial products.

I call the rapporteur.

Mrs Lenz, rapporteur. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, although I consider it an honour to represent the Committee on External Economic Relations in this debate on the conclusion of an agreement between the EEC and Romania, I must nevertheless voice my disapproval of the fact that not only has the date for the discussion of this report been deferred three times, but the discussion has also been postponed to this very late hour in the evening. It is after all the first time that the Community has concluded such a treaty with an Eastern European country, and I feel that it is most regrettable that we cannot pay more tribute to the occasion by debating the issue at a more suitable hour in the day. What is more, this is not the first time that the Committee on External Economic Relations has been forced to present matters which are of considerable importance to the European Community at so late an hour.

The agreement between the EEC and Romania was signed on 28 July 1980 and entered into force on 1 January this year. The agreement concerned the creation of a Joint EEC-Romania Committee and trade in industrial products. The Committee on External Economic Relations attaches special significance to relations between this East European State-trading country and the European Community, as up to now Romania is the first and only country in Comecon to opt for this form of relations. There have of course been two prior agreements — the textiles agreement of December 1977 and the steel agreement of 1978. Together these two agreements in fact account for over 85 % of all Romania's trade with the European Community, and this in itself is worth

noting. The report gives a breakdown of the economic data which I cannot go into more thoroughly now because of the shortage of time. One item of considerable interest however, is surely the fact that since 1 January 1975, all trade negotiations with the state-trading countries have been conducted through the Community. The European Community originally proposed a general agreement to these countries to replace the bilateral trade agreements between themselves and individual Community states which were about to expire, but with the exception of Romania, none of the Eastern European countries has so far responded to this move.

We took particular care when dealing with these matters in the hope that the agreement signed with Romania last year would herald the development of more extensive relations and agreements between the European Economic Community and other countries in Comecon. At the same time, however, we have no wish to deny certain negative aspects which have been noted in the report and which should not be overlooked in the event of any further negotiations.

What is certain is that Romania, faced with its particular economic situation, wants to introduce significantly more powerful measures to increase its exports, which is of great interest to us. But it wishes to do so — and this is one of the criticisms we have to make — partly through measures which are viewed with misgivings in the West. On 1 January 1981, a law entered into force, the main purpose of which, in addition to supporting firms active in foreign markets, is to provide for the development of joint ventures with foreign firms. It also enables Romanian firms to safeguard their interests abroad through trade representatives. On the other hand, the aim is to reduce imports by making substantially tougher demands — and this should arouse our misgivings — for barter transactions, particularly for the importation of plant, machinery and equipment. Here we come to the crux of the matter. The European Community, the Commission and western firms are extremely reluctant to increase barter transactions as they more or less prevent free trade and thus considerably hamper competition. Western firms are complaining about the lack of choice, because the better products are mostly sold for foreign currency and are excluded from the barter arrangements. Although the Committee acknowledges that the agreement with Romania is only a partial agreement, it nevertheless feels that it illustrates some of the overall difficulties which are likely to occur whenever treaties are concluded between Comecon countries and the European Community. To this extent, it provides pointers for any future policy on agreements. The way in which the Joint Committee operates can be seen as a test case for the exchange of ideas and the joint management of problems concerning the development, coordination and supervision of mutual relations, including those in special areas such as barter transactions and cooperation activities or even the granting of loans — which

Lenz

are known to have some negative aspects. The signing of these agreements can also give a boost to the formulation and implementation of further Community policies. The conclusion of this agreement with Romania is in line with CSCE provisions and should be used accordingly, particularly where cooperation and the strengthening of economic ties — as provided for in Basket II — are concerned. We should not however gloss over the fact that human rights in this Eastern European country and its ties with the West are not exactly free of problems. We therefore call upon the European Parliament to carefully monitor the development of relations between Romania and the Community, among other with a view to negotiations between the Community and Comecon, so that it can intervene with its own proposals when any future agreements are being concluded. As is well known, this appeal finds an echo in Parliament's endeavours over the so-called Jonker Report, which calls for more exhaustive consultations on international agreements. The Committee approved the motion for a resolution and the report with one abstention recommends Parliament to adopt the motion for a resolution.

President. — The Socialist Group has the floor.

Mr Radoux. — (*F*) Mr President, it is my great pleasure to thank Mrs Lenz on behalf of the Socialist Group for the considerable work which she has done. She has put perfectly into perspective the first agreement ever made between an Eastern bloc country and the Community on the basis of the offer which the Community put to the East European countries as a whole.

After I have spoken of the Socialist Group's support for the report presented by Mrs Lenz and for the resolution which it includes — with the addition of two amendments which I will explain when we come to the vote — I should like to outline the general views of the Socialist Group on the application of this agreement, and the basic reasons for our desire to see the agreement implemented in the best possible conditions. Our first reason is that the agreement is one application of Article 110 of the Treaty of Rome. This Article confirms the will of the Member States to contribute to 'the development of world trade, the progressive abolition of restrictions on international trade and the lowering of customs barriers'. Our second reason for satisfaction is that the conclusion of the agreement between the Community and Romania is consistent with the declaration made by the Heads of State and Government on 21 October 1972 when they said: . . . 'in order to promote détente in Europe, the Community re-affirms its resolve to follow a trade policy towards the Eastern countries . . . The Member States are prepared to promote a policy of cooperation with these countries based on reciprocity . . .'

From the Romanians' point of view a landmark was passed in 1978 when they offered to seek an agreement with the Community. The Council authorized the opening of negotiations and in 1980 Mr Thorn and Mr Haferkamp made a first official visit to Romania for the signing of two agreements: the first relating to trade in industrial products other than textiles and steel, the second to a Joint Committee which would enable the authorities of both sides to hold regular meetings. It was an excellent thing to have set up such a committee since its existence will enable the agreement to be developed, rather than remaining static and will thus allow continued improvement in relations between Romania and our Community.

The opportunity represented by the setting up of this Joint Committee of representatives of both sides, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, is one which I feel we should grasp, and use to establish links between representatives of the Romanian legislative body and this Assembly. Such links could lead to valuable exchanges of views. I hope this suggestion of mine can be followed and will lead to something.

The Socialist Group is delighted with this agreement, too, because the normalization of international relations, both multilateral and bilateral, is to advantage of that cooperation whose benefits are repeated on every occasion that either East or West makes a statement of good intention. Actions have to be shown to follow the line of such statements. In approving this report, the Socialist Group's aim is the pursuit of its policy which will enhance the prosperity and wellbeing of the people of Romania.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to close with two further comments: first of all my regret that questions which are regarded as important by a Community having such a major role in world trade as our own, could fail to be included in this Assembly's order paper at anything other than the best possible time. For, as a result, they do not get the attention that they deserve. I should add that tomorrow, on Friday, at the very end of the session, we shall be talking about both Spain and Yugoslavia. A better time could have been chosen. I felt I had to insist on this point, Mr President, to ensure that the Assembly does not continue in this way.

After a point which I regret one which pleases me: that is the awareness of Community interest with which the Commission carries out its talks and negotiations with the East European countries. The Commission's efforts must be encouraged, and at the same time we must hope that its perseverance and pragmatism will finally convince the other side of the Community's good intentions and wish to contribute to East West relations with a series of mutually advantageous economic agreements. Such agreements are of foremost importance, I repeat foremost, in a world where the economy has taken such an important role. Such a

Radoux

policy is logical if we want relations between the countries of Europe to be built on up-to-date or even modern foundations. That is why all those who have committed themselves to this kind of progress are to be congratulated. By adopting Mrs Lenz's report, this House will be paying tribute to those people who are doing the right thing.

President. — I call the European Democratic Group.

Mr Welsh. — Mr President, we too should like to offer our congratulations and our thanks to Mrs Lenz for her most skilful report and assure her that it has our full support. The East European countries are important and natural trading partners for the countries of the European Community, and it is interesting to realize that the most important trading-bloc for us is in fact the EFTA countries. It is nice to imagine how tremendously more prosperous we should all be — and I use the word 'all' advisely, Mr President — in Europe if we could have the same level of trade with the countries of Eastern Europe as we do with those of the West. This is a potential which is important and which should not be ignored. Indeed, we shall best achieve the relaxation of political tension which we all seek if we can establish sound economic relationships and realize that we are better off together than we should ever be apart.

In this connexion, we particularly welcome the reference in paragraph 3 of Mrs Lenz's resolution to Basket II of the Helsinki Agreement. Agreements such as this must lead to the balanced development and liberalization of trade, and we expect great things from the Joint Cooperation Council in this regard. It is most important that it should become a genuinely dynamic forum for the discussion of problems between the Romanians and ourselves, and we are particularly concerned that the Commission, which has the responsibility for making this Cooperation Council work, should see it as a dynamic force and should involve the Parliament closely in its discussions. We hope and expect that the Commission will make it clear who their representatives on this Council are, so that Members of Parliament can have access to them and can explain what problems their own constituents, companies in their own countries, have in trading with Romania and our own industry can be assured that its interests are properly taken into account in the Romanian transactions.

We welcome this agreement because it marks a new departure for the Community. It is the first agreement that has been made independently with a member of the Council for Mutual Economic Cooperation; we hope that it will be a trendsetter and that within the framework of the common commercial policy agreements will be made with other individual East European countries for the benefit of all.

Although we have great respect for Mr Radoux's knowledge and experience in these matters, we are not going to support his amendments, because we feel it is important for the Community to take its own initiatives. In the case of Romania, Mahomet did not come to the mountain: the mountain had to go to Mahomet. And the mountain will have to go on going to Mahomet time and time and time again until these economic barriers are overcome.

We hope that this agreement will be a new departure and a stimulus for a genuinely common Community policy towards the Comecon countries. We look forward to the report that is being prepared by Mr De Clercq on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, which will, perhaps, give a new direction to the entire thrust of Community thinking about trade with Comecon; and we regard Mrs Lenz's report and the Romanian agreement as a most valuable start.

President. — The Liberal and Democratic Group has the floor.

Mr Bettiza. — (*I*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen I can only express my satisfaction at the precision, the competence and the wealth of facts of Mrs Lenz's report on relations between the European Community and Romania, a very significant country and very significant indeed for Europe since it is the bridge between Eastern and Western Europe.

On behalf of the Liberal Group I can do no more than express the wish that Mrs Lenz's work will go forward and receive the attention which it merits as a question of such magnitude. And at the same time, I must join with Mr Radoux in deploring that a question such as Romania, and questions of such vital importance as Spain and Yugoslavia, which we are discussing tomorrow, should be discussed last thing at night on the last full day of this session. We have become used to the idea of talking about exotic countries on Mondays and Tuesdays; not that their problems are unimportant but they are a long way from what we are concerned with, outside our jurisdiction and beyond our influence. Romania, Yugoslavia and Spain on the other hand are countries with which our own destiny is closely linked, and I cannot understand why this Parliament cannot put Europe at the heart of its own business. We are neither the League of Nations in Geneva nor the United Nations in New York; we are the European Parliament which is an institution of this continent which should be working for this continent.

As far as Romania is concerned I would like to make only a few very short remarks on the question of policy. Romania has chosen to follow a way to technological development and industrialization which is completely different from that chosen by any other East European country. Romania took this individual,

Bettiza

this unique choice to industrialize and refuse to become the raw materials reservoir, the agricultural hothouse of Comecon, and as a result of that choice Romania also chose its own trading path, which is Western Europe and the European Community. It was a very individual development path to choose. Romanian industrialization is in the forefront of East European technology. In comparison the industry of Czechoslovakia belongs to the 19th century. Poland has troubles of its own which we know all too well. With Romania we can see what the results of intelligent technological development can be when they are applied on a commercial basis and in an efficient way. And of course this individual Romanian type of industrialization is the foundation of the Romanian foreign policy which is perhaps the most unusual and original thing ever to have to come out of Eastern Europe. Romania is not just a bridge between the European Community and Comecon. Mr Ceausescu's policy, carrying on that of Mr Titulescu from the days of the 'petite entente', is a bridge between East and West and it was a very major bridge in the improvement in relations between China and USA. It is a critically important link in the peace treaty between Egypt and Israel. Romania today has diplomatic relations with 137 countries and trading relations with 143. And reaching an agreement with Romania adds to the credibility of the Community too because with the establishment of a Joint Committee Romania is the first Comecon country to recognize and legitimize the existence of a Joint Committee.

The last point I would like to make is to express the hope that this agreement will not go the way the Yugoslavia agreement has gone. Tomorrow you will be hearing about the unfortunate problems of the Yugoslavia agreement as regards baby beef: the Council's action has resulted in an absolutely scandalous situation with Yugoslavia. Mr President, please God the same situation does not arise with the Romania agreement!

President. — I call Mr Almirante.

Mr Almirante. — (I) Mr President, we members of the Italian destra nazionale are also able to give our approval to the Lenz Report and we are delighted at the work of our charming rapporteur, particularly with paragraphs 3, 6 and 7 of the resolution.

With regard to paragraph 3 we feel that we should stress that the economic agreements reached so far between the European Community and Romania are 'a constructive factor for the organization of relations between individual Comecon countries and the Community'. This is critically important. What I mean is that this is precisely the right line, since we cannot accept the Soviet thesis that any relations should be between the Community as a whole and Comecon as a whole, which would of course effectively result in

preventing the Community itself and its ten present Member States from concluding increasingly extensive agreements with those Comecon countries which wish to do so and which need to begin a constructive dialogue with free Europe.

Paragraph 6 'urges the Commission to establish bilateral contractual relations with other Comecon countries' and this appeal is perhaps even more important and just as urgent. We need only think of the situation in Poland and of the political importance which would be attached to agreements between the European Community and Poland if they involved more than simple — and very modest — aid.

In paragraph 7 the hope is expressed that trade with the Comecon countries will give 'particular emphasis to the principle of reciprocity'. And this too is very important precisely because it will enable us to get away from the temporary, from the occasional, from the ambiguous and enable us to establish an economic development and cooperation policy between the European Community and individual Comecon states, or, at least, those states which are free to establish such relations, in other words free to liberate themselves slowly from pressure and exploitation by Soviet Russia.

President. — I call Mr Rieger.

Mr Rieger. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the agreement on the creation of the Joint Committee between the European Community and the Romanian Socialist Republic and on trade in industrial products came into force at the beginning of this year. The report of the Committee on External Economic Relations, which is now before Parliament, contains the detailed appraisal of this agreement, including the political aspect of the development of relations between the European Community and Romania. I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate Mrs Lenz on her excellent work as rapporteur.

Allow me to briefly outline the political significance of these agreements against the background of attempts to arrive at a comprehensive implementation of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. The 1975 Helsinki CSCE Final Act defined the framework for greater cooperation between the European countries, particularly also in the economic sphere. The agreements between the European Community and Romania are an example of how, with patience and determination, the process of détente between countries with different economic systems can be furthered and brought to a successful conclusion.

These days, as the second CSCE follow-up conference in Madrid continues its work, it is useful to show that despite all the difficulties, it is possible not only to

Rieger

strive after but also to succeed in establishing fruitful economic and political relations between the European Community and a country of Eastern Europe. With circumspection, energy and determination the European Community should endeavour to arrive at such agreements with other Eastern Europe countries also. A corresponding initiative by the European Community in the framework of the CSCE discussions could contribute towards this in many ways, particularly when one knows how vital a climate of mutual trust is for such agreements but also for ensuring peace in Europe.

President. — I call Mr De Clercq.

Mr De Clercq. — *(NL)* Mr President, I should like to associate myself with the congratulations to Mrs Lenz, and I should like, very briefly, to stress the importance of the recently concluded agreement between the EEC and Romania. As other speakers have already said, Romania is the first, and so far the only, Comecon country to respond to the Community's offer to strengthen its trading relations with the European Community by way of an agreement. There are grounds for hoping that Romania's example will rub off on other Comecon countries, whose initial reticence as regards direct contacts with the EEC may well disappear if it can be shown that the nature and the practicalities of formal agreements can produce favourable trading results for both sides. We may entertain this hope, then, but we must also do everything in our power to see that the constructive attitude adopted by Romania inspires and stimulates the other Comecon countries to formalize their external economic relations with Europe.

The conclusion of an agreement, Mr President, is a welcome and admirable thing in itself, but it is nowhere near enough. We must make sure that the agreements concluded are respected and properly applied, which is why we attach so much importance to the work of the Joint EEC-Romania Committee. As Mrs Lenz rightly said, the Committee has far-reaching powers covering all aspects of trade and cooperation between the two sides. In addition to its watchdog role, we hope that the Joint Committee will, in the very near future, be in a position to enter into discussions on other problems such as energy supplies, transport, technical and scientific cooperation, and so on.

These matters are not of course incorporated in the trade agreement, but may, at a later time, be the subject of new agreements leading to wider and constructive cooperation between the EEC and Romania, and — let us hope — via Romania with the other Comecon countries.

I should like to conclude, Mr President, by drawing your attention to a specific situation regarding Romania, a situation our Romanian friends are not

entirely happy with. As you know, Romania wishes, for economic and political reasons, to be regarded as a developing country, and as such, applied for the granting of general preferences by the EEC. Romania has been part of this system since 1974, but it would appear that Romania has been clearly discriminated against compared with other countries to which this system likewise applies. Romania does not enjoy the same Community benefits, and this discrimination is all the more keenly felt because they now involve quantitative restrictions on Romanian export products which are of great importance to that country's external trade. I would greatly appreciate it, Mr President, if this House were to urge the Commission to persuade the Council to put an end as quickly as possible to this discrimination against Romania. Despite this blemish on our trade relations with Romania, I should like to reiterate my appreciation of, and full confidence in, the agreements which have been concluded. We hope that they will usher in an era of fruitful trade relations with other Comecon countries.

President. — That is the end of your group's speaking time for today.

I call the Commission.

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — *(D)* Mr President, I share the view of the rapporteur and those speakers who pointed out that the important topic to which this excellent report is devoted would have merited detailed discussion in view of its fundamental significance. I also feel it should be proposed that comparable topics receive equivalent treatment under the rules of procedure so as to avoid misinterpretations.

The agreements between the Community and Romania on trade in industrial products and on the setting up of a Joint Committee, which were signed in Bucharest on 28 July 1980, are indeed of great legal, economic and political significance for relations between both parties. Whereas up to a few years ago legal relations between the Community and Romania were limited to the multilateral framework of the GATT, since 1976 the autonomous trade policy of the two parties has gradually been replaced by contractual agreements with the result that with the exception of the agricultural sphere, all other products, i.e. 85 % of trade, is now covered by mutual agreements.

The setting up of a Joint Committee completed the legal framework and created a classical instrument of trade dialogue which is essential for the development of trade between the Community and Romania. The various agreements concluded between the Community and Romania on textile goods, iron and steel products and other industrial goods have a very specific economic content and lay down well-defined

Narjes

rights and duties for both sides. Of course not all trade questions could be settled, but this agreement created the necessary basis for doing so and opened up tangible prospects of a revival of trade relations between the Community and Romania.

Politically the conclusion of the last two agreements marks an important stage in the process of strengthening and deepening relations between the Community and Romania and provides proof that with imagination, goodwill and above all persistence, the bases can be laid for fruitful cooperation between different social and economic systems.

These agreements which make a concrete contribution to implementing the Helsinki Final Act and form part of the policy of openness and international cooperation pursued by the Community since its foundation; they prove also that in spite of the difficult economic situation it is possible, by adopting a realistic and pragmatic approach to problems, to arrive at bilaterally acceptable solutions to the particular difficulties inherent in trade between the Community and state trading nations as a result of the different systems.

The Commission is convinced that by concluding these two agreements the Community has helped to create an atmosphere of understanding and mutual trust with Romania, which are fundamental prerequisites for the development of economic cooperation and the preservation of peace between peoples. In keeping with the wish expressed by the European Parliament and the Community declaration of 1974 in which it outlined its readiness to negotiate trade agreements with all state trading countries, the Commission is prepared, at these countries request, to consider a strengthening and extension of trade relations and with them to seek appropriate solutions to the particular difficulties which may arise in the sphere of bilateral relations.

In anticipation of the creation of a contractual framework for trade and faced with the peculiarities of such trade the Commission is paying special attention to the development of an independent trade policy with these countries. Thus specific provisions which were applied in 1970 to all third countries, were substantially developed and adapted to state trading countries first in 1975 and again in December of last year.

At present all questions relating to trade with these countries fall within the sphere of Community law and any change in this area is worked out at Community level and approved either by decision of the Commission or of the Council.

President. — I should like to take this opportunity of calling upon the Members of the Commission to help us get through the evening's agenda by midnight.

The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

15. Compensation for victims of acts of violence

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-464/80), drawn up by Mr Luster on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee, on compensation for victims of acts of violence.

I call the rapporteur.

Mr Luster, rapporteur. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it is at this late hour that I have to report to you on a topic which is related to the evident increasing use of violence in our Member States. We are not speaking here of distant places, but of territories within the very competence of this Parliament, because let me point out that the constitutions of the Member States of the European Community unanimously guarantee protection of the basic rights of citizens. However, not even the best police force can totally eliminate crime. Since this is now the reality of our national existence, then it appears to be self-evident that the State should intervene to alleviate the damaging results of its inability to fulfil its constitutional obligations.

Now what happens in practice? Outrage at a crime of violence usually finds expression in efforts to catch the offender, to prevent him from committing further crimes of a similar nature, possibly to rehabilitate him, but also to obtain atonement for what he has done. The victim, however, generally remains in the public awareness for only a short time, usually as an object of sensationalism. In the course of often time-consuming initial proceedings against the offender and in the subsequent trial the psychological agony of the victim is often intensified further. It is therefore no coincidence that since the mid-60s several western democracies have adopted laws designed to guarantee the victims of crimes of violence financial compensation for the injuries incurred.

However desirable such legislation may be, at the present time it is not yet satisfactory. In the first place, not all Member States of the European Community have adopted laws of this type. Secondly, the laws that have been adopted differ considerably from each other. The amount of protection offered to a victim of a crime of violence depends essentially on where he is at the time. Moreover, entitlement to financial aid frequently applies only to the nationals of a given State and only on that State territory. In some cases the individual laws admittedly contain reciprocity laws mitigating the effects of such restrictions, but the prospects for equal treatment for citizens of the Community exercising their right to freedom of movement are still remote. The Member States must therefore enact legislation in accordance with the objectives of the EEC Treaty. The relevant resolution of the Council of Europe of 28 September 1977 would be one way of doing this, however, measures within the European

Luster

Community should not be confined to non-binding resolutions or recommendations. In addition, therefore, an appropriate Community directive should be adopted.

Allow me to say a word on the legal basis for action by the Community in this field. While the Community's powers are only peripheral in the field of criminal law, the problems involved in this instance however, are questions not of material criminal law, but of the general entitlement of an individual to make a claim against society for social reasons. They therefore fall within the overall sphere of 'social security', which, at least for workers, is subject to regulation at Community level under Articles 118 and 121 of the EEC Treaty. If a worker takes up an activity in another Member State of the European Community, he must enjoy the same level of social security as the workers of the host State. Such is the objective of the Treaties. That such social protection extends to all Community workers follows directly from Articles 118 to 128. However this legal framework does not cover all those who might be affected.

(The President urged the speaker to conclude)

Mr President, I will conclude immediately if you just allow me to sum up.

In addition may I refer also to the further legal basis for action by Parliament in the framework of European political cooperation. The conclusion arrived at by the Legal Affairs Committee was that it supported the motion for a resolution deservedly put forward by the Socialist Group, but goes further in as much as it calls for a solution specific to the European Community. This minimum Community solution will obviously not deal satisfactorily with all the problems involved. For this reason, the Ministers of Justice meeting in political cooperation should coordinate their position with a view to pressing, in the Council of Europe, for the implementation of the resolution of the Committee of Ministers of 28 September 1977.

(Applause)

President. — I call the Socialist Group.

Mr Sieglerschmidt. — *(D)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, only a few of the reports discussed in this Parliament can be said to really concern the individual Community citizen and to be of interest to him, and I must really 'congratulate' the Bureau on the fact that very often such reports come before the House at a time when any public response to discussions on them is certain to be avoided:

The Socialist Group welcomes this report and thanks the rapporteur for his work, and it is above all pleased that — as the rapporteur already kindly mentioned —

its initiative is now before Parliament in the form of this report and will be voted on. We hope that the objectives contained in this report will enjoy in Parliament the same approval, which I believe was unanimous, which it met in the Legal Affairs Committee. Ladies and gentlemen, the recommendations of the Council of Europe are a good basis for the legislation still outstanding in those Member States which have not yet become active in this sphere. I use this opportunity, to call on these Member States — without mentioning them, those concerned know well who they are — to adopt such laws as soon as possible. These recommendations are however also a good basis for a legal instrument, a legal act for the territory of the European Community. It is not enough to remain content with recommendations of the Council of Europe, they are, in the final analysis, only recommendations. I am choosing my words carefully here, but anyone who has experience of committee debates, knows this. Should there be any doubts about the legal basis for such a directive — and I myself have expressed such doubts — then agreement should be reached on filling in the European legal area, about which there is so much talk, so that this legal area does not extend only to criminal prosecution but also to the rights of the victims of acts of violence.

On the questions of the proposals for amendment, I should like to state here briefly that I can understand the first proposal for an amendment of the Group of European Democrats, but not the second. I fail to see why the fixing of a minimum guaranteed compensation should not be considered in a positive light.

Finally let me make just one request of the Commission. To Commissioner Narjes, but also to the whole Commission I say: in this case please do not act as the German prosecution likes to act, asking first if it is at all competent in this area. And if it is not, then thank God, it does not need to do anything. Do something on this occasion, help us to progress further! This is not the time or the place to speak of the reasons for the increased violence, but we should all contribute to the implementation here of one aspect of a social union in the European Community.

President. — Mr Sieglerschmidt, you are well aware that the Bureau's principal problem is that there are too many items for too few days. If we were to have continuous sessions like other parliaments, we might manage to get through the items in a normal day's working time.

I call the European Democratic Group.

Mr Price. — Mr President, my group supports the arguments that have been set out so well by Mr Luster in his report. In essence my objective in getting up tonight is to move the two amendments that we have tabled. The first amendment deals with the issue of the

Price

criteria for such a scheme. Now, at the moment, in the report, in paragraph 5 (a), it talks about a Community standard for financial awards and then suggests that there should be something negotiated at Community level. Now, elsewhere in the report, Mr Luster draws attention to the disparities which exist between the existing schemes within the Member States and what is proposed by the Council of Europe. It seems to me that it would be much better now, since the member countries of the Council of Europe which include all the Community countries have agreed on a scheme to take that as a package and to build upon it. Therefore I notice that Mr Sieglerschmidt on behalf of the Socialist Group supports that idea. I hope that the rapporteur may also be able to accept it. It really is very much in line with his own report.

The second amendment deals with the question of whether there should be a minimum compensation payment specified at Community level. I would like to make clear to Mr Sieglerschmidt that there is no suggestion that we should exclude the idea of the schemes containing a minimum payment. The question is whether such a minimum should be set at Community level as the resolution would say if it were unamended. We take the view that if that was specified at Community level it would not take into account different countries. In fact it would probably be one of those factors which make it difficult to get the scheme off the ground, rather the help towards its creation. These sort of minimum payments are very useful in ensuring that the scheme does not involve administrative costs beyond the amount of the award. That is the kind of thing which clearly we want to ensure in order to have a scheme of this sort on a practical basis as soon as possible. We support the general report and urge the House to support the two amendments.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Almirante.

Mr Almirante. — *(I)* Mr President, this motion for a resolution ought to be adopted because it is based on a civilized and Christian principle: compensation for the victims of acts of violence should not just be restricted to those whose attackers are able to pay compensation. More than anyone else, it is our duty as Members representing the Italian National Right to support and adopt this motion for a resolution because there are more victims of acts of violence of all kinds in Italy — unfortunately — than in any other Member State. For this reason, we are all the more inclined to hang our heads in shame when we read in the explanatory statement of the motion for a resolution that Italy is one of the few States which has unfortunately not yet come to grips with this problem. A law was in fact recently promulgated on behalf of the victims of political terrorism, but apart from the fact that it is very unsa-

tisfactory, it is also not being enforced because the pertinent regulations governing its enforcement have not yet been issued, and who knows when they will be. Accordingly, there is a need for the proposals contained in this motion for a resolution to be implemented in all Community Member States. Where our own situation is concerned, we in the Italian Parliament will be paying particular attention to two of the most significant statements to be found in the explanatory statement, and for which we should like to thank the rapporteur, Mr Luster.

The first of these is on page 12, and I quote: 'If a worker takes up an activity in another Member State of the European Community, he must enjoy the same level of social security as the workers of the host State.'

We need only to remember that there are more than two million Italian workers in the various Community countries to grasp the tremendous scale of the problem and to deplore the fact that no legislation in this field has been produced before.

The second statement reads as follows, on page 14:

'Every State is obliged to allow claims under this system, without distinction as to nationality, from all nationals of the Member States of the European Community who fall victim to physical criminal injury on the territory of that State'.

We could speak at great length on this topic, because the system ought really to include criminal acts inspired by political motives such as are witnessed throughout the entire area of the European Community. It is even quite common for citizens of one State to sustain injuries from these acts outside their own country. We really do need to get to grips with this subject as soon as possible; the least we should do is to conclude enforceable agreements between the forces of law and order in Community Member States at the earliest opportunity.

On this occasion, however, we should like to pay tribute to Mr Luster for his motion for a resolution, which is certainly a step in the right direction.

President. — The Commission has the floor.

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — *(D)* Mr President, Mr Luster's excellent report on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee and the attached motion for a resolution deal with an important subject which is unfortunately of recurring topical interest, namely compensation for victims of acts of violence. The compensation problem goes beyond the sphere of social policy, and centres on whether it is possible to create special rights and dues for every single person in the Community, regardless of whether he or she is an employee, self-employed or a tourist visiting a

Narjes

foreign country — in other words, rights which apply regardless of the victim's nationality. For this reason, the Commission welcomes the fact that this subject has been taken up by the European Parliament.

The motion for a resolution set out in part A of Mr Luster's report addresses appeals to the Commission — regarding the submission of a draft directive — and to the Ministers of Justice of the Member States, meeting in political cooperation, concerning the speeding-up of the work of the Council of Europe in this field. The two appeals are closely connected with each other in the Council of Europe. As you know, Resolution No (77) 27 adopted by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe on 20 September 1977 recommended that the Member States should, in harmonizing their national legislation on compensation for victims of acts of violence, bear in mind a number of principles and report back every five years on the measures adopted in implementation of the resolution. The work of the Council of Europe so far has concerned only the problem of a State being responsible for injuries caused by one of its executive authorities. This very month, the Council of Europe's Committee on Criminal Problems will be deciding whether legislation should be drawn up covering compensation for victims of acts of violence. It would be a good thing if the Committee were to decide to draw up legislation along these lines; after all, the Council of Europe is concerned with the protection of human rights and, in view of its wider geographical coverage, is better suited for the creation of a legal framework, which should be as wide as possible, for the protection of victims from the financial consequences of violence.

The Commission takes the view that there is only any chance of its taking this matter up successfully if the Council of Europe fails to reach a satisfactory conclusion in the foreseeable future. That is the only way we can reasonably avert the duplication of work and respond with any conviction to the predictable controversies regarding the legal basis of Community measures. In conclusion, I should like to suggest that the European Parliament's Legal Affairs Committee should, in the foreseeable future, receive a report on the likely state of progress on this matter over the coming months.

President. — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

16. *UK immigration controls*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-573/80), drawn up by Mr Malangré on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee, on the UK Government's proposals for immigration controls.

I call the rapporteur.

Mr Malangré, rapporteur. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, first of all I should like to thank you for giving this subject your attention at so late an hour, and I should like to thank Commissioner Narjes for sharing our heroic European commitment in being present here with us.

The fact that it is only today, one year after the motion for a resolution was tabled, that the report can be submitted to the plenary session, is the fault neither of the Legal Affairs Committee nor of its rapporteur. The delay has instead been caused by the fact that during the course of the committee's work the Commission let it be known that it was attempting to make contact with the British Government with the intention of discussing a series of questions arising from the new immigration laws. As it was possible that the problems which gave the committee cause for concern might be solved or minimized, the committee postponed completion of its work until it became obvious that the discussions between the Commission and the government of the United Kingdom would not be concluded within our time-limit. We would be interested to hear the Commissioner's report on the current state of the discussions.

Turning to the matter in hand, after a thorough investigation the committee came to the conclusion that, although the area of immigration policy remains the responsibility of the individual States of our Community under an explicit agreement and that therefore we are not competent to judge on the matter, nevertheless these new provisions affect freedom of movement within the Community as well as essential provisions of the European Convention on Human Rights. Both the principle of freedom of movement enshrined in Community law and the European Convention on Human Rights are recognized by Great Britain as binding legal principles. This is why the new immigration rules could and had to be reworded in the meantime to produce the present version.

For your information, you will find a number of annexes to the report: the provisions of the new immigration rules which are of particular interest for us in this context, relevant extracts from the Convention on Human Rights, Treaty Law, the Council Regulation of 15 October 1968, the previous relevant case-law of our European Court of Justice and the first report from the committee of the House of Commons. The Legal Affairs Committee has based its decision on this material and has come to the conclusion that, because of the differential treatment of men and women envisaged in the new rules and the limitation on entry envisaged for nationals from one Community country to another, namely the United Kingdom, the new United Kingdom immigration rules may contravene fundamental provisions of the European Convention

Malangré

on Human Rights and the principle of non-discrimination enshrined in our Community law.

This observation refers to the amendments to the provisions made by the British Government after the motion for a resolution was tabled. Admittedly our Court of Justice has not given any decision on a case connected with these new immigration laws, as the short time that has elapsed has meant that this has not been possible, but it would be in line with its established and uniform case-law to extend its previous principles to the present area as well, particularly as it is not peripheral regulations of our Community law which are concerned, but the cornerstones of Community life — freedom of movement and non-discrimination — which are affected.

The motion for a resolution submitted to you by the Legal Affairs Committee was adopted unanimously by the committee on all points. Its contents also agree with the decisions of Parliament on woman's role in the Community and on freedom of movement in the Community. Therefore, on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee and my group, for whom I also have the honour of speaking, I should like to ask for your approval and to express the hope that the result of our statement will encourage a change in the content of the bill which at present is under discussion in this field in Great Britain.

President. — I call the Socialist Group.

Mr Megahy. — Mr President, may I first of all congratulate Mr Malangré on his very clear and concise report. It is a great pity, however, that this matter has been so long coming before this Chamber. It was first raised in November 1979, and I was one of the signatories to the original resolution. Indeed it is an indication of how far behind we are in the work of this Parliament that the actual report passed through the Legal Affairs Committee last October.

Nevertheless it is concerned with important subjects. The rules have now, in fact, come into force — they came into force on 1 March. However, the issues involved in these immigration rules are still a matter of live debate in the United Kingdom and are very much intertwined with those of the Nationality Bill which, in fact, is going through the United Kingdom Parliament at the present time. In all the arguments that have been heard in relation both to these immigration rules and also to the present Nationality Act, the British Government has always been particularly sensitive to charges that these rules were not free of sex discrimination and racial discrimination. Nevertheless I think that those Members who have studied the report and the annexes will realize from the evidence that has been given, the judgments of the European Court in relation to the implementation of aspects of the Human Rights Convention and also the evidence

presented by people like Lord Scarman and Anthony Lester, QC — and all the experts were united in their view — that the Human Rights Convention was, in fact, being breached.

Attempts are being made — and I only raise this because of the European Democratic Group's amendment which tries to suggest that some action may possibly be forthcoming — to show that the Nationality Bill at present before the House of Commons is not sex-discriminatory. These attempts are based on the argument that in the bill it stipulated that foreign husbands and wives are both subject to the same residence qualification of three years. However, this is where the immigration rules come in. It is precisely these rules that would prevent foreign husbands coming to Britain in the first place to be able to clock up their necessary three-year residence. There is no suggestion that I have seen from the British Government that they intend to alter the immigration rules or even to alter the Nationality Bill to take cognizance of these facts.

This report is rather late in going through this Parliament, as Clause 4 of the Nationality Bill will be coming before the House of Commons shortly. Nevertheless, it is still important that the view of this Parliament is known before that comes before the House of Commons because these two matters are interrelated. Mr Malangré has, of course, indicated the implications for the bill of the EEC's rules on freedom of movement. I can think of a case, for example, of a woman who was born in Uganda. The whole of her family, including eight brothers and sisters, are resident in the United Kingdom, and yet she has had permission for her fiancé, who was also born in Uganda and is working quite legally in Germany, refused because of these immigration rules. If this matter is taken before the European Court of Human Rights, then in my view there would have to be a judgment against these immigration rules. I see them as contrary to the rules of free movement inside the EEC.

There is another matter, of course, which is raised here — Mr Malangré refers to it on page 6, paragraph 5. That is the question of dependent relatives. He does not go into detail here, but I think this is very important because, in fact, this usually refers to older women and therefore is sex discriminatory in practice and also strongly racist because the people most often involved are Asians from Asia or East Africa. The reason it is sex discriminatory is because elderly dependants have to show both that they are dependent and that they enjoy a standard of living lower than that in the country they are resident in. Now if you think of the countries that many of these people come from you can see how discriminatory that is.

Of course the British Government has not given many facts and figures on how many are affected by the foreign husbands' rule. It seems that something like a

Megahy

thousand to two thousand applicants a year are involved, but you have got to multiply that by two because, obviously, there are two partners involved. This is based on the fact that nearly three thousand successful applications per year have been made in recent years. The numbers are not too large to cause widespread concern about race relations but they represent a very large number where the rules are in contravention in my view of the Human Rights Convention.

Two final points, Mr President. Mr Malangré notes at the top of page 7 the United Kingdom Government's argument that marriages are arranged solely to circumvent immigration rules. The question of arranged marriages is very important in the report, yet nowhere have any figures been published on arranged marriages. If this is the nub of the argument why in fact have no figures been produced on it? I would suggest that, in fact, there is very little genuine evidence to support the fact that this is a matter of prime concern and should be included in the rules.

There are many other aspects which one could touch on, Mr President. I realize that time is running out. It has taken some time for this to come before the European Parliament. I think Mr Malangré has put his finger quite precisely on those points of concern and in particular has referred to the fact that the EEC has a definite interest with regard to these immigration rules. I hope that, although we are speaking rather late in the day, nevertheless this report will be adopted and that the view of the European Parliament will be heard in Westminster and that at least some of the damage can be repaired where the present Nationality Bill is concerned. I hope that, in fact, some action will be taken with regard to the rules, although I do not accept the view of the European Democrats that the evidence is already available. However, I hope that when this report goes through there may well be second thoughts.

President. — I call the European Democratic Group.

Mr Prout. — Mr President, my group welcomes this report, so ably prepared by Mr Malangré, and we congratulate him on the way in which he has so patiently pursued the facts. We note the statement contained in the motion for a resolution that the United Kingdom immigration rules may contravene the European Convention on Human Rights and, further, that they may contravene the principle of non-discrimination enshrined in Community law. We would only wish to point out that, equally, they may not. The Legal Committee through its rapporteur has wisely, in our view, decided not to take a definitive position upon what is a highly contentious issue in law. And it could, indeed, form the subject-matter of litigation in both the European Court in Luxembourg and the Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg. I should

like to observe in concluding that the Nationality Bill, to which Mr Megahy referred, currently being debated in the United Kingdom, may lead to some further modification of the rules in question.

President. — The Liberal and Democratic Group has the floor.

Mr De Gucht. — (NL) Mr President, the Liberal and Democratic Group wholeheartedly supports Mr. Malangré's report.

Very briefly, I have the following comments to make. Firstly, the principle of free movement and the consequent principle of non-discrimination are an essential aspect of European jurisprudence which cannot be disregarded for specific eventualities. Secondly, the immigration legislation affects mainly non-white women, and as such, looks very much like xenophobia, a syndrome which we must be very much on our guard against in this economic crisis and to which we must under no circumstances succumb. Thirdly, with certain individual exceptions which affect every race, it is an affront to human dignity — and especially to non-white women — to maintain in general terms that they enter into marriages of convenience.

Mr President, investigation of this problem has shown on a number of occasions that there is a gap in the system of non-discrimination. The regulation of 1968 enshrining the right of settlement for the family of someone working in another Member State discriminates against subjects of this Member State working in another Member State, for whose family the right of settlement does not necessarily apply, or at least not to the same extent. In view of the Court of Justice's judgment to the effect that Community legislation must not give rise to discrimination against a Member State's own subjects, and in view of the principle of freedom of movement for workers, I would call on the Commission to draw up a proposal for plugging this gap.

I should like to conclude, Mr President, by expressing my wholehearted support for Mr Malangré's report.

President. — I call the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

Mrs Ewing. — Mr President, I must thank Mr Malangré for highlighting what, to me, seems to be a clear example of sexual discrimination. I think Mr Prout almost had a legal tongue in his cheek tonight in making what can only be regarded as a very apologetic legal defence for something that really amounts to one Member State taking a step backwards in the matter of sexual equality when we have just managed to take a great step forward. This is really not to be tolerated. I

Ewing

hope that Parliament tomorrow will very firmly reject the Conservative amendment and adopt the report as a token of its condemnation of the discrimination being shown by the Member State to which I belong.

Could I illustrate the discrimination very simply with a case which the National Council for Civil Liberties have brought before the European Court of Human Rights. It concerns a Ugandan woman, born of Ugandan parents, with a family, closeknit, all in Britain and all British including herself, two married brothers, and a married sister. Now all of these people are British but this girl is engaged to an Indian student studying music in Germany. She may not, as of right, bring her fiancé or husband, back to live with her in Britain. If it was a male Ugandan student engaged to an Indian girl studying music in Germany, the position would be otherwise. How can any person with common sense say that there is no sexual discrimination here?

I would also suggest, as the proposals virtually prevent a British woman not born in the UK, or whose parents who were not born there, from living there with her foreign husband that this must also be regarded as contrary to the principle of the freedom of movement of persons laid down in the EEC Treaty. So there are two grievances.

I would like to pass to a related matter, immigration rules being closely connected with nationality laws, and talk about the plight of our own EEC officials. One would think that all Member States would have nothing but admiration for officials who choose to give their lives to the service of the Community. If they have children, the chances are they will be born and live in the country of residence, which is most likely to be Luxembourg or Belgium. Does it not seem extraordinary that these people are about to be disadvantaged by the proposed Nationality Law? Of all people, surely EEC officials should not be disadvantaged.

I would like to give an example of this. Children born of EEC officials, some of whom are now of university and marriageable age, who themselves have children cannot automatically pass on their nationality to their children.

Now that seems to me quite an extraordinary proposition for Britain to be asserting at this time when surely we should be encouraging our EEC officials. Admittedly, the proposed law allows discretion and this discretion would apply in the case of a continuing close tie by the parents, that is to say by the EEC official and spouse. But I would say that discretion is no substitute for a fundamental right, and that discretion could be lost through no fault of the children.

For example, the parents may be killed in a car accident — not so unusual these days — or a parent may remarry or divorce and decide to settle in the Commu-

nity. And why not? Why should they not do this? Surely we are envisaging a great deal of cross-fertilization of our populations within the Community. So surely this must be against the spirit of the Community. I think it is necessary that the present law be retained by which a person with at least one grandparent born in the UK can pass on nationality to a second generation. We are actually going to have a situation for some of our EEC officials, if this law is passed, where they will have no nationality at all in certain instances. Surely that is not a fitting reward for a lifetime of service to the Community. Some people are even considering the absurdity of repatriating to Britain pregnant wives so that they may have their children there and not run this risk. Surely this is absurd. So for all the reasons mentioned I would support the report and ask that the Conservative amendment be rejected.

President. — I call the Commission.

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (D) Mr President, the Commission is grateful for Mr Malangré's balanced, knowledgeable and circumspect report; it is particularly helpful because the Commission takes the problems of immigration very seriously and is therefore grateful that this problem should be discussed in the European Parliament and be made the subject of a resolution.

The Commission has taken note of the motion for a resolution and of the report, and is at present energetically pursuing its discussions with the British authorities. The British Nationality Bill, which received a second reading only a short while ago, features in these discussions. The Commission departments will carry out a final inquiry into the legal situation before long, so please do not expect me tonight to anticipate the result of this inquiry and the preceding negotiations and discussions. But the honourable Members may be assured that we will institute the customary proceedings if our final inquiry should find that the British immigration law and the rules laid down for its implementation contravene Community law.

President. — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

17. *Disturbance of the Community apple market*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-757/80), drawn up by Mr Curry on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on disturbance of the Community apple market.

The rapporteur has the floor.

Mr Curry, *rapporteur*. — Mr President, a lot of debates in this Chamber take the form of a war between Member States. Unfortunately, perhaps, the majority of these debates take the form of warfare between the British and the French. One thinks about lamb, and one thinks of fish at the moment. This report on apples, Mr President, is not intended to be a prolongation of that warfare. It is intended instead to be a contribution to the peacemaking of which we are so much in need.

There are two parts in this report. The first part takes the form of an analysis of the demands and arguments which have been put forward by representatives of the British apple industry. It would have been terribly easy for me to have accepted the whole lot, to write a report which would have led to palm leaves, or at least Cox's orange pippin leaves, being strewn at my feet in the United Kingdom and being told what a splendid fellow I was. I have not done that. In fact, I have specifically rejected the argument that the system of intervention should be extended. I have specifically rejected the argument that withdrawal prices should be related to production costs rather than to market prices, because that would open the door to the escalation of costs. I have rejected any call for the escalation of costs. I have rejected any call for the interference with trade in the Community, and I have rejected the automatic assumption that continental growers are being subsidized and that the competition must be unfair because, in this particular sector they have an advantage over our own growers.

What I have done, Mr President, is to call for proper information on this very tendentious issue of aid. The truth of the matter is that we very rarely know what the extent of aid being given to anybody is. The Commission keeps the thing a very carefully guarded secret on the grounds that it would cost too much to publish the lot, and this lack of information perennially bedevils the whole of the discussion of the agricultural sector because we do not know where we stand. Quite often we find ourselves arguing over subjects of which we have virtually no information, and the sooner we are able to see a comprehensive list of the aid the sooner we will know where we stand.

My recommendations, Mr President, are designed to improve the whole operation of the apple market. In particular, they are designed to provide a breathing space for the British apple industry which has recently made very substantial efforts to put its house in order. We quite often assume in the United Kingdom that, by some strange sort of communication with the Almighty, we are the only people in the Community who know how to farm. The fact of the matter is that there are certain sectors in which we have things to learn from other people, and apples is very much a case where we have things to learn from our continental neighbours. One of the purposes of this report is to give us the time in order to learn those things and to put our house in order.

My report calls specially for a much more stringent monitoring of control of the gradings systems. The surplus of apples in the Community, Mr President, is almost entirely accounted for by the continued presence on the market of apples which should never be offered for sale. I have walked around the markets of Strasbourg, and I have walked around the markets of Saffron Walden, where I live, and in both of these towns there are rotten apples for sale which, if they were domestic appliances, porcelain or textiles, would be sent straight back to the maker at his own expense as wholly unsuitable to put upon the market.

I call also for a reworking of the calculations which govern the price paid in intervention to take account of the reality of trading patterns in the Community. I do not know who would benefit, but the system has been so changed and chopped and altered in recent years, Mr President, that it no longer has any rational base, and I ask that a rational base should be restored to it.

Finally, I call for a rigorous enforcement of the practice of intervention, for while I defend the system I am not prepared to defend abuses of it. It should not be used as a conventional tool of marketing. It is there as a safety net. I also identify the need to find uses for apples which do not meet the requirements of the market, and I am thinking in particular of juicing. The report also encourages the production and marketing of a variety of apples to meet consumer tastes and climatic needs. It is no part of Community policy and Community ambitions to produce an apple which is as standard as a ballbearing and which has the same uniform taste whether you were buying it in Salerno or Salonica or, as I said, my own town of Saffron Walden.

Now I know that certain colleagues are worried about the import situation. I have made some inquiries on this score. Imports this year are unlikely to exceed the average of between 340 and 360 thousand tonnes which the Commission believe is the level that the market can absorb. These do not replace Community apples. Community apples go into intervention in the main because they are part of a quality or variety which fails to meet the consumers' needs. Imported apples in fact sustain consumer interest, and the statistics prove they actually sustain the price of a domestic variety because their arrival pulls up the price of domestic apples. But I do agree that in a situation which is neither genuine free trade nor clear guidelines for the limitation of trade, fears are certainly justified and that clarification is called for.

Mr President, I will conclude by saying that my aim is a vigorous industry on both sides of the Channel promoting varieties which climate and taste commend to the market and to give the consumers a choice at reasonable price throughout the year and permitting the Community to rejoice in this diversity, not this

Curry

uniformity. I beg to move my report which was accepted unanimously by the committee.

(Applause)

President. — I call the European Democratic Group.

Mr J. D. Taylor. — Mr President, I must follow your advice and speak very quickly in the few moments available to me. I would immediately congratulate my colleague Mr Curry on a very well-balanced report on what is a particularly sensitive issue in the United Kingdom. Both our soft eating-apple, the Cox's Orange Pippin, and our main cooking-apple, the Bramley apple, are under great strain in our country, and I especially am concerned about the position of the Bramley apple, because it is the main apple in Northern Ireland. The main section of Bramley apple production in the United Kingdom is concentrated in the province of Northern Ireland, where we have some 10 000 acres of orchards, most of which are under Bramley apples.

Very briefly, I would direct the Commissioner's attention to the points made by Mr Curry in relation, first, to national aids for apple crops in some parts of the Community and, secondly, to the effectiveness of the present inspection that is carried out, because we in the United Kingdom can compete, but we must ensure that there is fair competition throughout the Community. I would also direct the Commissioner's attention to paragraph 4 of the motion where we have the ingenious suggestion by Mr Curry of a new form of intervention price for all varieties, which would be based on a market price commanded by the French-grown Golden Delicious, plus costs of transport to the market.

Whilst the Commission are considering that, I would in the interim appeal to them for urgent attention to the whole question of the Bramley apple intervention coefficient. This should be increased to about 1.2, because just as the Golden Delicious is the large soft apple, so is the Bramley apple the large cooking-apple. Secondly, as I have said, Bramley apple production in the United Kingdom is concentrated in Northern Ireland, a region with 20 % unemployment tonight. With such a gesture the EEC could operate very quickly to support a concentrated agricultural production in Northern Ireland and ease the unemployment situation.

I understand that the United Kingdom Government submitted several months ago a proposal to the Commission that the coefficient for the Bramley apple should be increased, and I should like the Commissioner to explain why there has so far been no response by the Commission to increase this coefficient. Secondly, I should like to know whether it would be possible to extend the proposed time-limit of

31 May this year for the operation of the intervention scheme for this season's crop. It will be imperative to have this date extended because of the late marketing of the Bramley apple this year and the large stock of apples which are still in store. I wonder whether that suggestion will receive some approval from the Commission.

Finally, I refer in my final minute to the proposal on juicing. We had a report on juicing from my colleague Mr Johnson in the spring of last year. It was approved by this House: it then went to the Council of Ministers. The proposal was that we should restrict additives, critic acids and lemon juice, and have pure apple-juice. Until that happens, the apple-juicing industry in Northern Ireland, based on the Bramley apple, cannot compete. If we are competing with artificial additives we cannot compete successfully. I would like to know what has happened to that document, proposed by the Commission in 1979. Has the Council not yet considered it? If so, why is there no decision by the Council? Which countries are opposing the Commission's proposal, which was supported by Parliament? If the Commissioner tonight is not in a position to give me a reply, I would request him to write to me to explain the present position on this juicing problem, so that I can convey the information to our producers in Northern Ireland.

President. — I call the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Martin. — *(F)* Mr President, the report by Mr Curry stemmed partly from our motion for a resolution which stressed the effects that apple imports from the southern hemisphere would have on French producers. But we have noticed that Mr Curry seems unaware of this aspect and has confined himself to dealing with the problem simply from the point of view of French apple imports into Great Britain. At the same time he has ignored the serious consequences that the enlargement of the Community would not fail to have for fruit producers, and not only those in the Mediterranean regions.

Our amendments are intended to correct the gaps and omissions in the report, at the same time guaranteeing a profitable income to producers and protecting them from excessive imports. It is from this point of view that we propose raising the level of reference prices, and applying an import schedule which limits access to the EEC market for certain products, in accordance with seasonal requirements.

We also ask that this report on apples be extended and complemented by a general study on the situation in the fruit and vegetable market, which gets very little benefit from Community financing and which as a whole is badly protected against imports from third countries.

President. — The Commission has the floor.

Mr Dalsager, Member of the Commission. — (DK) Mr President, I cannot perhaps be as brief as is my wont, as I feel bound to comment on some of the questions which have been raised in the course of this debate.

I do not think it will come as any great surprise when I tell you that the Commission does not entirely agree with your analysis of the causes of the disturbance on the Community apple market, nor with your proposed solution. However, there are a number of points the Commission can go along with, and I should like to discuss these very briefly.

Firstly, I should like to give this House an assurance that the Commission has in the past taken a number of measures designed to stabilize the apple market. The first of these was to ban the sale of Grade 3 apples on the fresh fruit market. Secondly, the new preventive withdrawal system will come into force once there is a substantial surplus on the market, and this gives us the chance to do more planning and to minimize or do away entirely with wastage. Thirdly, the basic price and the withdrawal price are set at a uniform level for the period from January to May so as to prevent speculation. Fourthly, the coefficients are reviewed constantly in the light of market developments. And fifthly and finally, the minimum size of the bigger sorts of apples on the market was increased with effect from 1 January 1981.

I have some comments to make on a few points in the motion for a resolution. Firstly, I should like to say that the Commission fully supports the efforts the United Kingdom is taking to improve its competitive position and the promotion and marketing of its products. As a result existing Community legislation — principally Regulation No 355/77 — it is up to the United Kingdom's producers and government to request support for improving sorting, packing and marketing processes and for the utilization of apples in various forms for industrial purposes.

Secondly, and in the light of the possible enlargement of the Community, the Commission is considering what should be done to improve checks on grading. Quality control is important, but I do not think we can go very far in the direction of grading apples by taste and so on, given the very wide variations in consumer preferences. Under no circumstances should these quality norms constitute a barrier to trade within the Community, neither for the Member States' own domestic trade nor for trade between Member States and third countries.

On the question of plant health provisions, I should like to remind the House that Directive No 77-93 aims to abolish, step by step, the checks carried out by the importing Member State. Let me repeat — thirdly — that the Commission is constantly reviewing the need

to revise the coefficients in the light of price trends on the Community market.

Fourthly, the Commission, as the institution responsible for ensuring that the terms of the Treaty are respected, is obliged to investigate any form of national support which may come to its notice. If it feels that a particular form of support does not comply with the terms of the Treaty, the Commission is duty bound to take action to remedy the situation.

Fifthly, I should like to draw your attention — in the context of some of the amendments which have been tabled — to the fact that the Community's market organization and regulations governing trade outwardly respect the principle of Community preference. The vast majority of apples are imported from countries in the southern hemisphere in the period from March to August. There have been no major increases in the quantities imported since 1974, and the selling price of these apples is well above the Community reference price. It is up to the Member States themselves to make sure that quality norms are adhered to, and to monitor import prices on the market. The Commission is currently engaged in examining ways of improving the checks on fruit and vegetables in all the Member States.

I apologize, Mr President, for having taken a little longer than is usual, but I thought it necessary to draw your attention to the fact that the Commission is well aware of the problems raised in this report.

President. — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

18. *Situation in the Community wine-growing sector*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc.1-680/80), drawn up by Mr Colleselli on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on the present situation in the Community wine-growing sector.

The rapporteur has the floor.

Mr Colleselli, rapporteur. — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, let me say first of all how much I deplore the fact that I am obliged for the second time to present this report — which in my opinion suggests practical solutions to vital problems and arouses justifiable expectations in all those involved in this problem in Community countries — at this late hour of the night. This has happened, despite the promises from the Chair at the end of the part-session in Luxembourg, when I was told that this item would be given due prominence on the agenda of this sitting.

Colleselli

Let me say at the outset that this report does not contain any message or abstract philosophical ideas. We have spent a long time deliberating and discussing this topic in the Committee on Agriculture, as it directly affects at least 3 million workers in the wine-producing sector in Community countries, representing a total market volume of wine in excess of 15 million tonnes. I need hardly spell out the amount of money involved in such an enormous volume of business, as I am quite sure that all of you are capable of working it out for yourselves.

Mr President, this report on the present situation in the Community wine-growing sector — which I have the honour to present on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture — was approved by the same Committee after detailed discussion. I feel it merits a few introductory remarks here tonight.

'There has never been so much talk about wine as there has in the last ten years, with all aspects — economic, political, medical and gastronomic — being discussed. Whether man or woman, non-expert or connoisseur, tippler or teetotaler, surely no-one in Europe can possibly ignore it.' These words are the opening remarks of a well-produced and informative booklet entitled 'Wine in the 1980s', published by the Agricultural Information Service of the European Community.

The above words are a suitable premiss for anyone — such as Members of this Parliament — wanting to tackle this question in a responsible and effective manner, as they express the scale and immediacy of the problem while evoking its many facets.

My report neither ignores nor contradicts the Commission document, nor the measures decided on by the Council which are summarized — for whoever wishes to consult them — in section B of the explanatory statement on pages 8 and 9 of the report; if anything, it confirms their validity on the technical, administrative and social levels, as they are provisions covering the period up until the end of 1986, and hence are valid long-term measures which will begin to have an impact only after a few years.

The proposals contained in my report, therefore, envisage short and medium-term measures which are more urgent in character, owing to the situation in the wine-growing sector, which remains extremely serious, with very substantial stocks and very low quotations.

I should like to thank all the members of the Committee on Agriculture and the representatives of the relevant Community bodies who offered me their help and advice. Their contributions were useful as well as enthusiastic, and provided a basis which enabled me to draw up the proposals in this motion for a resolution. This is no abstract text; on the contrary, I took great care to base it on the advice and opinions

which I gathered from a wide circle of people actually involved in the most representative wine-growing areas throughout the Community. I worked from the basic assumption that the policy on wine is an integral part of the common agricultural policy and not a sector apart.

As the statistics in the report reveal, the annual wine production of the Community now exceeds 150 million hectolitres. The major concerns and legitimate aspirations of three million workers in all categories of employment in the wine-producing sector are tied up with this production. So you can see what tremendous social and economic interests are vested in it.

Faced with the accession to the Community of countries like Greece, Portugal and Spain — all of which have very high levels of wine production, Spain alone producing 50 million hectolitres a year — it is quite understandable that we should be calling for suitable and clear-cut measures to regulate the production and marketing of Community wine.

We feel we are justified in believing that the measures and provisions proposed in the motion for a resolution now under discussion — and which I trust will meet with the firm backing of this Parliament — will be seen by these countries as an impetus to constructive thinking and to timely structural adjustments, so that we can avoid circumstances and unrealistic ideas which do not reflect the actual situation in the Community wine-growing sector now or in the future.

Although the 1980 harvest was not so abundant as the 1979 harvest, it is likely to make the crisis in the wine sector deteriorate still further, as consumption has been falling off steadily. The situation is particularly grave in France and Italy, which are the countries which have the highest levels of production and consumption.

The present crisis is also exacerbated by the persistence of obstacles to intra-Community trade, particularly in the area of taxation, given the very high excise duties in certain Member States, which are levied in flagrant violation of the Treaties and the regulations authorizing the free circulation of wine. Added to this are the difficulties encountered in exporting wine to third countries.

We must act swiftly to introduce stringent measures to stop the adulteration of wine and to eliminate fraud, we must organize and finance campaigns to promote the export of quality wines, and we must take steps to counteract the general campaigns to combat alcoholism which are directed against wine. Wine is after all an agricultural and alimentary product of high repute, and should not be confused with aperitifs and other alcoholic products!

Colleselli

Having taken due account of other proposals which may be swiftly implemented in the short and medium term, bearing in mind the limitations of the 1981 budget appropriations, we should endeavour to devise the instruments needed to bring about a steady improvement in the production and marketing structures, especially in cooperative or even private wine-growers' associations, both through greater recourse to the provisions of Regulation No 355/77 and through specific sectoral aid measures such as the gradual elimination throughout the Community of the practice of adding sucrose to must, so that sucrose is replaced by concentrated musts.

The proposed measures can avert the expected or foreseeable delays and difficulties in applying the 1980 special measures, and can reduce the threat of financial and commercial crisis which results from the accumulation of surpluses.

(Applause)

President. — May I ask the House whether we should continue until we get to the end of the agenda or whether we should close the meeting now at midnight.

I call Mr Dalsass.

Mr Dalsass. — *(D)* There is just one thing I should like to know, Mr President.

I am not supposed to be allowed to speak because my group's time has run out. However, the time at midnight runs out for all the groups. Why should other Members be allowed to speak now? If you are going to call other speakers, Mr d'Ormesson and I also ask leave to speak. If you agree, I shall start.

President. — The question of speaking time is settled among the groups, so this is something on which you should consult Mr Klepsch. Your group's speaking time was already used up by about half past nine this evening. That is not my fault.

I call Mr d'Ormesson.

Mr d'Ormesson. — *(F)* Mr President, a debate on wine in the middle of a crisis in the wine-growing sector is an important matter. It is already a disgrace that we have not got round to it until ten minutes to midnight. Either all the groups get a chance to speak or I shall ask for the debate to be ended!

President. — Mr d'Ormesson, I would advise you to talk to the chairman of your group. It is the group chairmen who agree the speaking time for the whole week and draw up the timetable for the whole week.

I call Mr Sutra on a point of order.

Mr Sutra. — *(F)* Mr President, I am raising this point of order to remind the House that on Monday, when we adopted the agenda for this part-session, I stood up and pointed out that the Colleselli report had been ready in time for the January part-session but was not included on the agenda and had then been deferred to February when we had no time to consider it. I am asking the House not to consider matters where we do have some power of decision as the European Parliament at ten o'clock on a Thursday evening. I think it is high time we put Parliament in order, instead of wasting whole weeks discussing matters on which we have no power. I am not saying we should do away with debates on human rights, but I do not like it when they stop us discussing matters on which we are required to give an opinion for the people of Europe.

(Applause)

President. — Mr Sutra, I shall gladly take a vote on whether we should now bring the proceedings to a close. First of all though, I call Mr Dalsager.

Mr Dalsager, Member of the Commission. — *(DK)* Mr President, we do not normally stand on our rights, but the Commission would like to continue the debate. The Commission sets great store by the European Parliament's opinion on the various proposals, and I would respectfully ask that the Früh report — which I am sure this House will associate itself with — be left on the agenda for debate tomorrow immediately following the requests for urgent procedure. The reason I make this point at this particular time is because the Commission and the Council are relying on Parliament to give its opinion in good time so that it can be taken into account in the proper manner in the Commission's and the Council's deliberations. I would therefore ask you, Mr President, to ensure that this report is at least debated tomorrow in this House.

President. — I shall transmit your request to the member of the Bureau who will be in the Chair tomorrow morning.

I call Mr Oehler on a point of order.

Mr Oehler. — *(F)* Mr President, I was due to speak for four minutes. As a result of your attitude I shall be voting against this report tomorrow.

President. — It was not I who agreed that the Thursday sitting should be closed at midnight. The agenda is drawn up by the chairmen of the groups, not

President

by the Bureau. Your criticism should therefore be directed at Mr Glinne and not at me.

I call Mr Frangos on a point of order.

Mr Frangos. — (*EL*) Mr President, we are all extremely concerned about the Colleselli report and my country, Greece, has a particular interest in the matter. The facts of the matter are known, and there are a lot of points for discussion. I therefore call upon you to ensure that the first item on the agenda for tomorrow morning is the continuation of the debate on the Colleselli report.

19. *Urgent procedure*

President. — I have received from Mr Vandenmeulebroucke and others a motion for a resolution, with request for urgent debate pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure, concerning a permanent framework for negotiations between Parliament and its staff.

The reasons supporting this request for urgent debate are contained in the document itself.

The vote on the request will be held at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

20. *Agenda for next sitting*

President. — The next sitting will be held at 9 a.m. tomorrow, Friday, 13 March 1981, with the following agenda:

- calendar of part-sessions
- decision on the urgency of two motions for resolutions
- Hoffmann report on decisions to be taken by the Council in the transport sector
- joint debate on two motions for resolutions on Spain
- motion for a resolution on Poland
- motion for a resolution on Chile
- motion for a resolution on the Law of the Sea
- motion for a resolution on the Afghan refugees
- motion for a resolution on the cooperation agreement with Yugoslavia
- motion for a resolution on the joint Council meeting
- continuation of the debate on the Colleselli report on the situation in the wine-growing sector
- Kirk report on catch quotas for 1981
- Provan report on bovine livestock
- Früh report on certain less-favoured areas of the Federal Republic of Germany

Votes.

9 a.m.: vote on requests for urgent procedure

10.30 a.m.: vote on motions for resolutions on which the debate has closed

after 10.30 a.m.: the motions for resolutions will be put to the vote at the end of each debate.

The sitting is closed.

(*The sitting was closed at 12.15 a.m.*)

SITTING OF FRIDAY, 13 MARCH 1981

Contents

1. Approval of the minutes: Mr Pannella; Mr von der Vring; Mr Blaney; Mr von der Vring; Mr Enright; Mr Bangemann	255	● Luster report (Doc. 1-464/80): Compensation for victims of violence: Mr Luster, rapporteur	273
2. Agenda: Mr d'Ormesson; Mr Klepsch; Mr Bangemann; Mr Klepsch	256	Explanation of vote: Mr Megahy	273
Procedural motion: Mr von der Vring	256	Mr Luster	274
Mr Bangemann	256	Adoption of the resolution	274
3. Date and place of part-sessions: Mr Enright; Mr Pannella; Mr Rogers; Mr von der Vring; Mr Bangemann; Mr Dankert; Mr Enright; Mr Schmid; Mr Estgen; Mr Pearce; Mr Kellett-Bowman; Mr Pannella; Mr Kellett-Bowman; Mr Fischbach; Mr Blaney; Mr Rogers; Mr Harris; Mr Enright; Mr Pearce; Mr Bonaccini; Mr Sutra; Mr Herman; Mr Sutra; Mr Estgen; Mr Mart; Mr Forth	257	● Malangré report (Doc. 1-573/80): UK immigration controls: Mr Malangré, rapporteur	274
4. Decision on urgent procedure: Mr Bangemann; Mr Rogers; Mr d'Ormesson; Mr Glinne	265	Explanations of vote: Mr Tyrrell; Lady Elles; Mr Seal	274
Procedural motion: Mr Moreland	266	Adoption of the resolution	275
Mrs Baduel Glorioso; Mrs Van den Heuvel; Mr Pannella; Mr Calvez; Mr Pannella; Mr Israel; Lady Elles; Mr d'Ormesson; Mr Pannella; Mr von der Vring; Mr Vandemeulebroucke; Mr Bangemann; Mr Boyes; Mr Arndt; Mr Doublet; Mr Pannella; Mr Glinne; Sir James Scott-Hopkins; Mr Vandemeulebroucke	266	● Curry report (Doc. 1-757/80): Community apple-market: Mr Curry, rapporteur	275
Procedural motion: Mr Alber	270	Explanations of vote: Mr C. Jackson; Mr Patterson; Mr Penders; Mr d'Ormesson; Mr Sutra; Mr Wedeking; Mr Israel	276
5. Votes	270	Adoption of the resolution	277
● Prag report (Doc. 1-460/80): Linking work and training: Mr Prag rapporteur	270	6. Decisions on transport to be taken by the Council by the end of 1983 — Report by Mr Hoffmann (Committee on Transport) (Doc. 1-951/80): Mr Seefeld, deputy rapporteur	277
Adoption of the resolution	272	Mr Albers; Mr Janssen van Raay; Mr Moorhouse; Mrs von Alemann; Mr Doublet; Mrs Ewing; Mr Pannella; Mr Dalsager (Commission)	278
● Lenz report (Doc. 1-678/80): EEC-Romania relations: Mrs Lenz, rapporteur	272	Consideration of the proposal for a draft resolution: Mr Seefeld	284
Explanations of vote: Mr Bonaccini; Mr Pannella; Mr Radoux	272	Adoption of the resolution	284
Adoption of the resolution	273	7. Attempted coup d'état in Spain — Joint debate on motions for resolutions by Mr de la Malène and others (Group of European Progressive Democrats) (Doc. 1-978/80) and by Mr Glinne and others (Socialist Group), Mr Klepsch and others (Group of the European People's Party), Mr Fergusson and others (European Democratic Group), Mr Fanti and others (Italian members of the Communist and Allies Group) and Mr Bangemann and	

others (Liberal and Democratic Group) (Doc. 1-8/81):

<i>Mr Israel; Mr Lückner</i>	284
<i>Mr von der Vring; Lord Douro; Mr Pannella; Lord Douro; Mr Bonaccini; Mrs von Alemann; Mr Pannella</i>	286
<i>Procedural motion: Mr Patterson</i>	289
<i>Mr Beyer de Ryke; Mr Glinne; Mr Pasmazoglou; Mr Haralampopoulos; Mr Damette; Mr Bourmias</i>	289
<i>Procedural motion: Lord Douro</i>	292

<i>Mr Oehler; Mr Papaefstratiou; Mr Natali (Commission)</i>	292
<i>Explanations of vote: Mr Plaskovitis; Mr Peponis; Mr Kappos</i>	294
<i>Rejection of the de la Malène et al. motion</i>	295
<i>Adoption of the Glinne et al. resolution</i>	295
8. <i>Dates of the next part-session:</i>	
<i>Mr Langes; Mr Alber</i>	295
9. <i>Approval of the minutes</i>	295
10. <i>Adjournment of the session</i>	295

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

Vice-President

(The sitting opened at 9 a.m.)

President. — The sitting is open.

1. *Approval of the minutes*

President. — The minutes of proceedings of yesterday's sitting have been distributed.

Are there any comments?

I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (F) Mr President, yesterday's minutes, on page 23, last line but one, state that Mr Pannella and Mr Nielsen raised points of order. For once, Mr President, I was entitled to give an explanation of vote, and it was therefore for that purpose that I asked for the floor. On the other hand, the minutes state on page 29 that 'the following spoke: Mr Coutsocheras, on behalf of the Greek members of the Socialist Group, Mrs Viehoff and Mr Pannella'. I wish to point out that I was given the floor, not for an explanation of vote but to raise a point of order.

President. — Mr Pannella, the minutes will be corrected accordingly.

I call Mr von der Vring.

Mr von der Vring. — (D) Mr President, speaking from the Chair, Mr Dankert told us yesterday that a proposal concerning the venues of part-sessions for the rest of this year would be submitted to us today in writing. I find no such proposal among my documents and would like to reserve the right to come back to this later. I should not like to see a new situation arising here by default.

President. — The text in question appears on page 11 of the minutes submitted for your approval. The promise made yesterday by the Chair has therefore been kept.

I call Mr Blaney.

Mr Blaney. — Mr President, with regard to the calendar of meetings for the year, could the Chair tell us under what form this matter is to be taken this morning? Is it a motion for a resolution or is it merely a matter of information? If the latter, does the Parliament have to approve or reject it? I am puzzled by the fact that this item has not been tabled either as a written motion or a proposal and circulated before the sitting began. I would be very grateful if the Chair could clarify whether the first item on the agenda this morning is a motion, a proposal or merely a communication.

President. — I have already given my reply on this point to Mr von der Vring. All other explanations can be given when we reach this item on the agenda.

I call Mr von der Vring.

Mr von der Vring. — (D) Mr President, I merely wish to make sure that your last remark, that an explanation can be given when we reach this item on

von der Vring

the agenda, relates to the statement contained in the minutes that a vote on this item is due to take place at 9 a.m.

President. — That is the case.

I call Mr Enright.

Mr Enright. — The minutes state, on page 13, that Mr Forth has suddenly come from Luxembourg and been granted Luxembourg citizenship.

Secondly, can the President inform us how we can ask for amendments to be made to the proposal from the Bureau about the part-session? I understand that Mr Estgen quite properly has put down an amendment. I certainly did so myself yesterday, and I was given to understand that it would be voted upon.

President. — The powers of the Chair are limited: its occupant cannot change Members' nationality or their sex. . .

For the rest, we shall come back to the matter in a few moments and we shall see what is the most correct procedure.

I call Mr Bangemann.

Mr Bangemann. — (*D*) Mr President, your last remark to Mr Enright gives me an opportunity of asking you to tell the House that a proposal from the Bureau can only give rise to counter-proposals, not to amendments.

President. — That is what Mr Dankert said yesterday when he was presiding over the sitting.

Are there any other comments?

The minutes of proceedings are approved.¹

2. Agenda

President. — I call Mr d'Ormesson.

Mr d'Ormesson. — (*F*) Mr President, I wanted to speak on last night's proceedings, but I will give way to my Group chairman.

President. — Mr Klepsch accordingly has the floor.

¹ For information on documents received, see the minutes of proceedings of this sitting.

Mr Klepsch. — (*D*) Mr President, the Colleselli report, which is very important, could not be dealt with yesterday. In view of its importance, I would request, on behalf of my Group, that if at all possible we place it at the beginning of the agenda for the next sitting — that is, that we debate it on the Monday of the extraordinary part-session before we take the fisheries debate. It is out of the question that we should try to deal with it today in the last quarter of an hour.

President. — I call Mr Bangemann.

Mr Bangemann. — (*D*) Mr President, much to my regret, I regard this proposal as unacceptable since it does not conform to the Rules of Procedure. A rapporteur can always demand that a report be referred to committee and also ask that it be placed on the agenda of the next sitting, but according to the Rules of Procedure the agenda can no longer be changed on the basis of an oral request. I am very sorry to have to oppose this request.

President. — I call Mr Klepsch.

Mr Klepsch. — (*D*) Mr President, the rapporteur agrees with me, but on this occasion, in order to give full satisfaction to the finer points of the Rules of Procedure, I would ask you to put the question to the rapporteur, Mr Colleselli.

President. — So far the rapporteur has not asked for the floor. We have heard one speaker for and one speaker against.

(Parliament adopted Mr Klepsch's request)

I call Mr von der Vring on a point of order.

Mr von der Vring. — (*D*) I am sorry, Mr President, I only wanted to point out that Mr Bangemann was not speaking against but was only giving us a lesson on the Rules of Procedure.

President. — That is a point for the minutes. I imagine that Mr Bangemann himself will take care to see that what he says is correctly recorded.

Mr Bangemann. — (*D*) Of course, Mr President, but not the way Mr Pannella does it!

(Laughter)

3. Date and place of part-sessions

President. — The next item is the adoption of the calendar of Parliament's part-session.¹

Yesterday the President conveyed to the House the enlarged Bureau's proposals concerning the dates and place of part-sessions for the rest of the year. I would remind you that this list is to be found in the minutes of proceedings of yesterday's sitting, which were approved a few moments ago. The President also stated that amendments to this proposal were inadmissible.

In addition to the amendment tabled by Mr Enright, which would make Brussels the venue for the part-session of 23-24 March, I have an amendment tabled by Mr Estgen, Mrs Lentz-Cornette, Mr Fischbach, Mr Hamilius, Mr Mart and Mr Abens, which would make Luxembourg the venue for this part-session and would defer the fixing of venues for the Parliament's part-sessions during the second half of 1981 until it has been informed of the Council's proposals concerning the seat of Parliament.

As was stated by the Chair yesterday evening, these amendments are not admissible at this stage of the proceedings, it being understood that any Member is entitled to table a motion for a resolution on the basis of Rule 2 (2) of the Rules of Procedure. I call Mr Enright.

Mr Enright. — I must say, Mr President, that it seems to me that the Bureau is showing about as much sensitivity as a herd of elephants attempting a ballet dance on ice. Surely it is quite possible for us to vote separately upon each individual part-session and I would like to ask the House to do so. I can find absolutely nothing in the Rules of Procedure concerning the President, the Bureau, the Parliament or the voting which says that the Bureau's proposals must be presented as a package and voted on in their entirety and cannot be amended.

(Applause from various quarters)

President. — Similarly, there is nothing in the Rules which states the contrary.

(Laughter)

I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — *(F)* Mr President, I should like to call to witness the occupant of the Chair at yesterday's

sitting, Mr Rogers, who, I am certain, stated that when the Bureau's proposals were announced, the House would be entitled to amend them. That is word for word what Mr Rogers said, I am quite certain. I remember particularly well because this procedure seemed to me suspect. . .

Well then, I noted the fact and I recall it now, because it was solely because they relied on this announcement of Mr Rogers that Mr Enright and others decided to postpone their demands until today. The Chair would do well not to contradict itself, particularly to this extent, within the space of a few hours!

President. — I call Mr Rogers.

Mr Rogers. — Mr President, I am in a very difficult position. . .

(Applause from the European Democratic Group)

. . .because I have to sit here all day and look at Conservatives.

(Laughter)

One thing I did not realize, Mr President, is that Conservatives could see at all!

As you know, I held a quite different view from other members of the Bureau on this matter, and maybe as a result of that I have quite a different understanding of what the ultimate decision was. As I understood it, as I communicated it yesterday to the House, and as Mr Enright quite rightly repeated this morning, the decision of the enlarged Bureau was that we would submit the dates to the House; but at the meeting I suggest that, because the House had overturned the previous agreement with the staff, it would be rather foolish to suggested a venue and that we should leave it to the House to decide where we should meet. It was claimed that we must make proposals under the rules, to which I replied, in that case let us propose that the part-sessions be held either in Strasbourg or Luxembourg, and let the House decide between them. Eventually it was decided that one place should be suggested, but if there were any alternative proposals from the floor of the House, they would be considered. Now that is the cycle of events at the meeting, and that cannot be denied. If necessary, I am prepared to refer to the transcript.

I do not want to speak in this debate; I have spoken at length in the Bureau on the matter; but I really believe that Members have to participate in the decision-making process. I think the lines of communication are bad. The Bureau is losing credibility because it has not got good lines of communication, and I think that now we really have to let the Members decide. It is no good our making decisions and then having the House overturn them, Mr Bangemann! You cannot run a

¹ For petitions and requests for urgent debate, see the minutes of proceedings.

Rogers

Parliament like a regiment of soldiers, and if Members express wishes about how things should be done that is the way it has got to be done.

(Applause from various quarters)

President. — I call Mr von der Vring.

Mr von der Vring. — *(D)* Mr President, in view of the decision the procedure adopted by the Bureau is very strange. But I cannot deny that, because of the odd structure of our Rules of Procedure, your decision is in order. I should simply like to point out that this is further proof of the need for this point to be settled during the revision of the Rules of Procedure, because it is absurd, Mr President, for you to have to refer to Rule 2 (2), which concerns Parliament's seat, even though everyone realizes this is a baseless provision which is not worth referring to.

President. — Personally, I share your view that the Rules of Procedure are in need of a reform.

I call Mr Bangemann.

Mr Bangemann. — *(D)* Mr President, the House should not have the impression that the enlarged Bureau wishes to prevent it from taking a decision which it is entitled to take. This discussion in the enlarged Bureau is very fresh in my memory, as it probably is in that of Vice-President Rogers. Several Members, including myself, said during that meeting that we felt the House must vote on the Bureau's proposal.

(Interruption)

We are going to. That's not the point!

No one objects to a vote here this morning. As regards the content of the Bureau's proposal, I shall not advocate in the Bureau a place which I know does not have the support of the majority of the House, because I do not want to see another split like the one we had last month.

We shall vote on this now. But I would ask you one thing, and in this I agree with the Chair. The House should not make things too easy for itself, but accept this responsibility as the Bureau does. That is to say, in a case like this one cannot simply make minor adjustments but must put forward a different proposal, and this has already been done. We shall vote on the alternative proposal put forward by Mr Enright, and we shall do so in accordance with the procedure proposed by the President. In this way we can deal with the matter quite openly. This is a reasonable decision for the House to take. But a Vice-President, who should be putting forward the views of the members of the

Bureau — that is his duty, Mr Rogers, unless I have the wrong idea about the duties of a Vice-President — should not create the impression that he is not doing his duty properly in the enlarged Bureau by saying in this debate that the enlarged Bureau does not want this House to decide. We do want the House to decide!

Furthermore, I personally have no idea how to run a regiment of soldiers: I have never been a soldier in my life, though I am quite willing to learn from you. At all events, as a Vice-President you would do better to help prevent a split between the Bureau and the House than to add fuel to the fire.

(Applause from various quarters)

President. — I call Mr Dankert.

Mr Dankert. — *(NL)* Mr President, as a Vice-President I am slowly beginning to wonder what the House hopes to achieve with this discussion. As far as I know, the Bureau and the enlarged Bureau do not yet meet in public. Perhaps they ought to, but they do not at present. So there can be no check on discussions such as that between Mr Rogers and Mr Bangemann. The House has no means of establishing whether what they say here corresponds to what they may have said in the Bureau. As a matter of principle, therefore, I consider such discussions out of place.

President. — Indeed, it is not good to allow a discussion to take place on the internal deliberations of the Bureau.

I call Mr Enright.

Mr Enright. — Mr President, you said that there was nothing in the rules stipulating that we could vote separately on each part-session; but we do have a precedent, because in January we adopted Strasbourg for July but failed to adopt Strasbourg for February. We took a separate vote then. That is the only precedent we have. Therefore, I would suggest that we can take a separate vote on each part-session.

(Applause from certain quarters)

My amendment that we should have the extra part-session in Brussels can quite easily be reasoned against, but I would just like to hear the Bureau reason against it. The whole purpose of that amendment is to ask the Bureau to explain its decisions to this House. That, I think, is very important, because, as Mr Bangemann rightly said, the Bureau is accountable to this House.

(Applause from certain quarters)

President. — I call Mr Schmid.

Mr Schmid. — *(D)* Mr President, the politically unlikely event of Mr Bangemann and myself agreeing has occurred. I shall therefore refrain from speaking.

(Laughter)

President. — I call Mr Estgen.

Mr Estgen. — *(F)* Mr President, I entirely agree with what Mr Bangemann has said, but I should like to point out to him that Mr Enright was not the only one to table a motion for a resolution. The Luxembourg Members of this Parliament have tabled another motion for a resolution, which I should like to see put to the vote.

President. — I call Mr Pearce.

Mr Pearce. — Mr President, I have the greatest possible respect for the way you preside over our meetings and for the way in which you are presiding over this meeting at this moment. But in view of the fact that there is, on all sides of the House, widespread dissatisfaction with the way the Bureau is conducting its affairs, and in particular as regards the venue of sittings of the Parliament, in my opinion the President of the Parliament, Mrs Veil, owes it to the Members to be present here, now, while our discussions are taking place. It is, after all, she who presides over the Bureau that has got us into this muddle, this state of general dissatisfaction. It is apparently she who is presiding over the proposal, which you have read out, to thrust an indivisible package of ideas at the Members and so prevent them from expressing their views in the way they want. I do not think it is right that you, Mr President, should be expected to sit there and read out the decision of a Bureau which meets behind closed doors. We have elected Mrs Veil President of this Parliament. I believe that she should be here. I think it would demonstrate the point that Mr Bangemann and others have made, that the Bureau and the President of the Parliament are responsible to the Members. All 434 of us have the same rights and we will not accept these decisions taken behind closed doors for reasons which are never explained to us.

I would, therefore, like to suggest that this matter be put off till 10.30, and that at 10.30 Mrs Veil be asked to come here and explain the decisions over which she has presided. It might also constitute a precedent for a practice that some of us would like to see, namely, that the President of Parliament should be here on Friday mornings to hear what we think about the running of our Parliament. I hope, Mr President, that you do not find this in any way a discourtesy to your

presidency at this moment. I do not mean that at all. I wish that Mrs Veil would come here as President of the Bureau and as President of the organization as a whole.

(Applause from various quarters)

President. — Thank you, Mr Pearce, for that expression of confidence, but the Bureau is a body marked by collegial solidarity: the occupant of the Chair represents the whole of the Bureau and I cannot accept the suggestion that the Bureau is in any way divisible or that the conduct of sittings is modified in the light of circumstances or wishes expressed. I shall therefore not renounce the task that has been entrusted to me.

(Applause from various quarters)

I call Mr Kellett-Bowman.

Mr Kellett-Bowman. — Mr President, if this is indeed a debate I would like to give notice that I wish to give an explanation of vote at the appropriate moment, but would you please tell me just when that might be?

(Loud laughter)

President. — Certainly.

Mr Pannella, you have already spoken three times and there must be no privileges accorded to anyone in this House, even to you. Nevertheless, I will give you the floor once more, but for the last time in this debate.

Mr Pannella. — *(F)* Mr President, I do not think a Member should be allowed to speak, even once, in contravention of the Rules of Procedure; but if he has any observations to make on these Rules — and in fact I have, as I shall show you in a moment — or on errors possibly committed by the Chair, he can speak five times or even ten times, in full conformity with, shall we say, the accepted practices of this House.

Mr President, you said just now, with regard to this debate, that what was at issue was Rule 2(2). I merely wanted to say that this rule implies the existence of a resolution, a case which does not apply here since we are being confronted with proposals. What is more, it would require an absolute majority of the current Members of Parliament. Since you referred to Rule 2 (2). I wanted to remove this source of misunderstanding.

As you see, my intervention is on a point of order. For the rest, I am in favour of Luxembourg but I shall make my explanation of vote when the right opportunity occurs.

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, allow me to clarify the situation.

The Bureau, in conformity with the mandate entrusted to it, has drawn up a calendar of the part-sessions for the rest of the year. This calendar was announced to the House yesterday, and subsequently Mr Enright and others declared their intention of tabling amendments.

This calendar, I repeat, is to be found in the minutes approved this morning, and I can, if necessary, read it out to you. Yesterday evening, the occupant of the Chair, Mr Dankert, declared inadmissible any amendments which would modify one or another element in this calendar. This applies to Mr Enright's amendment and also, of course, to that tabled by Mr Estgen and others.

That is the Bureau's position as announced yesterday and obviously I have not other course today but to maintain it. If any Members consider — and perhaps not without reason — that this raises a problem of procedure, they might be well advised to refer it for discussion to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure. In any case, as one of our colleagues has suggested, a problem of this kind might well be usefully studied in the course of the reform of the Rules of Procedure.

As for those who legitimately ask what the House can do, I would reply that the House has two possible courses. I shall shortly be putting the proposed calendar of part-sessions to the vote, and obviously the House can decide for or against. If the proposed calendar is rejected, the Bureau will have to bear this rejection in mind and, after due discussion, draw its conclusions: these conclusions I cannot, of course, anticipate. The occupant of the Chair yesterday pointed out, and I now confirm, the possibility open to those desirous of proposing a modification under Rule 2(2): the tabling of a motion for a resolution. So far, no such motion has been tabled. Incidentally, such a motion, to be adopted, would need a majority of the current Members of Parliament.

From the legal point of view, the situation seems to me perfectly clear, even if one or another Member, very understandably, finds it regrettable. The present occupant of the Chair can only conform to the line of conduct laid down yesterday, of which he is, so to speak, the heir and executor.

(Applause from various quarters)
(Parliament adopted the enlarged Bureau's proposal)¹

I can now give the floor for explanations of vote.

I call Mr Kellett-Bowman.

Mr Kellett-Bowman. — I thought it would take place before the vote, as is our custom, but I am getting a little bit lost this morning. I voted against the Bureau's recommendations, Mr President, as a protest against the shoddy and shabby way in which the relations with staff are conducted on our behalf by the Bureau.

(Applause from certain quarters)

In no way do I question the primacy of Parliament in these matters, but I would remind Members that the institution is really a partnership between the elected Members and our staff. They form part of the institution. There is a spirit of confrontation amongst some Members in this House; they reckon that the staff are paid sufficiently to be told what to do. They also travel just as we have to travel.

As far as pay is concerned, I do not think anybody is paid sufficiently to be treated without consideration. And as far as travel is concerned, if we are going to use the *ennui* of travel as an argument for trying to settle our place of work, we must not be surprised if the problem of travel rubs off on the staff themselves. Mr President, we must treat the staff with consideration; they should not be used as pawns in our disputes as to where our working place should be, nor in our dispute between the House and the Bureau.

(Applause)

President. — In accordance with the wish expressed by the Staff Committee, the Bureau has appointed some of its members to get in touch with that body. The first meeting took place yesterday afternoon; a second will take place next Tuesday in Brussels. A consultation procedure has therefore already been launched along the lines that you indicate.

I call Mr Fischbach.

Mr Fischbach. — *(F)* Mr President, there were four fundamental reasons for my voting against the calendar presented by the Bureau.

In the first place, I believe that, having called upon the Council and the governments of the Member States to take a decision on the seat of the European institutions, including Parliament, by 15 June of this year, it is wrong for Parliament to pre-empt the final decision by seeking to change the status quo at this stage.

Secondly, I voted against the Bureau's proposal because I feel that it does not take into account the legitimate interests of the staff. In fact the Bureau, as the executive body, is as much failing in its responsibilities to the staff this year as last. It is all too often

¹ See the minutes of this sitting.

Fischbach

overlooked that the officials of Parliament, and the same goes for Community staff in general, are not elected representatives but full-time employees of Parliament, who are fed up with Parliament deciding time after time to hold their meetings and part-sessions in places far removed from the administrative centre and far removed from their families.

Mr President, I also had a third reason for voting against the Bureau's proposal. Compared with the system of part-sessions alternating between Luxembourg and Strasbourg, its proposal would entail a much higher cost — I will say no more than that, this being neither the time nor the place to go into figures — which it would be difficult to justify in the eyes of public opinion.

Finally, Mr President — and this is perhaps the fundamental reason for my voting against the Bureau's proposal — it is precisely because the wish expressed just now by the majority of the House, particularly in the wake of the oral amendment introduced by Mr Enright, is unclear, even ambiguous, in the sense that those who have now voted for Strasbourg might just possibly have strengthened the case of those who in fact are neither for Luxembourg nor for Strasbourg, but in favour of the Community's legislature and executive sharing one and the same working place.

President. — With regard to the staff, I can only confirm the reply I gave a moment ago to Mr Kellett-Bowman.

I call Mr Blaney.

Mr Blaney. — I also voted against the calendar presented by the Bureau, not because I firmly believed it was utterly wrong but because of the manner in which it has been put before this House by the Bureau, which, let me remind the House, surely can only be regarded as the agents of Parliament. I think it is absolutely ridiculous and scandalous that we should have been told from the Chair at approximately 6 p.m. last night that here was a calendar for the next nine months.

I disagree with this method of introducing such an important matter. I do not agree with the Chair, with all due respect, Mr President, to you this morning, or with the statements of the Chair yesterday, that no amendments should or can be made to this list of proposed sittings. Nor do I agree with the further argument that, because nothing in the Rules provides for such amendments, no amendments can be made. The rule should be, as it is in other assemblies, that amendments can be made. If we are not given a written record of the proposal then we should be able to make these amendments orally when the list is presented. I disagree with all this.

I am also against meeting here in Strasbourg until we get a transport system in and out that is worthy of Parliament. I disagree further on the basis that no proper consultation took place with the staff as promised almost a year ago, when we found ourselves in much the same situation of confrontation with the staff as we do now. Promises were given by the Bureau at that time which we have not upheld. We promised to consult; we promised to hold, as from then, special part-sessions in Luxembourg in addition to scheduled part-sessions. We have not lived up to that; we have not consulted; we have been ham-fisted, and we now find ourselves in difficulties. So we must now take the rap. But the proposal before us is not the way out, and I therefore vote against it.

President. — I call Mr Rogers.

Mr Rogers. — Mr President, I abstained in the vote, and I did so because of the different interpretations given yesterday. I think I should perhaps explain to those who were not here. First, however, I would say to Mr Blaney that when he was called to speak just after 3 o'clock he was not present. If he had been present, he would have heard me say that it was possible to put down amendments. If one looks at the written record of yesterday's sitting — I have not got it in front of me but I have a very good memory — one will find that I did say that the proposals would be put and that if Members wanted to put amendments they could do so. Mr Enright and others have acted on that basis. Mr Dankert, in all fairness to him, received at 6 o'clock something that I should probably have had at 3 o'clock, which was a written communication to read to the House. Mr Dankert then produced another interpretation, i.e., that it was a block situation that was going to face the House. That was the reason why I spoke earlier, and that is the reason why I abstained.

However, while giving my explanation of vote, I must say that I am glad I abstained, because of the sheer cant, hypocrisy and humbug that some Members are now participating in. The very Members who are performing now are the same ones who broke the agreement with the staff. It was not the Bureau or the enlarged Bureau that broke the agreement. Mr Kellett-Bowman talked about shoddy and shabby ways of treating the staff. This Parliament treated the staff shoddily and shabbily by turning around and breaking the agreement reached with the staff that two part-sessions out of six would be held in Luxembourg and that every other extra part-session would be held in Luxembourg. That was the agreement reached with the staff last year, and you reneged on that agreement. Every individual Member of Parliament who voted for all the part-sessions to be held in Strasbourg broke the agreement. Mr Enright may have tabled the motion, but his motion was carried by the votes of Parliament. It was Parliament that broke the agreement with the staff, and not the Bureau.

President. — I call Mr Harris.

Mr Harris. — Mr President, I would like to explain why I voted against the motion and I would particularly like to take up the points just made by Mr Rogers. I voted against for two reasons. First of all, I feel that today's decision by the Bureau will in some way pre-empt the very important decision on the seat of Parliament.

The second reason, I think, is just as important, and here I come to Mr Rogers. It is to show my total disgust with the way in which the Bureau system works, or rather does not work, in this place. Mr Rogers has accused the House of reneging on an agreement made with the staff. The trouble is that we, the ordinary Members of the House, do not know what the Bureau is up to. Indeed, I suspect the Bureau itself does not know what it is up to. The point I want to ram home is that there must be accountability by the Bureau to the House. The Bureau must inform the House and the staff. I endorse what was said earlier by Mr Pearce. I believe the President should have been here today, because who does speak for the Bureau? Surely if there is one person, it must be the President. She must speak to the Members, and in my opinion she should have spoken to the Members today and explained the situation, explained what was happening, explained the practicalities of holding a part-session here in Strasbourg and the difficulties that would arise if we went to Brussels or indeed to Luxembourg.

There must be accountability; there must be communication — better communication — between the President and the Bureau, the staff and the ordinary Members — the backbenchers — who are here first thing on Monday and will be here last thing today. We are important; we do not make as much noise as Mr Pannella, but we are here and we demand to be at least informed.

(Applause from various quarters)

President. — Indeed, we must also improve liaison between the Bureau and the Assembly.

I shall report your remarks to the Bureau.

I call Mr Enright.

Mr Enright. — Mr President, I voted against for exactly the same reasons as Mr Harris. We have had no explanation whatsoever from the Bureau as to why they chose Strasbourg for all the part-sessions. It may be perfectly justifiable, but we have been given no justification whatsoever. Mr Rogers, in his capacity as Vice-President, has just said that we made an agreement with the staff. The whole problem with the staff is that we have made no agreement as a Parliament:

the Bureau has made an agreement, but it has not explained that agreement to this House. The staff have no proper channels of communication with the Bureau. That is precisely why we, as backbenchers, are extremely disturbed. As you have just said. Mr President, the Bureau really must be accountable to the Parliament as a whole and not to individual parts of it.

Finally, Mr President, I thank you for your courtesy this morning in telling us that the Bureau had, in fact, set in train the lines of communication with the staff and I wonder if you could further inform us which members represent the Bureau and speak to the staff.

President. — I call Mr Pearce.

Mr Pearce. — I voted against this motion for two groups of reasons. One is again a desire to mark the discourtesy with which we think the Bureau treats the Members of this Parliament. I sometimes think the Bureau acts like a lot of dictators, meeting behind closed doors, and I am going to enquire in the future whether there is a rule that prevents ordinary Members from attending Bureau meetings to find out what these clever chaps actually do behind their closed doors. Because I think the system stinks, and I think it should be changed.

Mr President, you explained to me earlier why Mrs Veil could not occupy the Chair, the reason being that it was your function to occupy the Chair at this moment. And I am delighted to see you there. If that is the problem, she could sit here with us. That might not be such a shocking thing, that she should actually sit with us and see what the table looks like from down here. And if there is not a chair over there, Mr President, there is a spare chair next to me, because my neighbour is not here. I should be delighted to welcome Mrs Veil to sit here with me, and I think it would be for both of us a very interesting experience.

(Laughter)

The second reason, Mr President, for my voting against this motion is the constitutional point that we seem to be slipping into accepting Strasbourg as the sole place where the Parliament meets. I do not intend to reopen the whole argument here about this, but I think it should be put on record that this decision taken by Parliament today in no way constitutes a precedent. It cannot and must not be taken that the fact that we are going to meet in Strasbourg for the rest of this year is any reason why we should continue to do so in the future. And I hope that that point is firmly understood.

Finally, Mr President, you kindly referred to the team of thinkers representing the Bureau in negotiations with the staff. Mr Enright asked you if you would name the members of the Bureau who are doing that,

Pearce

and perhaps in due course, Sir, you will do so. When you do, would you also confirm to me that the person who was appointed by the Bureau to lead this consultation team on its behalf was not present yesterday afternoon at its inaugural meeting? And if that is the case, could you explain to me why that person was not present?

President. — I can give an answer on this point. In accordance, incidentally, with the Staff Committee's wish to have a small number of Bureau representatives as negotiating partner, the Bureau appointed three of its members: Mr de Ferranti, Mr Jaquet and myself.

As I have already said, the first meeting with a delegation from the Staff Committee took place yesterday afternoon and a further meeting is to be held on Tuesday at Brussels.

I call Mr Pearce.

Mr Pearce. — Mr President, you kindly answered part of the question. You did not confirm to me whether all of the three members whom you have now named were present yesterday. I wonder if you would be kind enough to do that.

President. — A report will be submitted to the House.

I call Mr Bonaccini.

Mr Bonaccini. — (*I*) Mr President, on behalf of the Italian Communists I wish to protest at the quite disgraceful turn of events in this affair, particularly as we did everything necessary at the time to prevent it.

At the time, faced with what I have described as a disgraceful turn of events, we voted in favour of the proposals put forward by the Bureau so as to ensure at least a minimum of logic in the positions adopted in this matter by Parliament and the Bureau.

Having said that, we must make it absolutely clear that we regard as utterly deplorable the way in which the negotiations with the staff are being conducted, remembering that the staff has considerable justice on its side and that it should be given a free hand to act as it thinks best. We should refrain from subjecting them to subtle pressures or to cruder forms of intimidations, as we believe is happening at the moment. We hope that whatever differences there are will be resolved. As regards the seat of Parliament, the Italian Communists have always maintained a very definite attitude and I believe our Parliament should also look with a critical eye at its own conduct in the matter. If we have not always been successful in stating our wishes clearly and decisively, perhaps this might be the time to spur ourselves on to do two things: firstly to decide finally

what we really are looking for, and we can only reiterate what we have said previously on many occasions, and secondly to set up a framework for negotiations with the staff that is worthy of our times and of our societies.

President. — I call Mr Sutra.

Mr Sutra. — (*F*) Mr President, we are unfortunately in this debate confusing two issues which should be kept quite separate. We have heard many speakers against. I thought I saw a large majority for.

I would like to say that there is nothing shameful in having voted for. As I see it, democracy means delegating responsibility. Everyone of our groups has a group chairman and a group bureau. We entrust them with the day-to-day running of our groups and it seems natural to me that in an Assembly like ours we should have a President and a Bureau. I should not like us here to adopt an excessively 'grass-roots' approach which would mean our having to keep tabs on everything ourselves.

As far as our calendar is concerned I think we can place our trust in the Bureau which we elected. If the Bureau we elected does not perform to our satisfaction, well then after two and a half years it will be changed and we can speak out against those who might have let us down. But so long as it is in office, let us leave it to get on with its work and with managing Parliament! . . .

Mr Herman. — (*F*) Bravo!

Mr Sutra. — (*F*) It is now after ten o'clock. We have just spent an hour on futile arguments which are of no concern to anybody but the 434 Members of this Parliament and a few thousand officials who work in it. Last night we did not even have three minutes to spare for a debate on wine-growing, a matter that concerns three million people in the Community! I know we have a problem as regards relations with the staff, but we have a Bureau that is responsible for dealing with it. If it does it badly we will pass judgment on it at the end of its term of office.

I should like the Bureau to have the best possible relations with the staff and to do its job. As far as I am concerned the elected Bureau has our confidence until such time as we pass a vote of no confidence in it. If there have to be altercations between the staff and Parliament, let them not spill over into a special session that concerns millions of farmers in Europe! There are twelve part-sessions a year. Let them choose some other time so that we can avoid falling into the trap that some would like to see us fall into of causing friction between peoples.

Sutra

Finally, Mr President, a word on the order of business. On Monday, when we adopted the order of business for this session, I pointed out that in the preceding part-session we only got to those subjects over which we have power of decision and which matter to the citizens of Europe at the night sitting on Thursday. It has been the same this week. Of course I want the European Parliament to be the sounding-board for all human rights problems in the world; of course I think that the fact that we do concern ourselves with these problems is important for democracy throughout the world — we carry a lot of weight with public opinion — but for this to prevent us from working on those things that concern us directly, well, there is something wrong there! The group chairmen should give us an order of business which lets us get on with our work!

(Applause from various quarters)

President. — I call Mr Estgen.

Mr Estgen. — *(F)* Mr President, I voted against the proposal for a number of reasons. First of all, because I find the procedure we are using quite unacceptable. We are in fact completely at odds with the Rules of Procedure. What we have now voted through is in no way covered by the Rules of Procedure, quite the contrary. As Mr Sutra quite rightly said, we have given the Bureau authority to manage the business of this Parliament. The Bureau consults us on a proposal, that is quite democratic, but what is not democratic is to reject a counter-proposal put forward by the Members themselves!

For example, I cannot see how, Mr President, you could immediately put the Bureau's proposal to the vote when you have on your desk another proposal by the Luxembourg Members which goes further and says 'For goodness' sake, let us not vote now on the venue for part-sessions in the second half of the year'. Why? Because we have given the Council of Ministers a deadline to come to us here with a proposal on the seat of Parliament.

We all know that right at this very moment the Ministers are in the middle of some tough negotiations on this question. We also know that they are ready to come here to present their case to us within the time limit we gave them. We know perfectly well that the Council is disposed to enter into a dialogue with us in order to establish better contacts with this Parliament. So, what do we do? We again go back on our own undertakings: We set a deadline, but we do not wait for it to pass, instead we make a hasty decision on a matter that has yet to be formally submitted to us.

But that is not all. It has been said 'We have delegated our powers to the Bureau'. And that is quite true, this same Bureau has also been negotiating with the staff.

It gave an undertaking to the staff and we cannot say: 'It's not us, it's the Bureau!' It is we, not the Bureau, who gave an undertaking to the staff. For example, we have decided to hold the special part-session, due to commence on 23 March, here in Strasbourg. What does that mean? It means that more than 1 000 people, that is to say more than 1 000 officials, members of staff, will have spent five weeks out of seven away from their homes. But they have an official place of work, which is Luxembourg. We, who have so often in this very Chamber pleaded the rights of workers and the obligations of employers, do not even stand by our commitments to our own staff, and that is quite deplorable.

And another thing. We are all very much aware of the accusations of wastefulness being levelled against us these days in the European press. We must defend ourselves against these attacks and we must prove our willingness to save public money wherever possible. We know full well that the forthcoming special session is going to cost 12 million Belgian francs more than it would have done had it been held in Luxembourg. And for what? Let no-one say 'Well, it affects the Members just the same', because that is not true. The Members have to travel in any event. And let no-one say 'The office accommodation is better here in Strasbourg than in Luxembourg', because the next part-session will be an amendments session and every responsible Member will be spending the entire part-session in this Chamber in front of his electronic machine, pressing buttons to vote on the hundreds of amendments. The quality of the office accommodation is therefore going to be irrelevant for this part-session.

But the decision taken by the majority today is far more serious in its implications. In effect we have decided that the small nations will always be relegated to the background even when their vital interests are at stake. That I find equally unacceptable, Mr President. What we need is for this House to be inspired by a European federalism, and in that regard, too, I deplore the decision we have taken today.

President. — I call Mr Mart.

Mr Mart. — *(F)* Mr President, let me say first of all that I am speaking not just on my own behalf but also on behalf of Mrs von Alemann. I entirely agree with what has just been said by my Luxembourg colleagues, Mr Fischbach and Mr Estgen. I would add that in my view the majority of Members in this House are unaware of the difficulties being experienced by the staff at the present time. As Mr Estgen said, out of five working weeks they are spending three of them on the road. Now these people have exactly the same right to a private life that we have. It is not enough for Members of Parliament to uphold the trade unions in their own country, they should do it here as well! But by their vote they have shown themselves to hold

Mart

entirely different opinions here when their own interests are involved. Here they do not have to worry about what the electorate thinks and so they behave differently. Many of the Members, let us face it, are acting selfishly and the vote on the calendar proves it. As always it is their own interests that they are protecting, not those of our Parliament, nor of the Community, nor of the staff. That is the truth of the matter! It is a pity, moreover, that no thought whatever has been given by some Members to the enormous investments made in the interest of Europe both by the city of Strasbourg and by Luxembourg. Now they want to go to Brussels!

President. — I call Mr Forth on a point of order.

Mr Forth. — May I point out, Mr President, that had the Chair not ruled out of order my agenda-change on Monday which made provision for a half-hour Question Time this House would not have had now to spend 1 hour and 10 minutes on the sort of things that I sought to allow it to do through a parliamentary Question Time. It is through the Chair's ruling out of order what I was suggesting that we have wasted time now in this House, and I would like you to bear that in mind.

May I say to Mr Sutra that if he were to table a motion of no confidence in the Bureau, which I think he was suggesting, I would ask him to come to me for my signature. He may well get it.

4. *Decision on urgent procedure*

President. — The next item is the decision on requests for urgent procedure in respect of two motions for resolutions.

We begin with the d'Ormesson *et al.* motion for a resolution on the death sentences in Luanda (Doc. 1-19/81).

I call Mr Bangemann.

Mr Bangemann. — (*D*) Mr President, I can only state my own opinion, because this matter has not yet been discussed by my Group. I personally shall not be supporting any requests for urgent debates of this kind in the future, now that it has transpired that the motion tabled by Mrs Lizin and others on death sentences in Chile had got its facts completely wrong.

(*Interruption*)

Yes, I know, Mrs Lizin's request for an urgent debate has been withdrawn, but we are talking about Mr d'Ormesson's request now.

(*Interruption by Mr Arndt*)

No, Mr Arndt, because this reveals the following: we are in the position of a court of law which, without taking any evidence, deals with matters which are perhaps sometimes clear but in very many cases are very unclear. I believed what the Socialist Group had to say about condemned trade unionists in Chile and voted in favour of the request. But it has now turned out that they were terrorists and they have not even been sentenced to death. That is why, Mr President, I am no longer prepared to support such requests.

(*Applause from various quarters*)

President. — I call Mr Rogers.

Mr Rogers. — Mr President, I, unlike Mr Bange-mann, am very concerned about the fact that people are going to be executed, but I do not support the request for urgent debate on this matter. I am very moved and concerned about the fate of the prisoners and I do hope that other agencies can take it up, but the reason why I am going to vote against urgent procedure lies in the description under paragraph 1 of these as 18 'resistance workers'. It is very strange that when they come from one side they are called resistance workers and when they come from another side they are called terrorists. It depends on the side you are on. I condemn terrorism, whether it is funded by the United States of America or by the Soviet Union; so I am not going to be that much of a hypocrite and support one and not the other. Members ought to realize that Unita is an organization that exists in Angola, funded and supported by the United States of America and by the South African Government in order to destabilize the sovereign state of Angola, a country that has reached its own destiny and is now being illegally invaded and occupied in its southern part by the fascist and racist régime of South Africa, which maintains, supports, trains and provides weapons for Unita. I am sorry, I cannot support this resolution in its present terms and most certainly because it does not mention the greatest evil of all that is participated in by America, Russia, Great Britain, France, Germany and many other countries of the world — and that is the supply of arms to third countries in order that people can be butchered to maintain the strategic supply of uranium to America and Europe. On these grounds alone I cannot support this resolution.

President. — I call Mr d'Ormesson.

Mr d'Ormesson. — (*F*) Mr President, it is not my habit to request urgent debate, but I do so now because I feel that people sentenced to death cannot be placed in different categories. This Parliament should either intercede on behalf of all those condemned to

d'Ormesson

death for political reasons or abstain entirely from dealing with problems of this sort. We cannot have double standards. Now, as regards the matter in hand, what exactly is involved? Eighteen people have been sentenced to death. Incidentally, I did not refer to them as resistance workers but simply as members of the resistance movement — that is to say, people opposed to the Luanda government. The Luanda government, on the other hand, is supported by a force of 23 000 Cubans which, if I am not very much mistaken, comes from outside Angola. That is why this Parliament owes it to itself to vote for my urgent motion to plead for clemency — I am not passing judgment on that country's legal system — to plead for the lives of these eighteen people who were sentenced to death last Friday.

President. — The Socialist Group has the floor.

Mr Glinne. — (*F*) I have asked to speak so that I might say, in reply to Mr Bangemann, that we have concrete evidence that in recent days the repressive measures aimed at various categories of opponents have been intensified in Chile. We have only withdrawn motion for a resolution No. 21 because, by agreement with our colleagues in the Christian-Democratic Group in particular, we intend tabling at the forthcoming special part-session of Parliament a completely revised joint motion for a resolution which will incorporate all the cases brought to our attention up to that time.

President. — I call Mr Moreland on a point of order.

Mr Moreland. — Mr President, I must say that I am totally confused. Are we talking about Luanda or Chile or what? Is there a mix-up in Socialist geography?

President. — Mr Moreland, there is no confusion: I have already indicated that the motion on Chile has been withdrawn.

The Communist and Allies Group has the floor.

Mrs Baduel Glorioso. — (*F*) We oppose both the resolution itself and the request for urgency. I am against the death penalty and I am sure that at the forthcoming referendum the majority of Italians will vote against the reintroduction of the death penalty in Italy. However, it is a fact that here we apply the term 'resistance movement' when we are talking of the Afghans or Unita — and Mr Rogers made this point very well — but we apply the term 'rebels' in connection with El Salvador or the Polisario guerrillas. We shall be voting against urgent procedure for this reso-

lution because one cannot have double standards. That is something we do not do, Mr d'Ormesson. I have often heard urgent procedure being requested here for the death penalty and there has always been someone, not from this side of the House, who has got up to say that there was no need for urgent procedure and that the matter should be referred to the Political Affairs Committee.

The request for urgency is justified by the fact that the death penalty has already been pronounced. We are told that these sentences were announced on 9 March. I, personally, have no information on the subject but I regard it as a provocation that we should be asked to vote for urgent procedure on this motion when during this very part-session the Polisario have been denied the right of existence and a request for urgency has been turned down in respect of a motion on El Salvador that had been signed by all Italian parliamentarians in the Italian Lower Chamber and Senate and in the European Parliament: That is nothing less than shameful and disgusting hypocrisy. And I say that for the third time.

(Mr Pannella insistently asked for the floor to speak in favour of the motion for a resolution)

President. — I call Mrs Van den Heuvel to speak in favour of the motion for a resolution.

Mrs Van den Heuvel. — (*NL*) Mr President, I should like to express my wholehearted support for this resolution.

I agree with those who say that this Parliament has repeatedly used two standards. We talk about rebels on the one hand, and resistance fighters on the other, and that, of course, implies a difference of conception which is connected with differing political views. Sometimes we are prepared to support urgent resolutions concerning death sentences, other times we are not. I am well aware of this, and yet when people are threatened with the death sentence, even if they belong to a group which I want to fight with every possible political means, such as Unita in Angola, I shall always be utterly opposed. I therefore call on the House to grant the request for an urgent debate on this resolution.

President. — I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (*F*) Mr President, may I first raise a point of order. Let me read to you from Rule 14 (2) of the Rules of Procedure: 'Only the person making the request, one speaker in favour, one speaker against, and the chairman or rapporteur of the committee responsible may be heard, in each case for a maximum of three minutes.' Mr d'Ormesson having spoken as the person making the request, I called out 'for'. But

Pannella

you gave the floor to someone else. I am sorry to have to resort so often to interventions of this nature, but in this instance the Chair must bear part of the blame for the confusion.

President. — You must admit that you sometimes contribute to it.

Mr Pannella. — *(F)* I am honoured to be able to collaborate with you from time to time, even if it is only in causing confusion.

(Laughter)

Mr President, being against capital punishment I am in principle in favour of Mr d'Ormesson's resolution. But what do we see? Mr d'Ormesson is protesting against a trial as a result of which death sentences were pronounced. I agree that that is absolutely shameful and deplorable! But, Mr d'Ormesson, since you are so concerned with Africa, is it any less appalling to learn that 46 people in the Ivory Coast were choked to death, without trial, after being seized in a police raid? Where is your heart, Mr d'Ormesson? It beats intermittently. When people in France are sentenced to death you are not so eloquent . . .

Mr Calvez. — *(F)* No one ever spares a thought for the victims!

Mr Pannella. — *(F)* . . . You shut up, Calvez! You with your French Electricity Board would no doubt propose the electric chair.

(Exclamations from various quarters)

Mr President, we shall be voting against because we feel it brings no credit to our Parliament when some of its Members support the death penalty when their own people are the assassins and only oppose it when 'the other side' are doing the assassinating. This is assassins' logic.

President. — The Group of European Progressive Democrats has the floor.

Mr Israel. — *(F)* Mr President, may I respectfully urge Members to exercise greater restraint in this debate. It really is a very serious matter that 14 people have been sentenced to death for political offences. I believe it is important for us, as a matter of principle, to underline whenever necessary that this Parliament is against the death sentence for political reasons.

There are clearly certain obscure points in this whole affair, but let me say to Mr Bangemann, with the greatest respect, that even if we do not know all the facts

we can still resolutely condemn, again as a matter of principle, any use of the death penalty for political motives.

President. — The European Democratic Group has the floor.

Lady Elles. — Mr President, I am ashamed to be a member of a parliament that discusses in this way the lives of people, whether they be in Chile or in Luanda. I think it is an absolute disgrace to elected Members of a European Assembly to be making either a laughing-stock or a joke of this particular matter. In the one case you have in Chile people who are known to be terrorists, and we have a group over there, including Mr Rogers, who is a member of that group, asking for the release of these people who are known to be terrorists. Mr d'Ormesson, on the other hand, is asking for a reprieve from a death penalty.

Our view is that these matters should not be raised in this Parliament at all. It is a disgrace to democracy to talk, as we are doing, of such matters when people, whether they be Chilean terrorists or Luandan resistance workers, or whatever you like to call them, are actually about to die for whatever they believe in. Despite the truth of the facts behind Mr d'Ormesson's resolution, I would request, Mr President, that he be kind enough to withdraw it.

I would also request that the Chilean resolution should not be put before Parliament again next time, but that these matters should be discussed seriously in the Political Affairs Committee away from the heat of this Parliament and the publicity, which can only denigrate the work of our parliamentarians.

(Applause from the European Democratic Group and the Group of European Progressive Democrats)

President. — I call Mr d'Ormesson.

Mr d'Ormesson. — *(F)* Mr President, I accept Lady Elles's proposal. My object in tabling the resolution was to focus attention on the fact that this Parliament would be prepared once and for all, without mentioning any names or countries where such things occur, to condemn the use of the death penalty for political acts. That is all. I hope that a lesson has been learned for the future.

(Applause)

President. — Mr d'Ormesson's motion for a resolution is accordingly withdrawn.

I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (*F*) Can it not be taken over by other Members if these so wish?

President. — Authors of motions for resolutions are entitled to withdraw them at the moment they consider appropriate.

I call Mr von der Vring.

Mr von der Vring. — (*D*) Mr President, the person entitled to withdraw a motion for a resolution is its signatory. There is no 'author': all those who have put their names to a motion are signatories. I ask you to establish whether all the signatories have withdrawn their signatures.

President. — That would certainly be very difficult. At this stage of the procedure, I can only consider the motion as having been withdrawn.

*

* *

President. — We proceed to the Vandemeulebroucke *et al.* motion for a resolution on a permanent framework for negotiations between the Parliament and its staff (Doc. 1-31/81).

I call Mr Vandemeulebroucke.

Mr Vandemeulebroucke. — (*NL*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we all know by now what this is about. It may not be possible to hold the second March part-session because of the boycott announced by the staff. Despite what is perhaps maintained, this situation has not arisen because the staff refuse to go to Strasbourg, but because there is no basic consultation structure to permit the discussion of possible disputes. The President has now stated that a kind of crisis consultation is now going on, involving Mr de Ferranti, Mr Jacquet and Mr Pflimlin. But I must point out that this is *ad hoc* rather than permanent consultation. It has therefore been proposed that we should install a permanent structure for negotiations with the staff, and I should just like to recall what Mr Rogers said, that we Members of Parliament have assured the staff that additional part-sessions would be held in Luxembourg. It would be appalling if we did not keep this promise and did not set up a negotiating structure. We have talked so much about a social Europe, about the improvement of working conditions, about workers' participation and co-responsibility in industry: let us set an example and urge the Bureau straight away to create permanent means of consulting with the staff.

President. — I call Mr Bangemann.

Mr Bangemann. — (*D*) Mr President, you said earlier, and Mr Vandemeulebroucke has just done the same, that on a proposal from Sir James Scott-Hopkins the enlarged Bureau has instructed you and two of your colleagues to negotiate with the staff on a permanent basis. Mr Vandemeulebroucke, this is not intended merely as a temporary measure. What is being proposed here is in fact already being done. There is therefore no reason to take a vote on it.

Secondly, I should like to repeat to Mr Vandemeulebroucke what Mr Rogers has already rightly said. The Bureau has kept to what was agreed with the staff, which was also known to the House. During the debate on Mr Enright's motion calling for the July part-session to be held in Strasbourg, I informed the House that there was an agreement with the staff. So everyone knew what was at stake when the vote was taken. Nevertheless, Mr President, in its wisdom, which I will not dispute, the House decided to contravene this agreement. There may certainly be some argument about that, but one thing, Mr Vandemeulebroucke, is undoubtedly wrong. The same Members who, by voting as they did, broke this agreement in the full knowledge that it existed are now standing up and accusing the Bureau of not keeping to the agreements. As a member of the Bureau I cannot accept that.

The answer I sent to the chairman of a Socialist trade union who sent me a savage letter of protest was couched in appropriate terms: Comrade, I wrote, if I remember rightly, I am a Liberal. I have kept to the agreements with the staff. Mr Enright, on the other hand, is, if I remember rightly, a member of the Socialist Group, and many of his comrades voted as he did. A Socialist trade union should therefore turn to Mr Enright and the Socialist Group when they do not abide by the agreements with the staff, not to me.

(*Applause from various quarters*)

President. — I call Mr Boyes.

Mr Boyes. — Mr President, it is regrettable that Mr Bangemann has had to insert a red herring about the Enright resolution into this debate, because he knows full well that that is not the reason why this resolution is being moved this morning by the signatories. I want to make it clear that the Members from the British Labour Party totally support the staff in this action. I regret that Mr Pflimlin should be in the Chair this morning, because he knows full well my feelings about the seat of this Parliament being located in Strasbourg. However, I have to say that not one Member of the British Labour Party will pass a picket line if the staff decide to go on strike during this extra part-session.

Boyes

(Cries from the European Democratic Group)

I appreciate your applause and your appreciation of the solidarity of the British Labour Party Members and other colleagues with the staff in this matter.

(Interruption by Mr Bangemann)

We are in total sympathy with the staff in this situation, and people like you, Mr Bangemann, are not going to represent this as a case of the Parliament against the staff when in actual fact the total responsibility for this situation lies with the Bureau of Parliament, which after two years in office has not yet set up a permanent framework for negotiations between the Parliament and its staff. The emphasis in this resolution is on a permanent framework. It is not just enough that the staff have a grievance at the moment and that therefore the Bureau decides it will try and solve that grievance. We want to see a permanent negotiating machinery between the staff, with whom we have a relationship of absolute solidarity and understanding, and the representatives of this Parliament.

I hope, Mr President, that you will also ensure that when this resolution is adopted this morning, as I am sure it will be, the Members of this Parliament will be given an immediate report on the deliberations of the Bureau on this matter. It must not be one of those resolutions that are allowed to rest on a pile until dust settles on them. We want an urgent report to this Parliament on the results of the Bureau's deliberations.

President. — I will simply reply to you on one point and confirm what Mr Bangemann said on this subject.

What the Bureau has decided to set up is not a 'crisis management', to use the expression I heard a moment ago, but a permanent framework designed to deal, not with the particular problem of the extraordinary part-session, but, on the contrary, all the problems concerning the staff.

The Socialist Group has the floor.

Mr Arndt. — *(D)* Mr President, the bureau of the Socialist Group yesterday discussed the fact that the Bureau of Parliament has instructed three Vice-Presidents to consult with the staff on a permanent basis. We are of the opinion — and this opinion is generally shared by the Bureau — that this contact should be made. Only if this is unsuccessful and if it comes to a real dispute should Parliament intervene.

We know, therefore, that three Vice-Presidents have received these instructions. The bureau of the Socialist Group has received a report on the first meeting. We hope that this will result in many of the difficulties being resolved, and we have so much confidence in

Gérard Jacquet, a member of our Group, and also in yourself, Mr President, and in the representative of the Conservative Group that we are sure reasonable solutions can be found with the staff. We feel that, if the authors of this resolution had known this, they would very probably not have made this request for an urgent debate, because in my view the matter has now been settled.

I do not therefore consider it right for us to set a debate in motion by granting this request, because this would make the current negotiations with the staff extremely difficult, and all of us in this House should have an interest in reaching an agreement with the staff. I feel that, if this request for an urgent debate is granted, it will only make the present negotiations more difficult, and that would not be in the interests of either the staff or of Parliament. I shall therefore vote against the request for an urgent debate.

President. — The Group of European Progressive Democrats has the floor.

Mr Doublet. — *(F)* If I speak in this debate it is because I can claim to have the advantage of a certain measure of experience. Throughout my long administrative career I have had many dealings with staff of every kind and numbering as many people as the staff which is at the centre of our discussions today. I really do believe that it is vitally important to have an organized structure for regular and frequent contacts, in an atmosphere of trust, between our Parliament and the staff working for it.

In the short time I have been here I have been impressed by their devotion and their anxiety to help in every possible way. That is why I will give you my absolutely frank opinion on this problem. Permanent contacts between the Bureau, which is responsible for maintaining them — I fear that, hitherto, they have not been as frequent as they might have been — and the staff are, of course, essential. But to set up a permanent framework is, in my view, a mistake.

Secondly, I appeal to the staff. It has not right to oppose any decision taken by Parliament in its legally most incontrovertible form. On the other hand, we, for our part, must take a closer interest in its lot. In actual fact, the point at issue is not so much the forthcoming part-session as the lot of the staff which has been living in uncertainty for some years, having been persuaded to put itself out and run up debts to set up home in Luxembourg, and now fears that it might have to move out again. We need right away to open a dialogue with the staff in order to try to find an acceptable solution which will impair neither the interests of the staff nor Parliament's legitimate rights.

President. — I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (F) Mr President, I believe that the statement you have just made to the House has come as a pleasant surprise to many of us. Could it be that the permanent structure proposed by Mr Vandemeulebroucke has already been set up? Mr President, we are overwhelmed!

If the group chairmen, who are here, and the members of the Bureau would confirm it, then I believe we have something that we would all welcome.

For my part, I wish to inform you that our Group will be voting in favour of the Vandemeulebroucke proposal, if it is retained.

President. — I call Mr Glinne.

Mr Glinne. — (F) Mr President, I can only confirm what you have said on several occasions. Not only has this permanent framework for negotiations been set up but it is actually working. And all the political group chairmen could confirm this. The machinery has been established. Accordingly I no longer see any point in the motion for a resolution — however well-intentioned it might have been, I hasten to add. It has been overtaken by events.

President. — I call Sir James Scott-Hopkins.

Sir James Scott-Hopkins. — No more, Mr President, than to confirm what has been said by Mr Glinne. I hope my honourable friends will follow me in rejecting this motion, because we have already set this up and it is actually working, and had a meeting yesterday. This is really unnecessary and, as Mr Arndt said earlier on, could even be counter-productive.

President. — I call Mr Vandemeulebroucke.

Mr Vandemeulebroucke. — (NL) Mr President, I tabled my resolution with a view to installing a *permanent* negotiating structure. As my proposal has evidently been overtaken by events, I will withdraw it.

IN THE CHAIR: MR DANKERT

Vice-President

President. — Mr Vandemeulebroucke's motion is accordingly withdrawn.

I call Mr Alber on a point of order.

Mr Alber. — (D) Mr President, we shall certainly not complete our agenda today. I have, however, been asked by the Commission to say that we should, come what may, deal with the very last item, because it concerns a very urgent matter. It can be taken without debate, and only two amendments have been tabled, so it should not take longer than one or two minutes.

President. — If Members take us relatively little time for explanations of vote and the like, we shall reach it, but that depends on the Assembly, not on me.

5. Votes

President. — The next item comprises the votes on those motions for resolutions on which the debate is closed.

We begin with the Prag report on linking work and training for young persons in the Community (Doc. 1-460/80).

(Parliament adopted the first indent of the preamble)

After the first indent of the preamble, I have Amendment No 5, tabled by Mrs Gaiotti de Biase and Mr Pedini and inserting the following new indent:

- having regard to the Commission's communication to the Council on perspectives for education policy in the context of employment policy with particular reference to the problems of the transition of young people from education of working life;¹

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Prag, rapporteur. — In favour, Mr President.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 5 and the second indent of the preamble)

President. — On paragraph 1, I have Amendment No 1, tabled by Mrs Gaiotti de Biase and Mr Pedini and replacing this paragraph with the following text:

1. Recognizes the urgent need, in a period of low growth, high unemployment, rapid technological change, and changing social and cultural significance of work, to provide young people with training that will enable them to face the challenge of innovation and to become the leading exponents of progress, while also improving their employment prospects;

What is the rapporteur's position?

¹ COM (80) 177/FIN.

Mr Prag, rapporteur. — I think the committee would not have objected to this, Mr President, at least if the English translation had been better and there was something which did not say 'to become the leading exponents of progress'. But I think that is a question of language.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 1 and adopted first paragraph 1, then paragraphs 2 to 4)

President. — After paragraph 4, I have Amendment No 2, tabled by Mrs Gaiotti de Biase and Mr Pedini and inserting the following new paragraph:

- 4(a). Believes that work-linked training should be promoted not only for socio-economic reasons, but also because of its psychological, educational and cultural value and for the dynamic element of innovation which it introduces into the educational system;

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Prag, rapporteur. — I would like to split this one, Mr President. I am entirely in favour up to 'cultural value', but the remainder of it just is not true, because *alternance* has been used in some of our member countries, at least one of them, for 50 years. So the word 'innovation' is rather inappropriate. If we could split it at 'cultural value', I should be in favour up to there and against the rest of it.

President. — I put to the vote the first part of Amendment No 2, ending with the words 'cultural value'.

(Parliament adopted the first part of Amendment No 2, rejected the second part of this amendment and adopted paragraph 5)

President. — After paragraph 5, I have Amendment No 3, tabled by Mrs Gaiotti de Biase and Mr Pedini and inserting the following new paragraph:

- 5(a). Deplores the fact that the Ministers of Education took no part in the Council's decisions concerning the integration of educational systems with employment policy, and demands that in future these Ministers attend the joint Council meetings on unemployment proposed by the European Council of 2 December 1980;

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Prag, rapporteur. — I am against this, Mr President. I think the presence of the Education Ministers would be likely to put an additional brake on progress in this field.

(Parliament adopted, first Amendment No 3, using the electronic voting system, then paragraphs 6 to 13)

President. — After paragraph 13, I have two amendments, each inserting a new paragraph:

— No 4, tabled by Mrs Gaiotti de Biase and Mr Pedini:

- 13(a) Stresses nevertheless the inadequacy, in today's world, of training geared solely to technological developments and foreseeable changes in work, and believes that

- work-linked training should be considered in a context of continuing education that is not restricted to young people;
- there should be strong emphasis on providing an understanding of social, economic and political mechanisms, in order to increase political participation by the workers and the exercise of their rights;
- in addition to training for subordinate work, individual and group enterprise should be promoted;

— No 12, tabled by Mr Price on behalf of the European Democratic Group:

- 13a. Requests the Commission to ask CEDEFOP, in conjunction with vocational training bodies in the Member States, to prepare recommendations for the development of linked work and training courses along the lines set out in paragraph 13, looking forward to the future needs of industry and the new opportunities opening up for young people;

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Prag, rapporteur. — I am against Amendment No 4 and in favour of Amendment No 12.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 4 and adopted Amendment No 12 and paragraphs 14 and 15)

President. — On paragraph 16, I have Amendment No 6, tabled by Mrs Gaiotti de Biase and Mr Pedini and replacing this paragraph with the following text:

16. Recommends that the Commission, within the framework of establishing the conditions set out in the first indent of Title II of the Council Resolution¹ should, when considering the Regional Fund, pay the greatest possible attention to those measures linking work and training which are in line with the objectives of Community regional policy, especially where they form part of integrated projects aimed at developing not only performance skills but also individual and group enterprises;

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Prag, rapporteur. — I am against. I think it would be quite impractical to bring the Regional Fund into it, Mr President.

¹ COM (79) 578 final

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 6, using the electronic voting system)

President. — After paragraph 16, I have the following five amendments, each inserting a new paragraph:

— No 7, by Mrs Gaiotti de Biase and Mr Pedini:

16(a). Stresses that work-linked training projects should not be concentrated solely in the industrial sector, important though that is, but that adequate provision should also be made for them in agriculture, crafts and the service industries, notably through closer coordination of the various Funds (EAGGF, EDF, ERDF);

— No 8, by Mrs Gaiotti de Biase and Mr Pedini:

16(b). Invites the Member States and the Commission to draw up careful and detailed programmes for work-linked training of community service volunteers, both within the EEC and as part of cooperation programmes with ACP countries;

— No 9, by Mrs Gaiotti de Biase and Mr Pedini:

16(c). Insists strongly on the need both to increase significantly Community appropriations for training and to adapt the provisions of the Social Fund to a policy of continued (alternating) training, instead of concentrating solely on retraining the unemployed;

— No 10, by Mrs Gaiotti de Biase and Mr Pedini:

16(d). Reaffirms the unconditional need, already recognized in Community directives, to ensure for young women full equality in access to work-linked training;

— No 13, by Mrs Vayssade:

16a. Believes that positive discrimination in favour of young women as regards access to work-linked training is essential if the principles enshrined in the three Community directives on equality are to be realized;

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Prag, rapporteur. — I am in favour of Amendment No 7; against Amendment No 13, because I think Amendment No 10 is more practical and does the same thing; in favour of Amendment No 8; against Amendment No 9, because it is outside the scope of the report and inaccurate; and in favour of Amendment No 10.

(Parliament adopted Amendments Nos 7, 8, 9 and 10, rejected Amendment No 13 and adopted paragraphs 17 and 18)

President. — I put, thus amended, the motion for a resolution as a whole to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.¹

*

* *

President. — We proceed to the Lenz report on relations between the EEC and Romania (Doc. 1-678/80).

(Parliament adopted the preamble and paragraphs 1 to 5)

On paragraph 6, I have Amendment No 1, tabled by Mr Radoux and replacing this paragraph with the following text:

6. Hopes that the other Comecon countries will embark on or develop the process of bilateral negotiations leading to the conclusion of agreements which will take account of the economic and trade problems created by East-West relations; in particular, these agreements should encourage exports and define the terms on which compensation transactions are of mutual interest;

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mrs Lenz, rapporteur. — (D) Mr President, I am against both amendments, which in similar form were rejected in committee.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 1 and adopted paragraph 6)

President. — On paragraph 7, I have Amendment No 2, tabled by Mr Radoux and replacing this paragraph with the following text:

7. Considers it necessary that the Community institutions, having regard to the difficulties encountered in East-West trade, and in particular Community exports, should examine how the various aspects of the common trade policy can be strengthened so as to introduce independent and bilateral measures to lend a new impetus to this trade;

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 2 and adopted, first paragraph 7, then paragraphs 8 and 9)

I can now give the floor for explanations of vote.

I call Mr Bonaccini.

Mr Bonaccini. — (I) Mr President, we did not speak in yesterday's debate, in the course of which we heard many wise things said by representatives of various political groups and also, shall I say, the occasional rather pointless potpourri. We are, however, entirely in favour of this resolution on the agreement with Romania, even though we are aware that it is only a

¹ OJ C 77, 6. 4. 1981.

Bonaccini

first timid step towards policies of a much more ambitious nature. We trust that this resolution will prompt all our institutions to summon up all imaginable courage and initiative to develop our relations in this direction to the greatest possible extent.

President. — I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (I) Mr President, we, too, shall be voting for this resolution because, like Mr Bonaccini, we consider that too little has been done in this direction and any gesture, however small, is undoubtedly opportune.

Nevertheless, the less we are satisfied with the little that is being proposed, the more we become aware of finding ourselves in the situation of a "new Yalta," or, indeed, of a "worse Yalta," which is looming over Europe. During the Carter administration, we let President Ceaucescu call repeatedly for definite disarmament measures, and I think we must now all be very concerned about what the future holds in store. Here, therefore, I agree with Mr Bonaccini that we need courage to swim against the stream, because the mainstream, seen from this point of view, augurs nothing good.

President. — I call Mr Radoux.

Mr Radoux. — (F) Mr President, I must say that I do not share the view expressed by the last two speakers. What we are considering here is not a first, small step towards an ulterior aim: it is the first agreement to be concluded by the Community with a country of Eastern Europe on the basis of the proposals it made in 1974. It is, indeed, extremely important, and I seize this opportunity of congratulating the Romanian Government on being the first to respond to the offers made by the Community.

President. — I put the motion for a resolution as a whole to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.¹

*

* *

President. — We proceed to the Luster report on compensation for victims of acts of violence (Doc. 1-464/80).

(Parliament adopted the preamble and paragraphs 1 to 4)

On paragraph 5, I have two amendments tabled by Mr Tyrrell and Mr Price on behalf of the European Democratic Group:

— No 1, rewording subparagraph (a) as follows:

- (a) creates minimum Community criteria for financial awards from public funds to victims, or the dependants of victims, of crimes of violence against the person, based on those already agreed by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe;

— No 2, deleting subparagraph (b).

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Luster, rapporteur. — (D) Mr President, the first amendment provides a meaningful addition, while the second would make a cut which is unjustified.

(Parliament adopted Amendments Nos 1 and 2, the latter by means of the electronic voting system, paragraph 5, thus amended, and paragraphs 6 and 7)

President. — I can now give the floor for explanations of vote.

I call Mr Megahy.

Mr Megahy. — Mr President, I shall abstain on this final vote. My objection is to paragraph 5 and to the legal basis of paragraph 5. I do not think that the Community has any competence in this matter of criminal compensation. This is a matter for criminal law, as I understand it. In the Legal Affairs Committee, I opposed the argument that in some way this was connected with the social security provisions: I do not think so; certainly the British Government do not think so. As far as I can see, even to argue that you could extend by means of a directive the provisions of criminal compensation to only a section of the population, namely workers — because when you talk about the freedom of movement of persons you are talking about the freedom of movement of workers — seems to me to be quite nonsensical.

The argument that we are moving towards a European legal area is quite specious. We do not have a European legal area, nor are we likely to have one for some considerable time. This is another example of what I see as a continual attempt in this Chamber to try to extend the competence of the Community into areas it should not be in.

I sympathize a great deal, and I suppose after my recent experience in Strasbourg I must declare an interest in this subject — I did not claim compensa-

¹ OJ C 77 of 6. 4. 1981.

Megahy

tion, but I only wish that the police who have been hanging on to my money for many many months would get round to giving it back — but that is another story.

(Laughter)

As far as this is concerned, however, I shall abstain for the reasons given.

President. — I call Mr Luster.

Mr Luster, rapporteur. — *(D)* Mr President, I am particularly glad to support this initiative of the Socialist Group. Perhaps because of the special experiences we have had in my own country, I have become aware in the last few decades of a particularly irresponsible tendency to play down the importance of violence. Like a Trojan horse, the idea of damaging or destroying property has very rapidly ushered in violence against persons. In certain circles, protest and resistance by violence are, politically, the done thing.

After this wave of violence had begun, official attention in our legalistic state was concentrated — rightly so, but unfortunately almost exclusively — on those responsible and their subsequent rehabilitation, while the victims were neglected. This, to my mind, is quite the wrong way of looking at things, and so I am particularly glad now to find that the Community is being called upon to help this category of persons to which we ourselves may any day find ourselves belonging. I shall therefore do all I can to support this initiative and to make sure that the Commission takes action, not after the European Council, as it said yesterday, but simultaneously with it.

(Applause from various benches of the Group of the European People's Party)

President. — I put, thus amended, the motion for a resolution as a whole to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.¹

*

* *

President. — We proceed to the Malangré report on UK immigration controls (Doc. 1-573/80).

(Parliament adopted the preamble and paragraphs 1 to 3)

After paragraph 3, I have Amendment No 1, tabled by Mr Tyrrell on behalf of the European Democratic Group and inserting the following new paragraph:

3a. Notes however, that the rules in question were amended before implementation, and would be reconsidered when the Nationality Bill at present before the United Kingdom Parliament is passed;

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Malangré, rapporteur. — *(D)* Mr President, since I personally am not in a position to judge the latest legislative efforts of the British Government, I can speak neither for nor against the amendment. I must therefore leave it to each individual member to decide for himself.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 1 and paragraph 4)

President. — I now can accept explanations of vote.

I call Mr Tyrrell.

Mr Tyrrell. — Mr President, the Legal Affairs Committee quite rightly submitted a motion for a resolution which did not express an opinion on the legal effect of the British immigration rules. The motion is neutral. This is as it should be. There are other places where such issues are decided — namely, the national courts and, possibly, the European Court. I had, therefore, intended to support this motion. But during the speeches last night it was clear that certain Members, mainly from the United Kingdom, were not stating accurately what the effect of the motion is. Rather than run the risk that my vote and the votes of my Group should be misrepresented in the same way, I propose, therefore, to abstain on the resolution as it now stands, even though I regard it as one which is quite innocuous in effect.

President. — I call Lady Elles.

Lady Elles. — As another lawyer, I have every right to disagree with my learned friend, Mr Tyrrell. I would state to this House that there are several cases on this specific issue before the European Commission on Human Rights at the moment. It is therefore not timely that a resolution of this nature should come from this Parliament where Member States may have insinuations made against them that they are not upholding a convention which all Member States have ratified, namely the European Convention on Human Rights, which allows citizens of each country to appeal to that particular body for adjudication on such issues. Therefore, I would certainly request this House not to support this particular motion for a resolution.

President. — I call Mr Seal.

Mr Seal. — Mr President, as the person who put down the original motions, I am very pleased with the

¹ OJ C 77 of 6. 4. 1981.

Seal

quality of this report. While it does not put forward any firm conclusions, no one reading it can be left in any doubt that the Legal Affairs Committee feels that the action of the British Government contravenes Article 8 of the Convention on Human Rights.

We have just been told it is not timely for us to consider it. I feel it is very timely, because in one or two weeks' time the British Parliament will be debating, in a second reading, the new United Kingdom Nationality Bill. Unfortunately, some of the nastiest aspects of their most recent legislation is going to be written into the bill. I feel that this Parliament ought to come out firmly behind this report. Mr President, we are talking about a mere 1000 or 2000 people who will be affected by the legislation of the United Kingdom Government. Unfortunately, the people who are going to be affected mostly will be Asians — Asian women, dependants, elderly people who really need to go to the United Kingdom. Whilst, as I say, Mr President, I am not too happy that firm conclusions were not given in this report, I feel the report leaves no doubt at all in the minds of people that the United Kingdom has contravened Article 8 of the Convention on Human Rights and we ought to support fully the recommendations of the Legal Affairs Committee.

President. — I put, thus amended, the motion for a resolution as a whole to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.¹

*

* *

President. — We proceed to the Curry report on the disturbance of the Community apple-market (Doc. 1-757/80).

(Parliament adopted the first four indents of the preamble)

After the fourth indent of the preamble, I have two amendments, tabled by Mr Martin and others and inserting a fifth and sixth indent respectively:

— No 1:

— whereas imports of apples from the southern hemisphere have disrupted the Community market, which already had to cope with substantial stocks;

— No 2:

— whereas the position of fruit producers has deteriorated;

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Curry, rapporteur. — I am against Amendment No 1, Mr President, and in favour of Amendment No 2.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 1 and adopted Amendment No 2 and paragraphs 1 to 4)

President. — After paragraph 4, I have Amendment No 3, tabled by Mr Martin and others and inserting the following new paragraph:

- 4a. Calls for the principle of Community preference to be guaranteed by raising the level of reference prices, taking greater account of the Member States' needs and applying an import schedule which limits access to the EEC market to certain periods, in accordance with season requirements;

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Curry, rapporteur. — I am against the amendment.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 3 and adopted paragraph 5)

President. — After paragraph 5, I have Amendment No 4, tabled by Mr Martin and others and inserting the following new paragraph:

- 5a. Considers that the technical or health regulations should not be used as an artificial barrier to restrict or prevent intra-Community trade;

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Curry, rapporteur. — Against.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 4 and adopted paragraph 6 to 8)

After paragraph 8, I have Amendment No 8, tabled by Mr Costanzo and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (C-D) and inserting the following new paragraph:

- 8a. Requests the Commission to carry out the necessary controls to ensure full compliance with the Community preference clause on all the Member States' markets;

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Curry, rapporteur. — I am sure that is true as well, Mr President. I am against.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 8 and adopted paragraph 9)

¹ OJ C 77 of 6. 4. 1981.

President. — After paragraph 9, I have three amendments, each tabled by Mr Martin and others and inserting a new paragraph:

— No 5:

9a. Asks that production prices should yield a reasonable return and should be fixed in relation to the trend in production costs;

— No 6:

9b. Calls for the planned enlargement of the Community to be finally abandoned, since it would have serious repercussions for fruit producers in the EEC.

— No 7:

9c. Asks that this report on apples should be extended and complemented by a general study of fruit and vegetables;

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Curry, rapporteur. — Against the lot, Mr President.

(Parliament rejected all three amendments and adopted paragraph 10)

President. — I now can accept explanations of vote. I call Mr Christopher Jackson.

Mr C. Jackson. — Mr President, as a result of national aids and intervention the Community is moving towards a structural surplus in apples. Last year, 400 000 tonnes were withdrawn. Personally, I am fond of this particular fruit, but it cannot be considered a basic foodstuff nor of strategic importance. The view of the main farming organization in Britain and of many British farmers is that intervention in apples should be phased out. I share that view; phasing out intervention would lead to a healthier market and it would save some 12 million ECU of taxpayers' money — or at least free it for more useful purposes.

I oppose intervention, but while we have it the report is right to call for an increase in the Cox intervention co-efficient. There is also an urgent need for an increase in the Bramley co-efficient, from 0.75 to 1. The evidence for such an increase lies with the Commission and I trust they will take urgent action. I warn the Commission that I shall be very troublesome about this if they do not.

Finally, the use of intervention is currently limited to cooperatives. It should be made available to all big apple-farmers, whether or not they are in cooperatives say, those with 20 hectares or more in production.

Mr President, despite these reservations I shall vote for the Curry report, which is in most respects excel-

lent and which steers a clever course between the Scylla and Charybdis of the northern and southern apple-growers' requirements.

Mr President. — I call Mr Patterson.

Mr Patterson. — Mr President, like my colleague from Kent I will also vote in favour of this report, while remarking that it has come rather late. The motion for a resolution which Mr Jackson and I tabled was tabled as long ago as 1979, and it is one of the troubles with this House that it takes so long to get from a resolution to a report.

In 1979, apple-growers in my part of the Community were losing £ 330 per acre, and in that year, too, 5 % of the apple orchards in my country were destroyed. Now whose fault was that? To a certain extent it was their own, and the report makes very clear that failure to adapt was one of the problems. That has now been put right in the United Kingdom, and I am glad to see the report notes that apple consumption was up by over 8 % this last year. My constituents, for their part, believed it was the fault of the French, and particularly of their national aids. Well, on that matter the report shows that there is no clear-cut case that there is any contravention of the Treaty of Rome, but it also points out that it is absurd that the list of national aids should be regarded as a closely guarded secret. I notice that the 1980 agricultural survey has figures on national aids for 1977, and this is not good enough. So the report correctly states that the matter of national aids and subsidies is not proven, and it is up to the Commission to go into it.

Like Mr Jackson, I welcome the appeals in the report for the Commission to take further action on intervention, for inspection and grading standards to be adhered to and for support for processing. All these things call for further action and, like Mr Jackson, I shall have my eagle eye on Commissioner Dalsager.

(Applause and cries of assent)

President. — I call Mr Penders.

Mr Penders. — *(NL)* Mr President, in connection with the vote on a number of amendments, I want to ask you a question concerning Rule 29 (1) of the Rules of Procedure, which states:

Parliament shall not deliberate on any amendment unless it is moved during the debate.

Several times during the vote we have seen that there were amendments which no one, not a single person, was in favour of. Once Mrs Ewing voted for; on another occasion, no one at all. Could you not make it a rule that, on the analogy of Rule 29 (1), votes on amendments where no one is in favour are invalid?

President. — Mr Penders, we shall very soon be busy with the task of overhauling the Rules of Procedure, and when that happens, this problem too will be taken up. I think there is no point in going into the matter now.

I call Mr d'Ormesson.

Mr d'Ormesson. — (*F*) Mr President, Mr Curry's report on a difficult subject is a contribution which shows that our British friends are beginning to take the common agricultural policy seriously. That is why I shall vote in favour of this report.

President. — I call Mr Sutra.

Mr Sutra. — (*F*) Mr President, I shall vote in favour because this report is right, and despite the explanations of vote which I have just heard, which would have us believe that this report may revive the apple-war between France and Great Britain, I wish to make it perfectly clear that I shall nevertheless vote in favour. In fact, I believe that this report ushers in a new stage in our relations and in the British approach to problems connected with the Community's agricultural policy.

President. — I call Mr Wedekind.

Mr Wedekind. — (*D*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I wish to speak against. I do not share the view that the European apple problem can be solved in this way. Perhaps we should call for a change in the European's drinking habits: perhaps we should drink less whisky and more calvados and cider. The apple problem would then solve itself.

President. — I am not sure whether I should not protest against your call for an increase in the consumption of alcohol.

I call Mr Israel.

Mr Israel. — (*F*) Mr President, we find this report extremely well-balanced and we shall vote in favour. We are gratified to find that the apple report has not become an apple of discord in this Parliament.

President. — I put, as amended, the motion for a resolution as a whole to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.¹

6. Decisions on transport to be taken by Council by the end of 1983

President. — The next item is the report by Mr Hoffmann, on behalf of the Committee on Transport, on the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-563/80) for a draft resolution concerning priorities and the timetable for decisions to be taken by the Council in the transport sector during the period up to the end of 1983 (Doc. 1-951/80).

I call Mr Seefeld, who is deputizing for the rapporteur.

Mr Seefeld, chairman of the Committee on Transport. — (*D*) Mr President, Mr Hoffmann is unfortunately unable to be here today. According to our Rules of Procedure, the chairman of the committee may, of course, present the report if the rapporteur is unable to do so. My pleasure in presenting this report is the greater since the Committee on Transport unanimously adopted this motion for a resolution. All the Members who took part in the discussions and the vote in committee were in favour of Mr Hoffmann's report. I should like to thank him for his work, even though he is not here.

Mr President, the report concerns a proposal from the Commission which contains a list of priorities. This includes a number of measures which the Commission and our Committee on Transport feel are urgently needed. The implementation of these priorities will, we hope, be subjected to a very careful examination by this House in due course. The Commission is not setting a precedent, because it has already submitted two lists of priorities in the past. I would remind the House that a programme was established for the years 1974 to 1976. A second programme of action covered the years 1977 to 1980. The House has expressed its views on basic transport policy questions on several occasions, and I myself was the last rapporteur to draw up a basic report of this kind.

Obviously, what we unanimously adopted at that time has been compared with what the Commission is proposing today. I should like to summarize briefly what practical effects the Commission's programmes of action have so far had. I can sum up, as Mr Hoffmann does in his report, the implementation of the previous two priority programmes in the following terms. Most of the priorities set by the Commission have happily become the subject of practical proposals. The European Parliament has delivered its opinion on all these proposals and has rejected none of them, although it has, of course, amended some of the Commission's proposals to a greater or lesser extent, while the Commission for its part has incorporated many of our proposed amendments.

Up to this point I can therefore say: so far so good. But the Commission's priorities have suffered the

¹ OJ C 77 of 6. 4. 1981.

Seefeld

treatment that has been common in the past: many of the Commission's and Parliament's proposals have unfortunately come to a halt in the Council. In other words, the Council has proved in the past to be the weakest link in the chain of our institutions, and we can only regret that what we together considered right has not been put into practice by the representatives of the then six and later nine governments.

Mr President, we have a number of minor but, we feel, important amendments to propose to the Commission's document.

We believe a few things should be added to the Commission's plans for the period up to the end of 1981. For example, we should like to see progress made with the system of rates for the use of infrastructures. We are thinking of measures for the Mediterranean ports, which have become very important now that Greece is a member of the Community. We also include the construction of a Brenner tunnel, and we advocate the duty-free import of the fuel contained in the fuel-tanks of commercial vehicles. We also feel that some flexibility is needed in the implementation of the programme of priorities. Of course, we have to know what we want when and by when, but there may be unforeseen events. It is likely that certain new technologies will be introduced in the transport sector in the next few years and that the economic situation may become worse here and there, although we hope not. All this should be considered, and the Commission should be flexible when implementing its programme.

We also feel that such possible imponderables must not be taken as a pretext for delaying certain priority tasks.

We of the Committee on Transport do not want to be dogmatic, but various things we have called for in the past are not in the Commission's list of priorities. We could refer to many of them, but there is no point in doing so, because the House has decided that we should examine and adjust the whole of the transport policy. The committee has already appointed Mr Carrossino as rapporteur for this, and it will be reconsidering the whole of the European transport policy in due course.

To conclude, I should like to say that the Committee on Transport has happily always had the support of the House when it has voiced criticism, when it has called for more activities, when it has asked the Commission to be more active. In particular, there has always been agreement when we have criticized the Council of Ministers for dragging its feet over the European transport policy or taking no action at all. I should therefore like to say at this juncture that the European Parliament's Committee on Transport now has the impression that it might be possible to set new activities in motion where the European transport policy is concerned. We hope that the Dutch Presi-

dency will do everything possible to meet our demand for a uniform, global transport policy in the European Community at long last.

Two Council meetings are planned, which, funnily enough, is 100% more than has been usual in the past. An informal meeting of the Transport Ministers has already taken place, which again is something that did not happen in the past. The Dutch Transport Minister has told our committee that he agrees with us and intends to try to convince his colleagues — and we hope he will succeed — of the need for a uniform transport policy. Even though not all our demands have yet been met, we do hope that the list of priorities will enable a good start to be made on a successful transport policy for the coming years.

We therefore welcome the Commission's list of priorities, and we all appeal to you, ladies and gentlemen, to approve the Commission's proposal and Mr Hoffmann's report as unanimously as we have done. I should be grateful if this House again gave its general approval to a uniform transport policy.

(Applause)

President. — The Socialist Group has the floor.

Mr Albers. — *(NL)* Mr President, it is important that we should exchange views with the Commission on the list of priorities and the timetable. It is a pity that at this moment so little time should be available for this. It is also strange that the Commissioner responsible for this proposal is not present.

My group largely agrees with the priorities that have been set, but we should nevertheless like to refer to a few points to which we of the Socialist Group attach importance. We find it extremely important, bearing in mind, above all, the citizens of the European Community who observe this Community and our activities, but have frequent personal experience of the difficulties that still arise when frontiers are crossed, that particular attention should be paid to this aspect in particular in the years to come. We therefore feel that the parts of the programme of priorities relating to this aspect should be considered with especial care and with a degree of flexibility, as the chairman of the Committee on Transport has already said, by the Commission and also, of course, during the forthcoming Council meetings. We also call, of course, for the exemption from import duties of the fuel in the tanks of commercial vehicles, which cause annoyance and also delays. We must also reach an early agreement on the harmonization of the loading capacities of commercial vehicles, because this can also cause delays at the frontiers. We therefore very much welcome paragraph 4 of the resolution, which concerns this question. More, however, will need to be done to improve the situation at the frontiers. To ensure the

Albers

smooth flow of traffic, it might be very useful if lanes were set aside specifically for commercial vehicles travelling with special documents, so that frontiers can be crossed more quickly. This will mean investments, in infrastructure, for example, and so financial assistance from the Community will be needed. It is not only at the inland frontiers that we encounter such problems: there is also room for improvement at seaports and airports. We therefore see here a direct link with the increase in tourist traffic, including social tourism, for which some Members of this Parliament propose a separate committee should be set up, with which I do not agree, because such tourism can undoubtedly be handled by the Committee on Transport in cooperation with, of course, the Commission.

The improvement of safety in the transport sector is also a priority, because, with the growth of tourism, there is a need for the closest possible coordination of the highway codes in the ten countries, and the European driving licence may be an important means to this end. We also attach considerable importance to the improvement of certain conditions which still result in delays at the frontiers. It was once calculated that this costs 1000 m to 2000 m Dutch guilders a year, and I feel there is every reason to give this aspect top priority.

A second point I wish to raise on behalf of my group concerns the social policy and social progress in the transport sector. We fully endorse paragraph 8 of the resolution, which suggests that the Commission's proposals should principally be seen in terms of the improvement of working conditions and also of the protection of the environment and the conservation of energy. I also believe there is an urgent need for the proposals concerning the second stage of harmonization with respect to certain provisions of a social nature in the road transport sector, which have already been before the Council since 1977, to be considered at an early date and for a decision to be taken on them quickly, because then it will also be possible to find a solution to the problems of the remote areas raised by Mrs Ewing at a previous part-session.

A third aspect I should like to stress is the policy on sea transport and ports, although more attention is paid to sea transport. I find that some people feel there is no possibility of a Community policy on ports being established. What we face here is the subjective view of a majority of the port authorities. I should like information on the objective conclusions drawn by the Commission in this area, so that we of the Committee on Transport also know what action is needed to get the policy on ports off the ground at least, something we have advocated for so many years. It is a matter of some concern that the reduction in the number of officials working in this area has weakened the directorate-general. We therefore fully endorse paragraph 6 of Mr Hoffmann's resolution.

To conclude, Mr President, we all know that there is a backlog of proposals before the Council. It is therefore

important for the Council not simply to take note, as it has done in the past, of what this programme of priorities has to say. The Council must take a decision on this programme. It can perhaps amend it, but it must be clear that the Council seriously intends to implement this programme of priorities. We therefore welcome the fact that paragraph 11 of Mr Hoffmann's resolution very clearly calls for decisions to be taken and for the deadlines set to be respected.

President. — The Group of the European People's Party (CD) has the floor.

Mr Janssen van Raay. — (NL) Mr President, the Christian-Democratic Group also wishes to endorse the Hoffmann report and to thank the chairman of the Committee of Transport for presenting this important motion for a resolution in Mr Hoffmann's absence. We support the resolution as a whole. All I want to do is raise two points which deserve our particular attention.

I am referring to the transport policy measures which can be implemented quickly and which will have few or no financial implications. The major plans that will cost money are, of course, immensely important, but the European Community's transport policy has now been stagnating for so long that it is high time practical results were at last achieved. As a Dutchman, I hope that this can be done while the Netherlands has the Presidency of the Council.

We have had a particularly satisfactory meeting with the present President of the Council of Transport Ministers, Mr Tuinman. He was able to restore some enthusiasm to our committee. It will, of course, be difficult, but practical results must now follow.

I should like to raise two points in connection with the report. Mr Albers has already referred to them. First, there is the question of transfrontier traffic. There is absolutely no need for these lengthy stoppages at the frontiers. The drivers of commercial vehicles are held up at the frontiers far too long. That is an enormous waste of energy. Commercial vehicles spend a long time travelling at a speed of 1 to 2 km an hour. Just work out what that costs in petrol! And for the operators it also means an enormous investment of capital, because it naturally costs money when these commercial vehicles are held up at the frontier. A way must be found of at last overcoming the resistance of the national authorities.

One point I should like to emphasize here is that there is really no need at all for these checks at the frontier, as I have already said in a different connection. These checks can be equally well made at the loading- and starting-point, or, as far as I am concerned, at the destination. Checks can also be made at random *en route*, if that is what is wanted.

Janssen van Raay

These are very specific points. Transfrontier traffic must run smoothly, firstly, in the interests of the operators concerned and, secondly, so that results can be seen by the citizens of Europe to have at last been achieved in this important field. After all, a common market is not possible unless there is freedom of transport.

And, of course, while the Netherlands has the Presidency of the Council, the practice of charging a levy on imported fuel must be stopped, which means breaking the resistance of the two countries which do not want to allow exemptions from duties, there being absolutely no excuse for this attitude.

Secondly, a somewhat longer-term matter: we are concerned about the continued absence of a policy on the ports. There is a genuine need for such a policy in the European Community. It would take me too long to go into detail now. It is a question of proper competition among the various ports. It is a question of social facilities for crews. Skimping in one port is not only not in the interests of the crews concerned: it also results in unfair competition for ports which make proper checks in this respect. It is therefore important to establish a uniform policy on ports.

I do not want to anticipate the Third Law of the Sea Conference. Mr Hoffmann's motion for a resolution refers to the promotion of the Community's sea-transport interests. I should like to say, on behalf of my group, that it is high time the European Community attended and was represented at the Law of the Sea Conference as such and therefore in its own right. Otherwise, I can say that my group will be voting in favour of the Hoffmann report.

President. — The European Democratic Group has the floor.

Mr Moorhouse. — Mr President, one feels rather like a voice in the wilderness when calling for a common transport policy in the Community, so it is at least some comfort to know that the Commission has come forward with these particular proposals, granted that they are a continuation of previous proposals, and we feel Mr Hoffmann has done us all a considerable service in producing his report. However, I do share with Mr Albers regret that the Commissioner himself is not present, because this surely is a very basic matter of discussing the priorities for the next few years.

Inevitably, the emphasis placed on the various transport priorities will differ from group to group and from Member to Member, and we would not necessarily say that we agree with all that Mr Hoffmann has had to say; but we are in general agreement, because all of us on the Committee on Transport share the view that we must move on with a common transport policy.

Furthermore, we would say that a common transport policy is not just a nice thing to have, not just a nice objective; it is an absolute necessity, and I ask all Members who may not be convinced of that to think hard about the subject and consider that it is a vital objective, one which is at the heart of the future economic prosperity of the Community. For instance, trade between Community countries is growing all the time. Indeed, we are seeing some dramatic increases in trade. For example, the tonnage of unitized freight carried between British ports and France, Belgium and the Netherlands is increasing annually by no less than 13.7%, whereas, incidentally, the corresponding rate is only 2% or so within the United Kingdom itself. This increase well illustrates the clear need to develop Community transport links if the growth in trade, on which the Community depends, is to continue, and we shall therefore continue to press for a Community transport infrastructure fund to back projects such as the Channel tunnel which could assist the flow of Community trade. As rapporteur on the Commission's recent proposals on transport bottlenecks, I myself on behalf of the committee shall be taking a close look at the Commission's plans to facilitate the flow of passengers and freight throughout the Community and to determine what action could be taken in the immediate future. I share very much the view expressed by Mr Janssen van Raay that we must consider in particular proposals for easing traffic through cross-frontier points which cost little or nothing. That is one of the ways to follow in establishing an effective common transport policy in the relatively near future and in the life of this Parliament.

As I have really implied already, we need to inject a much greater sense of urgency into all of this: bromide statements of intent, some of which do appear in the Commission document, are not going to get us very far, or indeed anywhere. So, as the European Democratic Group, we will press, press and press again for a transport system, throughout Europe which will enable people and freight to move much more freely, without let or hindrance. We support Mr Seefeld in this, and we ask all our colleagues to join us with enthusiasm in that effort.

President. — The Liberal and Democratic Group has the floor.

Mrs von Alemann. — (D) Mr President, the Liberal and Democratic Group welcomes the fact that the Commission has now submitted this list of priorities. The Commission's document provides for practical action in the period up to the end of 1983. We hope that this will result in an acceleration of the decision-making procedures, for which we see an urgent need in view of the continued absence of progress towards a Community transport policy. We particularly endorse the emphasis placed on projects relating to infrastructure, reorganization of the railways and cooperation

Von Alemann

among the railway companies at Community level and also the projects aimed at facilitating combined transport operations and at improving safety in the sea-transport sector. But I should like to add the criticism that it might perhaps have been better to place greater emphasis on items in the programme which will lead towards a basic common transport policy, as the previous speaker also stressed, rather than listing all these individual points, which almost amount to a mail-order catalogue.

My group still feels that, if the general economic function of transport is not to be endangered, we cannot do without the harmonization of conditions of competition. We believe that it would be very difficult, to put it mildly, to integrate the transport markets simply by liberalizing this sector. The importance of this harmonization is evident from the question of the dimensions and weights of commercial vehicles. Until a decision is taken on the dimensions and weights of lorries, there is unlikely to be any further tax harmonization and certainly no solution to the problem of apportioning costs for the use of infrastructures. Unless this problem is solved, a tariff policy that accords with the rules of fair competition will be impossible. I hope that this programme of work and this list of priorities will take us one small step towards a common transport policy.

President. — The Group of European Progressive Democrats has the floor.

Mr Doublet. — (*F*) Mr President, whilst personally I can only agree with what has been said, particularly by the chairman, Mr Seefeld, and other members of the Committee on Transport, on behalf of my group I wholeheartedly endorse the Hoffmann report. We are delighted, of course, that the Council has consented to seek Parliament's opinion — which has not always been the case — on the list of priorities and the decisions to be taken in relation to the transport sector up to the end of 1983. However, I should like to take advantage of the fact that we do not yet have any Spanish Members in the House and use a characteristically French expression to say — and here I take up a remark made by Mrs von Alemann — that this document is a bit like a Spanish inn. You see, it is all very well agreeing on general principles, it is all very well, as Mr Seefeld said earlier, being flexible, but what we need to do first, in my view, is to draw up a positive plan of action backed up — and this is the essential point — by a financing plan. To put it another way, let us first of all make sure that we have the resources, because without them we should find ourselves in the situation so admirably described by Mrs von Alemann when she spoke of a large store catalogue. In short, I should like to lay emphasis on the need to give priority to infrastructures. May our urgent and unanimous wishes at long last be granted and I should like to renew my appeal to the Commissioner responsible for

transport and call on him to see to it that our governments adopt in the very near future that famous regulation promised some years ago relating to support for projects of Community interest. I should also like to see the Council give an immediate green light on the paltry 15 million units of account which we asked for and which for the past three years has always been replaced by a 'token entry'. These comments should not be interpreted as being any kind of reservations with regard to the proposal so carefully drawn up by Mr Hoffmann and so conscientiously examined by the Committee on Transport. We are merely reaffirming a clearly and often stated position of this Parliament, which cannot wait much longer for a response from our governments if we are all of us really interested in implementing the Treaty of Rome, the whole of the Treaty of Rome and nothing but the Treaty of Rome.

President. — I call Mrs Ewing.

Mrs Ewing. — Mr President, I am very grateful to Mr Hoffmann for his remarks about flexibility and his reference to the passing by Parliament in February of a resolution on a particular aspect of flexibility concerning drivers' hours in remote areas. I would welcome flexibility in considering priorities for areas with very small populations such as the area I represent, where there are only 7 people per square kilometre, although the EEC recommendation is that 35 people is too few. You will appreciate that in such areas with no public transport of any kind — no buses, no trains — a coherent infrastructure becomes very important. For instance, for lack of a bridge in certain areas hundreds of miles of extra roadway — and poor roads at that — have to be travelled, and in days of dear and scarce petrol this does seem to be the kind of case where a bridge might well be a very important item of coherent infrastructure, even though the population is remote. So I should like some assurance, perhaps from the Commission on another occasion, that they will not forget these areas where for instance the construction of a very small bridge, a not very expensive one, might keep an island populated. During the war, many barrages were built to connect islands in my area, so that you can now go along many islands by road. That was done because of the necessities of a war: it seems tragic that it should take a war to keep islands populated by providing a coherent infrastructure.

In conclusion, I would also ask what has happened to the road-equivalent tariff, a principle which would help all islands: it was passed by this Parliament but does not seem to be implemented, and if we are not careful it may be lost sight of.

President. — I call the Group for Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members.

Mr Pannella. — (I) Mr President, I am naturally broadly in favour of this proposal. Nevertheless, there is one point that I should like to bring to the attention of Parliament and, especially, of the Commission, which is particularly well represented here today as far as the comments I wish to make are concerned.

In the general context of transport policy and of the implementation of a transport system that is consistent with the interests of the Community, we must, I believe, be more mindful of the fact that in the recent agreements signed with Yugoslavia we were primarily concerned with establishing what we might call a north-south transport network, which the Community certainly needs now that Greece is a member of our Community.

However, it seems to me to be rather imprudent, to say the least, for us to be subsidizing, by virtue of the agreements with Yugoslavia, road infrastructures which after all, are outside the Community, beyond a frontier which is historically especially sensitive, whereas, apart from talking about it, we are doing nothing — and the Italian Government is doing no more — to guarantee the north-south transport infrastructure which, *via* the Passo di Monte Croce Carnico and *via* the sea-lanes, is to provide an efficient and direct transport link between all the countries of the Community — and therefore also with Greece — without this giving us the kind of right of way which we have acquired through a territory which is not — I am sorry to say — yet a part of our Community.

As I have indicated on many occasions in the past, this is a political and strategic problem, it is a serious problem and an investment problem, which concerns Yugoslavia's interests. In fact, if transport consignments of particular strategic importance to the Community are going to pass exclusively, mostly or increasingly through Yugoslavia — as will certainly be the case — the incentive to attack Yugoslavia will be all the greater. Accordingly, I see the problem as requiring a clear-sighted appreciation of the infrastructure and general economics of modern transport. Similarly, the precise needs within the Community should serve to remind the Commission of its institutional function — which it cannot disclaim before Parliament — in furthering through every medium, including the Council — in spite of Rome's idleness and irresponsibility — those interests that concern Europe and not just, say, the Vatican, or the Papal States or whoever else.

IN THE CHAIR: MRS VEIL

President

President. — I call the Commission.

President. — I call the Commission.

Mr Dalsager, Member of the Commission. — (DK) Madam President, Mr Contogeorgis is unfortunately unable to be here today, but I notice that some of the Members who have complained about this have now left the Chamber, so perhaps they are less interested in hearing the Commission's reply than one might think.

Let me say at once that the Commission — which is, of course, a collegiate body — very much appreciates the work that has been done and the efforts made by the European Parliament to deal in such a short time with the Commission's proposal concerning priorities for a Council working programme on transport up to the end of 1983, so that the Council can act on the proposal by 26 March. The Commission thanks the Committee on Transport for the excellent work it has done in such a short time and especially, of course, Mr Hoffmann, the rapporteur.

Apart from certain specific points that I shall refer to later, the Commission is very pleased with the motion for a resolution, which is generally in line with its proposal. This resolution will obviously strengthen the Commission's position when the proposal comes before the Council.

I note that, in the motion for a resolution, Parliament calls for greater flexibility in the multiannual programme and proposes eight or nine new points to be added to the 35 already included in the Commission's proposal. On the question of flexibility, the Commission absolutely agrees that a programme for Council action stretching over a period of over three years must allow for adjustments to take account of changing circumstances. It must be neither rigid nor exhaustive.

With regard to the nine further points which it is proposed should be added to the list of priority matters, may I point out that the Commission will naturally be extending the list beyond the 35 priority matters included at present, so it is not intended to be exhaustive: some work on other activities that are already under way must be continued, while new ones must not, of course, be ruled out.

Five additional points are proposed for 1981, and I should like to say a word about these. The first concerns the duty-free admission of fuel contained in the fuel-tanks of commercial motor-vehicles. The Commission is aware of the importance of this matter. Its proposal for doubling the quantity that can be admitted free of duty is being dealt with in the Council, and we shall certainly urge the Council to take up the question again when we think there is a possibility of achieving a positive decision.

The additional items proposed in the Committee on Transport's report include, among others, measures to

Dalsager

facilitate cross-frontier transport. This we are prepared to acknowledge.

As to the question of a system of charging for the use of transport infrastructures, this is a very complicated matter on which I do not think, as things stand at the moment, there is any hope of arriving at a comprehensive solution before the end of the year. The Commission has proposed that the Council should, before the end of 1981, adopt the first directive on duties on commercial vehicles, which constitutes the first step towards a satisfactory system of charging for the use of transport infrastructures.

On the question of competition in maritime transport, the Commission shares Parliament's view that there is a need to improve competition. Instead of introducing it as a single point in the programme of priorities, the Commission has proposed no fewer than five items directly or indirectly concerned with this objective.

Ports policy is also included. In fact, the Commission has just completed a report on the Community's ports. It is the result of seven years' work in a special working-party. Representatives of the Community's largest ports, who have helped to draw up the report, concluded that there was no question of distortion of competition between the big ports at Community level. On the basis of the conclusions in the report and in view of the fact that the directorate-general for Transport does not have enough staff, the Commission has decided, as part of the reorganization now going on in the Commission, not to set up any new division in the Directorate-General to deal specifically with ports. Therefore, I am afraid I cannot agree to Parliament's proposal.

Lastly, we have the question of building a Brenner tunnel and projects connected with outlying and coastal regions, islands, etc. The position here is that it has been decided, in connection with the Commission's proposal for financial aids to transport infrastructure projects of Community interest, that only states may submit infrastructure projects. It is not possible, therefore, for me to agree on behalf of the Commission to the inclusion of this item on the list of priority matters so long as there has been no proposal from one of the states for such a project.

Parliament proposes also that two other matters should be included, one being measures to facilitate cross-frontier transport. In my view, this is an area where the Community *can* help; the Commission has no hesitation, therefore, as I said a few minutes ago, in endorsing your proposal and including this item in the list.

With regard to air and road transport safety, I should first like to make the general comment that the Commission's policy regarding proposals for Community action must be thought out very carefully in order to avoid any duplication of work already being done

under the auspices of larger international organizations. With regard to air transport, may I point out that the Council of Ministers in 1978 approved a number of matters? It agreed to give priority to something like nine or ten things, some of which concerned safety aspects, too. As regards general road transport safety, the work of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe and the European Transport Ministers' Conference is extremely relevant and we already have contacts with these bodies — and that does not mean that nothing is happening.

The list in the Commission's Communication includes other matters for decision relating to Community driving licences and working conditions in road and rail transport. We have already implemented common legislation on the monitoring of commercial vehicles. The Commission does not think it possible at present to add more items in this sector and cannot accept this amendment.

Lastly, it is a notable fact that the Commission and Parliament agree about the vast majority of the decisions which the Council should take during the period up to the end of 1983. I hope that the reasons I have given make it clear why, in the Commission's view, the question of measures to facilitate cross-frontier transport is the only thing that calls for a special amendment to the Communication and the list at the end of the Communication. As honourable Members will understand, this Communication and list are of a selective nature, dealing exclusively with priority matters connected with Council decisions during the period in question.

In conclusion, I should like to say that we can all congratulate ourselves on the very high level of agreement which clearly exists between our two institutions. The Commission naturally values Parliament's views, unambiguously stated, very highly and appreciates its positive attitude and the rapidity with which it has accomplished this work. I have explained our views regarding amendments and I endorse the hope expressed by the Members that the Council, at its meeting on 26 March, will likewise be able to adopt a positive attitude to the programme and adopt the draft resolution. We consider it reasonable and believe it is necessary for the future common transport policy, that the Council should take quick decisions.

President. — The debate is closed.

We shall now consider the proposal for a draft Council resolution, on which I have Amendment No 1, tabled by Mr Cardia:

Other priority matters

After the indent measures for the benefit of sea ports, add the following new indent:

- links with peripheral and coastal regions and with islands.

President

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Seefeld, deputy rapporteur — (D) Madam President, what Mr Cardia is proposing is very sensible. It emphasizes the efforts of this House to be active in the area of regional policy as well. I am therefore able to recommend the House to adopt this amendment.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 1)

President. — I put the motion for a resolution to the vote. The resolution is adopted.¹

7. Attempted coup d'état in Spain

President. — The next item is a joint debate on

- the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr de la Malène and others, on behalf of the Group of the European Progressive Democrats, on Spain (Doc. 1-978/80); and
- the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Glinne and others on behalf of the Socialist Group, Mr Klepsch and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD), Mr Fergusson and others on behalf of the European Democratic Group, Mr Fanti and others on behalf of the Italian members of the Communist and Allies Group, and Mr Bangemann and others on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, on the attempted *coup d'état* in Spain (Doc. 1-8/81).

The motions for resolutions Nos 1-962, 968 and 970/80 have been withdrawn.

I call Mr Israel.

Mr Israel. — (F) My purpose in speaking in this joint debate on the two motions for resolutions is to argue the case for my group's motion for a resolution.

Firstly, why have we tabled our resolution? Above all because we believed it necessary to draw the attention of Parliament and public opinion to the solemn declaration of the European Council in Copenhagen which, on 7 and 8 April 1978, laid down that only countries that respected the principles of representative democracy and human rights were eligible for membership of the European Community. We wanted, through our resolution, to emphasize the fact that this fundamental principle was laid down by the European Council. We also felt it necessary to make the point that the blows to democracy in Spain are attributable to a terrorist organization under the name of ETA, whose allegiance to Marxism we felt obliged to underline.

Those, Madam President, are the two reasons for urging Parliament to support our own resolution.

As regards Mr Lücker's resolution, on behalf of my group I hereby formally request a vote paragraph by paragraph, since whilst we support the resolution as a whole we do not agree with all of the individual paragraphs.

In fact, Mr Lücker's resolution refers to the regions — I am well aware that the regions do exist for us internally and that they have a high priority for us — but it is unthinkable to suggest in an important resolution of this kind that the Community is composed of states and regions. To our knowledge only the ten Member States make up the Community.

Furthermore, we find extremely dangerous the suggestion contained in paragraph 6 of Mr Lücker's resolution that negotiations should be speeded up. One should never negotiate under pressure and one should never accelerate negotiations. If they are undertaken earnestly they will accelerate of themselves. And above all, Madam President, we want to avoid giving the impression that the difficulties Spain is currently experiencing could be interpreted by certain opponents of Spanish accession as a form of blackmail. We are in difficulties, so come to our aid promptly and help sort out our problems in such sectors as fisheries and wine-growing which are, as you know, absolutely vital to the stability of the Community.

Madam President, I have said all I wanted to say and I will not even sum up. It is perfectly simple, we urge support for our resolution and we request a vote paragraph by paragraph on Mr Lücker's motion for a resolution.

President. — Mr Israël, with regard to your request for a vote paragraph by paragraph, are you asking for a vote on each separate paragraph or only for a separate vote on paragraph 6?

Mr Israel. — (F) Madam President, I am asking for a separate vote on each paragraph

President. — I call Mr Lücker.

Mr Lücker. — (D) Madam President, I should first like to point out that there is no Lücker motion for a resolution. I am speaking to a motion that has been jointly tabled by all the political groups in this House with the exception of the group to which Mr Israël belongs. I hope you will accept this clarification, although I will not deny that I was involved in the preparation of the text of the motion for a resolution on behalf of my group. But if there were a Lücker motion for a resolution, it would undoubtedly be worded differently in a number of respects from this joint motion.

¹ OJ C 77 of 6. 4. 1981.

Lücker

This means that a very good compromise for this House has, I believe, been found in this case. This is a highly topical political matter, and I assume that many Members of this House are aware of the public response in the international press, particularly in Spain. The House was therefore well advised to endeavour to put forward a joint resolution to which almost all the groups in this House have put their names. I regret, however, that despite lengthy discussions and negotiations it was not possible for the Group of the European Progressive Democrats to agree. The information reaching us daily about what was really behind the *coup* that failed in Spain confirms that we of the European Parliament were well advised to submit a resolution which in fact endeavours to combine two political matters. Firstly, we want to make clear to the Spanish people and their political authorities at this time that the political organizations, the political parties and, of course, not least our Parliament are following the events in Spain with concern and also, as in the past, with human sympathy. In the past too, we have repeatedly shown that our sympathy is genuine and that we advocate Spain's accession to the Community not simply as an act of political routine. The Spanish people should know that we in Europe are following the events in Spain very closely, that we shall continue to do so in the future and that we particularly welcome the increased vigilance which, we are convinced, the responsible Spanish authorities will demonstrate in the future.

I am grateful that the whole House has agreed that King Juan Carlos of Spain should be thanked for his courageous action and his moral authority. We surely all agree that his authority and his action during the night of the *coup* very probably tipped the balance and resulted in the maintenance of democracy in Spain. We should also like to say very clearly to the forces in Spain responsible for this attempted *coup* that they were exposing the whole of the Spanish people to considerable danger. Spain's accession, which we are convinced is important for a better economic and social future for the Spanish people, is dependent on the existence of a pluralist democracy, the maintenance of democracy and also respect for human rights. This Parliament now includes Greek Members. You know how this Parliament reacted when the colonels suspended the democratic system in Athens. We officially broke off all relations with Greece. I believe that the Greek Members are still grateful to us for that today ...

(Applause)

... and we waited until democracy was restored in Greece. The same will apply to anyone who might wish to join this Community in the future.

Madam President, our intention was to encourage the Spanish people. The large numbers of Spanish people participating in the demonstrations in the major cities

of the country were convincing evidence of the general feeling. It made a deep impression on us all, I believe, to see how the Spanish people has learned to appreciate its freedom again and to demonstrate for its freedom, democracy and the Constitution. I would ask, Mr Israel to give a little thought to his group's attitude. When we talk about Spain in this House, we must not ignore the responsibility of our Community for Spain's future and its relations with us.

(Applause)

Many Members of this House share my opinion. In 1976, the infant Spanish democracy submitted its application for membership of the Community. Five years later, we find that the negotiations have not made anything like the progress they should really have made.

(Applause)

That is our failure, Madam President, let me make that quite clear. I feel that this delay in the negotiations with Spain has not been completely without effect in causing a certain change of attitude in the Spanish people. If we are to be honest, Madam President, we must do a little soul-searching and think of our responsibility. Above all, we must call on the Commission and the Council of Ministers to speed up the negotiations on Spain's accession. I believe this is more than justified. We cannot have these negotiations failing because of a few hundred or a few thousand tonnes of tomato purée or lettuces.

(Applause)

Anyone who uses such things as an argument is incapable of appreciating the political significance of the problem. My group will therefore be voting for this resolution, because we believe that, through the balance it strikes and the basic political objectives it sets, it represents a document which again expresses the will of this House and thus of the spokesmen of our nations to include Spain in our Community as soon as possible. This will not only consolidate democracy in Spain but also advance the democratic integration of Europe, the transformation of our Community into a European Union.

President. — I would remind the House that according to our agreements with the staff the proceedings should finish at 1 p.m. In fact we shall finish at 1.30 p.m., but it is entirely desirable that by then we should have had a vote on these motions, and I still have about ten names on the list of speakers. I simply wanted to point this out, since I know that there has been no allocation of speaking-time this morning, but it would be very regrettable if we were not able to vote at least on this item. The other reports will in any case be deferred to the next part-session.

The Socialist Group has the floor.

Mr von der Vring. — (D) Madam President, leaving aside certain differences of opinion over the wording here and there, the resolution jointly tabled by five groups in essence demonstrates how united our Community is in its profession of faith in democratic Spain. This is a demonstration of European unity and a confirmation of our common conviction, a warning to all those who appear to underestimate the extent of our determination when they sometimes hear confusing remarks from us.

An officer threatening freely elected representatives with a pistol in his hand — that is really inconceivable in this Europe. Many people are saying today — and I should like to make a few comments on this — that the Spanish democracy has got away with it once again, and many fear there will be another attempted *coup*. I do not believe that this pessimism — which is not, of course, completely unfounded — does justice to the actual situation in Spain, the phenomenon of Spanish democracy. Normal democrats going on strike forget all too easily what strength lies in their democratic constitutions. Spain's democracy, to which we pay tribute today, is not a house of cards, it is not a sham, it is a genuine force. The political maturity of the Spanish people has in recent years repeatedly caused astounded admiration particularly among sceptical observers. Astounding it may be, but it is certainly not a matter of chance, but in every respect a reality: a king who changes republicans into monarchists, that too is astounding, but not chance; a prime minister emerging from the Spain of yesterday, anything but a mere mouthpiece, leading the country in an impressive straight line into the everyday democracy of modern Europe. On the other hand, since his return from an inactivity imposed by exile, that lifelong Communist Carillo has proved himself to be an advocate of parliamentary stability. And, of course, I am not forgetting in this connection Felipe Gonzales, despite his youth the leader of the opposition, an alternative that inspires confidence in this new democracy. These astonishing phenomena of the new Spanish democracy, to which quite a few others could be added, are more than the outcome of mere chance: they make up a Spanish democracy which is difficult to explain, but is real and anything but fragile and is worthy of our confidence.

Spanish democracy — the new Spain — means leaving behind the Spain of yesterday, the Spain of the civil war, whose last proponents have shown their anachronistic ugliness in the spectre of those responsible for this attempted *coup* and of the ETA terrorists.

Perhaps we Europeans in particular find it difficult to understand this, because we are probably still somewhat under the spell of the Spain of the '30s: the Spanish civil war, which once united Europe across the board against fascism, which transformed Europe's poets, artists and philosophers into soldiers fighting for Spain's freedom, but which — I hope for the last time — gave us a true insight into the nature of

bloodshed and killing, sometimes turning brother against brother, as we can see from contemporary European literature. Even Picasso's 'Guernica', that painting of protest against war, murder and terror, still leads us to regard hatred, enmity and aggression as symbolic of the Spanish civil war. Spain, the song in praise of death — that, I believe is precisely the wrong image: modern Spain has broken with this tradition and history. This democratic Spain wants to leave the civil war behind it for good and all and with it the violence that only generates violence. It refuses to smash ETA terrorism with brute force because it does not want to get into the vicious circle of violence, which can so easily be romanticized. It also says: let us have an end to retaliation and the idea of retribution. One day the dead of both sides in the civil war will be commemorated at common cemeteries. This democracy also means refraining from claiming a demonstrative victory over the forces of the past. No break, no demonstration, simply the continuous evolution of democracy, with the greatest possible measures of discipline — that is what characterizes the new Spain.

I believe we must consider all these factors at once if we want to understand Spanish democracy. Democratic Spain presents itself today as a rigorous, unremitting break with the past, as a kind of non-violent confederacy — unremitting because there is absolutely no alternative. We live in a world dominated by violence. We are therefore aware what risks Spain is taking with its policy of non-violent, gradual change to democracy — the attempted *coup* was a warning — and the apparent or real frailness of this course fills us with concern.

At the same time, it is above all this course that Spain has adopted which unites our Europe right across the political spectrum in admiration, sympathy and solidarity. This too is a fact on which Spain's democracy can build: despite all the political antitheses and conflicts, there is in the European Community, which we represent here, no force which is prepared to tolerate the overthrow of the Spanish democracy. The Community will never interfere in Spain's internal affairs, but we all feel particularly committed to solidarity with the Spanish democracy. Those forces in Spain still flirting with the idea of restoring the old despotic régime should not be mistaken about our deep-felt solidarity. This may be an economic community, but it is an extremely practical and effective affair because of that. Between us — our Community — and the enemies of the Spanish democracy there can never be economic and social cooperation, integration or even association. On behalf of the vast majority of the political forces in our Community, I can say that Spain's accession to the European Community will cause quite a few economic and social difficulties. It will require a particular effort on the part of the Community to prevent Spain's accession from having adverse effects on the citizen in Spain and elsewhere in the Community. It is a matter of particular importance for this Parliament that it should press

Von der Vring

for comprehensive, carefully prepared support measures to be taken at the right time, so that the forces of convergence and of social adjustment in the Community of the future at last become the dominant factors which the Treaties of Rome intended them to be.

We therefore hope that the negotiations on accession will be stepped up, and we should like to encourage the Spaniards to prepare for this accession. Despite all the conflicts of interest to be considered, we can say to the Spanish people: we look forward to the early accession of Spain to the Community.

(Applause)

President. — The European Democratic Group has the floor.

Lord Douro. — Madam President, this debate could not have come at a better time, because on Monday the Spanish Foreign Minister is travelling to Brussels to meet the entire Council of Ministers, and we understand from this morning's papers that the subject of Spain will be high on the agenda at the European Council meeting on 23-24 March.

My group supports the joint resolution tabled by the five major political groups, which we have worked out over the last ten days.

I was in Spain during the attempted *coup*. There is no doubt that the King's intervention was decisive. He never wavered from his defence of the constitution. Unfortunately, if there should be a next time, they will know now who their first target should be. But what we are talking about today is what we can do to reduce the possibility of any similar attempt in the future. There is a universal feeling in Spain that membership of the Community will considerably strengthen democracy. Army *coups* may happen in South America but not in the European Community. The institutional and constitutional bonds between Spain and other EEC countries, which would be created by accession, would inevitably constrain and inhibit any future insurrections.

I also welcome very much the new Spanish Prime Minister's commitment to begin negotiations on Spain's joining NATO. This will bring Spanish officers into contact with the social, political and cultural attitudes of their European counterparts. . .

Mr Pannella. — *(F)* Like the Turkish officers!

Lord Douro. — . . . It will also complete Spain's return from her past isolation to her natural position as one of the major Western European countries.

The most important paragraphs in this resolution are paragraphs 6 and 7. In the former, we call on the Commission and Council to accelerate the negotiations with Spain and of course, although it is not mentioned, with Portugal as well. Once the French presidential election is over, I hope we shall see an increase in the pace of these negotiations.

We all realize that there are agricultural problems for some countries and industrial problems for other countries. But surely, Madam President, we can overcome these by extended transition periods. What is important is that we should become a Community of Twelve, that Spanish and Portuguese ministers should join the Council, that their Commissioners should join the Commission and that their elected representatives should join us here in the European Parliament. Paragraph 7 urges greater liaison within the framework of political cooperation, and I hope the Foreign Ministers will take this suggestion very seriously next Monday in Brussels.

Madam President, the European Economic Community was founded to preserve peace and liberty. The Treaty of Rome calls upon other European peoples who share our ideals to join us. We must now act quickly on the four-year-old application from Spain and I ask all Members of this House to support the resolution.

(Applause)

President. — The Communist and Allies Group has the floor.

Mr Bonaccini. — *(I)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, our Group, the group of Italian Communists — which gave its agreement to the motion for a resolution we are now debating — shares the views put forward by other Members. Perhaps we, like others, do not fully recognize our opinions in this motion for a resolution, but, like the others, we are aware that Parliament is taking a major political step, giving proof of its maturity, of its capacity, that is, to grasp the essence of a particular situation.

Thus we have taken a step concerning Spain; but I dare to hope that it is also one which will have a bearing on our more general thinking. We are probably all aware of what has happened in Spain. The pictures we have seen on television of the braggart armed with a pistol who entered the parliament and the pictures of the Guardia Civil leaping out of the window from parliament may look like scenes from a farce. Indeed, a great political writer of the last century, reflecting on the events which led to the formation of the Second Empire in France, said that some events looked like tragedy one moment and like farce the next. I think this time we must resist the temptation to look only at the farcical aspects of the event. It is a very serious

Bonaccini

matter: that 'braggart' also entered our parliaments, entered our houses, and we threw him out and will throw him out again thanks to the resolution we are adopting today, thanks to our joint resolve.

In this way we shall avoid the recurrence of other tragic farces such as have characterized the history of Europe — the tragic farce of non-intervention in the first events which led to bloodshed in Spain. We congratulate the Spanish people, the political forces, the trade unions and the Spanish Head of State, for his resolute and loyal stand; and at the same time we declare that we must all take care to ensure that such events and conditions do not repeat themselves, either in Spain or in Turkey, and that we must advance along the path of political decisions taken by the Community. This resolution is also a self-criticism revealing what we have all neglected to do; we want to assume our share of responsibility and work towards the achievement of all the many objectives and political hopes which we have fixed together.

Problems certainly exist, as the resolution notes in paragraphs 5 and 6 concerning enlargement; but the most serious problem is that of not being in step with the dynamic of political events, of risking taking no action or acting slowly. That is why we urge the Commission to accelerate the negotiations and call on all of us to reexamine the problems of a more general nature whose solution is vital to Spain, to our countries and to the European integration to which we are committed. We also appeal to the Council of Ministers for the practical implementation of the recommendations on political cooperation which we have put forward here.

President. — The Liberal and Democratic Group has the floor.

Mrs von Alemann. — (*D*) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, when they saw the pictures of those responsible for the attempted *coup* unlawfully and undemocratically forcing their way into the Spanish Cortes on their television screens, the members of all parliaments in the European Community and elsewhere could not fail to declare their solidarity with their Spanish colleagues. We should again like to express the shock and disgust we felt at this venture, to declare our solidarity with the Spanish people and their government and to congratulate the King on his personal commitment and great courage, which ultimately defused this crisis, which could have had so tragic an end.

We welcome the fact that a majority of the European Parliament has submitted a joint resolution and that the various other resolutions have been shelved. Of course, everyone prefers his own wording, but in the end what was important was that we should adopt a joint line in our efforts to offer our solidarity and help

to the Spanish people. I am happy that this has happened and would say this to Mr Israel: you said during the coordinating discussions that you would have liked to include the declaration made by the European Council in Copenhagen on 7-8 April 1978 as a means of alluding once again in this joint resolution to the maintenance of democracy and human rights. As you will recall, we, of course, immediately agreed and included in paragraph 4 of the joint resolution at your request, the words 'the maintenance of human rights'. We thus made a great effort to comply with the wishes of the individual groups in order to express our solidarity with the Spanish people on the basis of a joint approach by the democrats in this House.

I would like to explain the wording of paragraph 2 originally suggested by my Group. We wanted to express our indignation at the attack on the independent institutions of democratic Spain, our disapproval of this deed, our assurance of solidarity and also our promise to the Spanish people of our support for its integration into the European Community.

Ladies and gentlemen, this very important point should, I feel, be given particular emphasis. We all know that solutions have not yet been found to all the economic problems connected with integration. I do not think there is anyone in this House who is not aware of the problems that, of course, exist; but we also know that we have a duty to this people, which, now that it has returned to a democratic, pluralistic, parliamentary form of government, has applied for membership of our European Community. We said at the time that once a pluralistic, democratic form of government has been established, this country should become a member, and we must stick to that. We must assure the Spaniards that, as long as they have this form of government, they will have our solidarity and that we will intensify our efforts. The majority of this House call for the greatest possible haste in the decision-making process and the talks taking place, so that Spain can become a member of the Community.

On behalf of my Group, I would therefore call on you to adopt the joint resolution.

President. — The Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members has the floor.

Mr Pannella. — (*F*) I believe, Madam President, that the Spanish people can be sure of one thing: that as long as the King or the people or the political parties or luck can continue to foil *coups* in Spain, we shall continue to support Spanish democracy. As long as a *coup* is no more than bluster or appears to be perpetrated by figures straight of the world of the operetta, we shall remain on the side of the winners, of Spanish democracy, of the King.

Pannella

But come the time that our Conservative friend spoke of, when in place of truculent has-been colonels we have modern and efficient NATO officers, as is the case in Turkey, you will be on the side of the people responsible for these *coups*, just the same as the majority of you here in this Parliament are in the case of Turkey, because they are officers of NATO, torturers, murderers and barbarians, but strong and capable of success. And then we shall see the Fellermaiers, these so-called Socialists, endorsing these disgraceful attitudes, as we are doing at this very moment in Turkey. If it is true, Madam President, that you in the Bureau have appointed a delegation to go to Turkey carefully excluding our group, you are doing the colonels' work for them by sending over there only those that the colonels or generals are pleased to welcome. The facts, Mrs von Alemann, are quite different. Here they are: When the coups fail, everyone here bubbles over with good intentions and fine words, but when they succeed and 80 000 people are thrown into prison, as is the case in Turkey, when prisoners are tortured, when promises are broken, when the Commission, the Community continues to finance all that, then the attitude changes.

Personally I am in favour of Spain's entry into the Community, but not because we represent, because you represent a hope for democracy. You are often as much on the side of violence as the others. Your conscience forsakes you at times. Really, if there is killing somewhere and your own get killed you are up in arms, but when the killing is done in your name you are all for it . . .

(The President refused to allow Mr Beyer de Ryke to interrupt the speaker)

As I say, then, I am personally for Spanish accession, just as I was for Greek accession. It gives me great satisfaction because — in contrast to the utterly misguided views held by others — I believe that Mediterranean Europe and southern Europe must be interdependent and not look upon each other as enemies, as really the poor have been led to do. It is in fact southern Europe that could represent tomorrow, in the Third World, the hope of a policy other than that of the agri-foodstuffs multinationals, whose victims we in southern Europe and in Mediterranean Europe are, too, and the hope of a policy other than that of a military-industrial complex whose protagonists want to see Spanish democracy guaranteed by NATO.

In conclusion, Madam President, I would simply like to beg Mr Lücker not to confuse his hopes with reality. Mr Lücker, you have said repeatedly that all the groups with the exception of the European Progressive Democrats are signatories to this resolution. There is one group here that has not signed, namely mine. As long as there are people here who are prepared to cock a snook at the provisions of Rule 28 we shall stand firm and continue to voice our opinion, as we

are doing now. Here it is: We are not joining with the friends of Turkish torturers to express our solidarity with the Spanish people simply because they have not been beaten, for, if they had been, no one here would have given them any support!

President. — I call Mr Patterson on a point of order.

Mr Patterson. — I am terribly sorry to have to raise a point of order, but I think it is important for the conduct of debates.

Under Rule 34 it is stated that a speaker may not be interrupted, but it does give other Members the right to rise, and if the speaker agrees, and you agree, there can be a question on his speech. Now this seems to be an important feature of a debate, that if someone is saying the sort of things Mr Pannella was saying it is possible for another Member to get up and question the veracity of what he is saying. That is why there is a provision for this in the Rules. And I hope, Madam President, that in future, when someone does rise, you will give fair consideration to that request.

President. — I would point out to Mr Patterson that it is for the Chair to decide who is to be allowed to speak and that a number of speakers have urgently asked for the floor in this debate.

I call Mr Beyer de Ryke.

Mr Beyer de Ryke. — *(F)* I should just like to point out to Mr Pannella an apparent inconsistency in his remarks. First he protests in the strongest terms at a proposed visit to Turkey by a delegation from this Parliament, and then he expresses extreme annoyance at being excluded from this delegation. These two attitudes seem to me to be contradictory; that is all I wanted to say.

President. — I call Mr Glinne.

Mr Glinne. — *(F)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the Socialist Group would like to commend the various Spanish authorities for coming down in favour of democracy in their response to the *coup* of 23 February. We are also pleased to note the high value attached to freedom and democracy by a wide spectrum of political parties, by the trade union organizations and by the Spanish people. It is this that led us to participate in drawing up a joint resolution.

The chief merit of this text is, in our view, the fact that it contains a solemn reminder that a political system based on a pluralist parliamentary democracy and respect for human rights are conditions of accession to and membership of the European Community for any country. This means, without a shadow of doubt, that the *coup* of 23 February, had it succeeded, would have made it absolutely impossible for Spain to be considered for membership of the European Community. We

Glinne

are also satisfied with the emphasis laid in the resolution on the political importance of finding an economic and social balance between the countries of the Community and also, with all due respect to Mr Israel, between the regions that constitute those countries. Lastly, we are also pleased that paragraph 6 of the resolution — a crucial paragraph, this — calls for a speeding up of the accession negotiations.

Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I asked to speak on behalf of my Group so that I could comment briefly on the immediate and longer term prospects for Spanish democracy. It is in fact our painful impression that Spanish democracy since 23 February, but also before then, has been under the watchful eye of the army. The Spanish Constitution is moreover, rather unusual in that it contains certain unique clauses referring to the role of the army: we have to admit that this is not something we come across often in Western Europe. Of late there have been in Spain certain tell-tale signs: for example, the open opposition to the fourth divorce bill is a revealing detail. But there has been much more than just details. There is a growing and persistent rumour in Madrid of a second confrontation on the nature of the regime, which might develop in the near future. They are saying openly, even in some of the serious newspapers, that this could happen in two or three weeks' time. At any rate, in Madrid they are behaving as though such a confrontation were imminent. There is increasing evidence of a widespread conspiracy among the ranks and the leadership of the armed forces, which enjoys considerable financial support from well-placed civilian sources. The proof of the power of these networks is provided by the apparent reluctance on the part of the political authorities to carry out the plan, which, incidentally, they have never clearly spelt out, to purge the upper echelons of the armed forces. Some 15 % of these people have apparently given open support to certain conspiracies but the official attitude to them is to avoid any provocation. The participation of the Socialist Party in government, which has been spoken of over the past few weeks and which would in our view be an excellent way of achieving a more stable and balanced democracy in Spain, would also apparently be seen by some army officers as an intolerable provocation — by those in fact who would most readily place democracy on a tight rein.

And so the fact that the attempted *coup* of 23 February was foiled does not give us much confidence. The danger is still there. Some odd facts still need an explanation. For instance, the four generals arrested following the *coup* of 23 February are presently living extremely comfortably in officers' quarters, with no restrictions on visiting. Colonel Tejero, prime mover of the *coup*, is certainly in prison but he has become a national cult figure, thanks to the periodical *Alcazar*. Some rather strange public fundraising exercises are even being organized on his behalf. The newspaper *Diario 6* has also recently revealed that Colonel Tejero has access to a telephone

in prison which he may use without any surveillance or restriction.

While 15 % of the army is involved in some kind of conspiracy, only 5 % of all officers — and here I quote from the *Observer*, a serious publication, of 8 March — would support the Constitution, leaving a silent majority of 80 % who are committed above all to the unity of the armed forces and to ensuring a leading role for them in the nation and in the State.

The legal proceedings to be brought before the Supreme Military Court, which will not discuss the matter for another year, and the progress of the judicial inquiry into those behind the *coup* of 23 February have about them, as I say, an air of hesitancy and circumspection which are significant.

In short, there are very grave reasons for fearing that the situation in Spain could deteriorate to the point where the political life, and in particular freedom of the press, would be subject to a tacit veto by the armed forces and to a form of self-censorship. The danger is not so much that freedoms will be suppressed as that their enjoyment might be restricted. And here, in conclusion, I echo the opinion expressed by my Spanish friends who say that this is, our would be, intolerable. We for our part could never tolerate, in the near future or at any time, a regime, in which the military, behind a superficially democratic façade, would in the final analysis enjoy the political fruits of a *coup* without the inconvenience and trouble of staging it.

President. — I call Mr Pesmazoglou.

Mr Pesmazoglou. — (*EL*) Madam President, I wish to give my warm and fervent support to the motion for a resolution tabled by five groups of the European Parliament, and I want to make an appeal to the other groups and to all my colleagues in the European Parliament for us all to work together to produce a unanimous resolution. This is of critical importance, and I want to place direct emphasis on the fact that democracy is neither geographically nor politically divisible.

As a representative of the Greek people in Europe, I should like to impress upon the European Parliament the political importance of this resolution for the Greek people, who lived through the period of the recent dictatorship in Greece during the seven years from 1967 to 1974, and also to point out that a resolution of this nature will act as a warning to the forces of disorder which, as Mr Glinne explained a few minutes ago, are still operating in Spain; at the same time it will serve as a statement of the unity of the European peoples, thereby strengthening the political influence and effect of the European Community throughout the world.

President. — I call Mr Haralampopoulos.

Mr Haralampopoulos. — (*EL*) Madam President, since we are still not fully acquainted with procedural matters I did not put down my name, in accordance with the rules, to speak on this extremely important issue at present under discussion. However, I have prepared a brief text, just one page, in order to explain PASOK's vote on the joint resolution to which Mr Glinne referred previously. I could recount a large number of personal experiences, as I did to the Socialist Group, but I shall not do this as I do not want to impose upon the kindness you have shown me in allowing me to speak. Instead, I will confine myself to what I wrote in order to explain PASOK's vote. The MPs of PASOK will vote on behalf of this motion for a resolution condemning the attempted *coup* in Spain for the following reasons:

- 1) Because PASOK unequivocally condemns the attempted overthrow of the parliamentary system in Spain;
- 2) Because the resolution expresses support for the people of Spain in their struggle for democracy and free institutions;
- 3) Because, given the desire of all the political parties in Spain for accession to the EEC, PASOK is obliged to honour this desire; and
- 4) Because PASOK believes that there should be a resolution condemning the attempted imposition of a dictatorial régime, a resolution which up to now has been avoided by the Conservative majority in the European Parliament.

Finally, Madam President, I want to make the position of PASOK quite clear once again that democracy in a country is won and secured by the struggles of the people in that country and not by its participation in international alliances like the Common Market.

President. — I call Mr Damette.

Mr Damette. — (*F*) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I wish to point out first of all that the motion for a resolution in question has not been tabled by five groups, as an unfortunate presentation might lead one to suppose. The French Communist and Allies are in no way party to this document. I say this to set the record straight and for the minutes.

Everyone knows that the French members of the Communist and Allies Group are vehemently opposed to Spanish entry into the Common Market and what we have witnessed here can only serve to harden our attitude. In the first place, how can this Parliament give lessons in international democracy when just the day before yesterday it decided, with the only opposition coming from the Communist Group, to send a

delegation to Turkey and thereby legitimize a military dictatorship which throws both parliamentarians and trade unionists into prison, and practices torture and assassination. As for freedoms, perhaps you wish to give Spain a few good examples of how things are done in the Common Market. She could study how they ban the exercise of professions in West Germany; or how they deal with the problem of sovereignty in Northern Ireland by military repression and, if necessary, torture; how France under Giscard d'Estaing has sacked 12 000 trade union delegates in a single year. I shall stop there, but one could go on much longer.

This brings me to the central theme of the debate. As we see it, and we say this on the basis of our experience, this European Community of ours is not even a democracy, much less a guarantee of democracy. The European Community represents above all the concentration of capital, the stranglehold of the multinationals on the economy, the destruction of the farming community, the dramatic rise in unemployment. That is not the way to encourage the growth of democracy in any country, whichever side of the Pyrenees you happen to be on.

What we are really doing by our action here today, and I weigh my words very carefully, is playing straight into the hands of the multinationals which want to accelerate the process of enlargement and take advantage of the fact that feeling is running high to sweep aside the growing doubts and opposition to enlargement in France, in Africa and, yes, in Spain as well. Once again the discourse on democracy is simply a pretext, the veil to be drawn across a much more mundane reality, namely capital and the need to reemploy it.

The French Communists believe that the only real guarantee of democracy in Spain lies in the struggle of the Spanish people. In this they shall never lack our support, no more so than in the days of Franco when we supported their fight for freedom every inch of the way.

President. — I call Mr Bournias.

Mr Bournias. — (*EL*) Madam President, on behalf of the New Democracy Group, I express our deep satisfaction that today the Europe of the Ten is giving its wholehearted support for the rights of the Spanish people.

The newly-founded Spanish democracy underwent a great danger on the night of 23-24 February. Endangered with it was a whole system of free institutions which the Spanish people, after 40 years of dictatorship, had secured by a huge majority with constitutional provisions which were a product of the individual freedoms and special historical and social circumstances of that country. On that historical night of 23 February, the highest authority in the land, King Don

Bournias

Juan Carlos, with the relatively limited powers which he has under Article 61 of the Constitution of Spain, exercised his personal influence with courage and determination to compel the transgressors of constitutional order to respect and abide by the Constitution and the laws which ensure the rights of citizens in the autonomous regions. With the government and the parliament taken prisoner, he showed himself equal to the occasion and clearly demonstrated beyond the borders of his own country that he is a responsible man who has the highest regard for democracy. This brave and exemplary stand was given the immediate and united support of the Spanish people, who, regardless of party affiliations, gave their wholehearted approval to the King's stance and, by condemning the attempted *coup*, gave a totally new lease of life and real meaning to the 1978 Constitution and the concept of individual freedom. The action was decisive in the circumstances of the moment and served as a warning for the future.

The Greek Parliament, expressing the feelings of all Greek people, was first to send its resolution to the Spanish Parliament condemning and expressing its abhorrence at this abominable attempted *coup*. This spontaneous expression of solidarity, endorsed by the New Democracy Group here in Parliament, is not simply the consequence of our democratic tradition and support for individual freedoms, but the result of the particular sensitivity of the Greek people following seven years of dictatorship which was the scourge of the nation. Our present undivided moral support for Spanish democracy is of particular significance when one recalls the delicate task undertaken by New Democracy to return Greece to normality by overcoming the internal difficulties and regional tensions so as to lead it, at last, into the European family to which it belongs.

The experiences of the recent past were a source of inspiration to the authors of the Greek constitution, in which special provision is made to ensure that it is upheld by appealing to the patriotism of all Greeks which places a duty and an obligation on them to oppose absolutely anybody who attempts to overthrow the constitution by force. We think that this provision, over and above the authority and personal influence which those responsible for safeguarding the laws and individual freedoms are able to exercise, is innovatory in so far as it introduces the element of collective protection, thereby laying the foundations for broader and greater solidarity.

We believe and are confident that the main basis for constructing Europe is to be found reinforcing the solidarity of the peoples of Europe. The Spanish situation ought to be of use to us in defining a common policy towards Spain and any other European candidates for accession to the European Community. The unity of purpose displayed in overcoming and tackling the attempt to subvert democracy should, in our opinion, be a model code of conduct in the future for

all of us who wish to preserve and safeguard democracy in Europe and in the Mediterranean in particular. New Democracy, whose founder in 1974 re-established and strengthened democracy in Greece, wholeheartedly shares today's democratic gesture and endorses the message of support to the Spanish people, the King and the political leadership in Spain.

President. — I call Lord Douro on a point of order.

Lord Douro. — Madam President, as you said that we are due to stop at 1.30 p. m. and as I believe it is the will of the majority of this House that there should be a vote, could I not appeal to those people who are left to speak to either withdraw their names or be extremely brief? I am sure the Commissioner wants to speak, and we must try and get a vote in the next five minutes.

President. — Thank you very much for that appeal, to which I entirely subscribe.

I call Mr Oehler.

Mr Oehler. — (*F*) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, if I may just refer to that appeal for brevity, I believe there are those among us who have forgotten it in the course of this week. Last night I remained here until after midnight and, although I was to have spoken, I never even had the chance. Perhaps in future the injunction to be brief will be applied to everyone.

Madam President, Europe owes its support to the Spanish people who have demonstrated their democratic will so convincingly. All the same, on behalf of the French Socialists I am bound once again to state our position which is, I believe, absolutely clear. We have never yet challenged the principle, enshrined in the Treaty of Rome, which gives every European and democratic State the right to become a member of the European Community. We are happy and proud, in the present circumstances, that we never gave in to the pressure from those who would go so far as to despair of Spanish democracy. We have always laid stress on the economic problems in the accession negotiations with Spain, and the text submitted to us contains references to both the defence of democracy and the problem of enlargement. We have said what needed to be said about this, no more, no less. Whilst never challenging the principle, we have always said 'Not regardless of the cost, not to matter how'. We insist and always will insist that the essential prior measures that we have already indicated must be adopted with regard to agriculture, industry and regional problems. A vote paragraph by paragraph has been requested. We shall be voting against paragraph 5 of Mr de la Malène's motion and against paragraph 6 of the general motion. We shall state our position on the

Oehler

final vote after the vote has been taken on the amendments.

President. — I call Mr Papaefstratiou.

Mr Papaefstratiou. — (*EL*) Madam President, I shall be very brief, as the subject has already been discussed at great length. About 200 years ago, Bonaparte said that the people often rise up in rebellion to establish democracy but seldom act together to save it. I am pleased to see that the attempted *coup* in Spain shows that, in modern times, democracy in its cradle of Europe can be saved by the maturity of the people, unity of purpose and democratic solidarity between parties. I am also pleased by the fact that almost all the political parties in Parliament were unanimous in their opinion that the European Parliament should express its opposition towards the *coup* in Spain in the strongest possible terms. I am also pleased, and I want to make particular note of this, that the motion for a resolution was approved by our Greek colleagues in PASOK, who have fought for many years against Greece's accession to the Community. Their approval, however, shows that the European Community does act as a real guarantee for democracy in those countries where it is endangered.

President. — The Commission has the floor.

Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission. — (*I*) Madam President, I should like in the first place to pay tribute to this Parliament for the democratic and Community spirit it has shown in bringing this matter up so promptly. Secondly, Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I wish to convey the admiration and appreciation of the Commission to the Spanish authorities and principally to King Juan Carlos, to the political and trade union movements and to the Spanish people who by their demonstration on 28 February gave convincing proof of their commitment to democracy.

Nearly every speaker in this debate has stressed the importance of Spain's entry into the Community for the strengthening of democracy in that country. This is echoed in the resolution tabled jointly by five political groups and submitted to us.

Madam President, not least for reasons of time, I shall confine myself to just this particular aspect. I should like to take this opportunity to say that the same motives inspire us in relation to Portugal, as indeed they did in the case of Greece. Consequently, what I have to say about Spain will for the most part also apply to Portugal. Only recently, in fact, the Portuguese authorities reminded us of and emphasized the political weight they attach to entry into the Community.

It has become something of a commonplace to point out how, for all these countries, one of their first polit-

ical actions after regaining democracy was to apply for membership of the Community. This is clearly not just a mere coincidence and springs rather from a sense that membership of the Community is identified with the choice of a pluralistic parliamentary form of government and with respect for human rights. This is not a choice that was arrived at suddenly, but an idea that began ripening in the minds of Spanish democrats when the Community first came into being, during Franco's dictatorship. Spanish public opinion clung tightly to the idea of Spain's entry into the Community and felt sure that with the passing of the Franco regime the doors to Europe would immediately be thrown open.

Unfortunately, this hope was not fulfilled with the speed that had been expected. It is now four years since Spain submitted its application for accession. Mr Glinne, unless we are constantly mindful of the image built up by the forces for democracy in Spain, which identifies the Community with democracy, we shall end up by provoking and aggravating the feelings of frustration which, as Mr Lücker pointed out, protracted negotiations would inevitably engender.

It is therefore vital to give a clear-cut response which will remove this impression and the only proper way to do this, as most of the speakers pointed out, is to speed up the negotiations, dealing as quickly as possible with the fundamental problems connected with practical difficulties which are due both to the actual process and nature of the negotiations and, perhaps more importantly, to the internal crisis in the Community. I have to make it quite clear, however, that the delays resulting from our own internal difficulties should not be interpreted in any way as a lessening of the real political will on the part of the Community to conclude these negotiations as quickly as possible. Our Spanish friends are in any case aware of the difficulty of reaching a positive conclusion until we can define more clearly solutions to the problems that will have a decisive influence on the actual conditions of accession and which will in the end become their problems too. Furthermore, our Spanish friends have to realize that entry into the Community requires a change in outlook and in their operational structures, especially in some sectors of the economy.

Under these circumstances it is vital to emphasize the atmosphere and the rhythm of the negotiations. Regardless of how things stand, it is possible to deal immediately with all the sectors not directly affected by our internal problems, thanks to the enormous volume of detailed studies conducted by the Community and the Spanish authorities. It is extremely important, therefore — and I was delighted to see this point brought out by more than one speaker and also included in the joint resolution — to know just how these problems are going to be resolved, because there could be nothing worse than negotiations that have been 'patched together' and that simply postpone the problems rather than solve them. This would inevita-

Natali

bly produce further tensions within the enlarged Community.

Accordingly, a proper balance must be struck between the urgent political necessity of laying down a timetable for the stages that remain so as to enable the earliest possible entry of Spain into the Community, and the need to ensure that accession will result in the Community being reinforced and not weakened by enlargement, which clearly would be the case if the process were to work to the detriment of the poorest regions of the enlarged Community.

I should like to say that, since it first considered this question in April 1978, the Commission has laid stress on this dual necessity and has always insisted that in all important documents relating to its 'existence' the Community should — and must now — henceforth think in terms of the Twelve. And this is not just a practical consideration but a politically clear choice.

This is the line the Commission has tried to follow over the last few years, the line we shall be following in the busy near future in response to Parliament's votes and to the needs and hopes of the Spanish people, whose destiny is closely linked with that of our peoples.

President. — The debate is closed.

I can now give the floor for explanations of vote.

I call Mr Plaskovitis.

Mr Plaskovitis. — (*EL*) As a member of this Parliament and of PASOK, I should also like to point out that I completely endorse the statement by my colleague, Mr Haralampopoulos, on the way we shall be voting on the joint motion for a resolution tabled by five political groups.

We do not believe that a country's membership of the European Community is sufficient to ensure that its democratic institutions are preserved. The struggle for democracy is based on the dynamism of the people, its fighting spirit and its institutions, and heaven help us if we left it to others to protest our country against fascism. Consequently, it is not a matter which can be left in the lap of the gods. Furthermore, the scenes that took place in this parliamentary part-session when all the measures of support to the peoples of the Western Sahara, San Salvador and the freedom fighters condemned to death in Chile were rejected, are a more than clear indication of what would happen if some general tried something similar to what was done by Pinochet and more recently by the Francoists in Spain.

As regards Mr Papaefstratiou, who made a reference a moment ago to the position of PASOK, I think it would

be better if he advised his party in Greece not to keep all those who blindly and immorally served the colonels and conspirators of 21 April in key positions in the government, security forces and the judiciary. It would be a better guarantee for him, his party and Greece than trying to explain PASOK's position, which is well known to all Greek people and has been repeatedly explained in this Parliament.

President. — I call Mr Peponis.

Mr Peponis. — (*EL*) Madam President, after Mr Haralampopoulos's clear statement on our behalf, I do not think that any further explanation is needed from the Greek Socialists. I just want to add that the opinions and statements which PASOK expresses are made with the Greek people and their interests in mind. We support the view that association is more beneficial than accession to the people of Greece. What the Spanish people will do is up to them and the parties which represent them. We are united with them in the struggle against dictatorship. Beyond that, each people must face up to other issues with its own political forces.

President. — I call Mr Kappos.

Mr Kappos. — (*EL*) Madam President, I want to say on behalf of the Communist Party of Greece that we condemn in the strongest possible manner the attempted fascist *coup* in Spain and we want the leaders of the *coup* to be punished as an example to others. At the same time, we express our total support for the people of Spain in their struggle to secure and broaden the basis of democracy. We showed our solidarity with the Spanish people by demonstrating in the streets of Athens on the first day after the attempted fascist *coup*.

However, Madam President, we cannot share the opinions and positions assumed in the resolution on Spain for three basic reasons:

First, we are opposed to the expansion of the EEC, as this is tantamount to strengthening a supranational organization controlled by monopolies which are responsible for directing the strategic plans of expansion.

Second, we are opposed to the resolution because accession to the EEC provides no assurances whatsoever for democracy in any country. We cannot share the opinion which is voiced in the resolution presented in this House. Democracy is a matter for the people and the democratic forces of each country. It is something to be struggled for by the people and nobody else, and especially not by the EEC, which, as an organization that strengthens the control of monopolies, rejects democracy.

Kappos

(Protests. The President called on the speaker to conclude his speech)

Indeed it is an explanation of vote because a number of things were said, including the fact that I had signed the resolution. And in Greece the EEC only froze what it was advantageous for it to freeze and not everything, as was stated in the House. The financial agreements which the EEC benefitted from were frozen; tariff dismantling, however, was continued. Furthermore, we have the recent example of Turkey and yesterday's example of the Western Sahara.

The third and final reason why we are opposed and will vote against the resolution is the fact that we support the view that Greece should withdraw from the EEC. Consequently, we cannot support the accession of other countries to the EEC.

President. — I put the de la Malène *et al.* motion for a resolution to the vote.

The motion is rejected.

With regard to the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Glinne and others, I have a request for a vote paragraph by paragraph. I think we could begin by voting on the first four paragraphs together, which constitute a kind of preamble, then on paragraphs 5 and 6 separately and then on the last two paragraphs.

(Parliament adopted the first four paragraphs, paragraph 5, paragraph 6 and the last two paragraphs)

I put the motion for a resolution as a whole to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.¹

8. Dates of the next part-session

President. — I remind the House that our next sittings will be held at Strasbourg during the week from 23 to 26 March 1981.

Those items on the agenda which could not be dealt with during this part-session are deferred to the next part-session, it being understood that the proposed order of business gives priority to

— the vote on the Luster report on the Rules of Procedure;

— the Ligios report on agricultural prices, and

— the six reports on fisheries.

I call Mr Langes.

Mr Langes. — (D) Madam President, I realize that the remaining motions are being held over. Only Item 20, which not only calls for supplies of foodstuffs to Poland, but also makes proposals to the Commission, is really urgent. I would therefore ask you, Madam President, to place this motion right at the top of the agenda for the next part-session, and I hope that request will have your backing in the Bureau.

President. — No, Mr Langes, it is not possible to deal with any other items. They will all be included in the agenda for the next part-session, though I must make it clear that they will not be called then until after the Ligios and Luster reports have been dealt with.

I call Mr Alber.

Mr Alber. — (D) Madam President, I have been informed that the subject of Item 7, the last item on the original agenda, is on next Monday's agenda for the meeting of the Council, so there is absolutely no point in holding over the debate.

President. — Mr Alber, it has just been stated that we cannot deal with the items remaining on the agenda.

9. Approval of the minutes

President. — Rule 17 (2) of the Rules of Procedure requires me to lay before Parliament, for its approval, the minutes of proceedings of this sitting, which were written during the debates.

Are there any comments?

The minutes of proceedings are approved.

10. Adjournment of the session

President. — I declare the session of the European Parliament adjourned.

The sitting is closed.

(The sitting closed at 1.50 p.m.)

¹ OJ C 77 of 6. 4. 1981.

**Salgs- og abonnementskontorer · Vertriebsbüros · Γραφεία πωλήσεως ·
Sales Offices · Bureaux de vente · Uffici di vendita · Verkoopkantoren**

Belgique — Belgie

Moniteur belge — *Belgisch Staatsblad*
Rue de Louvain 40-42 — Leuvensestraat 40-42
1000 Bruxelles — 1000 Brussel
Tel 512 00 26

Sous-dépôts — *Agentschappen*

Librairie européenne — Europese Boekhandel
Rue de la Loi 244 — Wetstraat 244
1040 Bruxelles — 1040 Brussel

CREDOC

Rue de la Montagne 34 - Bte 11 — Bergstraat 34
- Bus 11
1000 Bruxelles — 1000 Brussel

Danmark

Schultz Forlag

Møntergade 21
1116 København K
Tlf (01) 12 11 95

Underagentur

Europa Bøger
Gammel Torv 6 — Postbox 137
1004 København K
Tlf (01) 15 62 73

BR Deutschland

Verlag Bundesanzeiger

Breite Straße — Postfach 10 80 06
5000 Köln 1
Tel (0221) 21 03 48
(Fernschreiber Anzeiger Bonn 8 882 595)

Ελλάς

Γ Κ Ελευθερουδάκης Α Ε

Νίκης 4
Αθήνα (126)
Τηλ 3226323
Τέλεξ 219410 eief

Πρακτόρευση

Βιβλιοπωλείο Μόλχο
όδος Τιμισκῆ 10
Θεσσαλονίκη
Τηλ 275 271
Τέλεξ 412885 limo

France

*Service de vente en France des publications des
Communautés européennes*

Journal officiel

26, rue Desaix
75732 Paris Cedex 15
Tél (1) 578 61 39

« *Service de documentation* »

D E P P — Maison de l'Europe
37, rue des Francs-Bourgeois
75004 Paris
Tel 887 96 50

Ireland

Government Publications

Sales Office
G P O Arcade
Dublin 1

or by post

Stationery Office

Dublin 4
Tel 78 96 44

Italia

Libreria dello Stato

Piazza G Verdi, 10
00198 Roma — Tel (6) 8508
Telex 62008

Nederland

Staatsdrukkerij- en uitgeverijbedrijf

Christoffel Plantijnstraat
Postbus 20014
2500EA 's-Gravenhage
Tel (070) 78 99 11

United Kingdom

H M Stationery Office

P O Box 569
London SE1 9NH
Tel (01) 928 69 77 ext 365

España

Libreria Mundi-Prensa

Castelló 37
Madrid 1
Tel 275 46 55

Portugal

Livraria Bertrand, s a r l

Rua João de Deus — Venda Nova
Amadora
Tel 97 45 71
Telex 12 709 — litran — p

Schweiz - Suisse - Svizzera

Librairie Payot

6, rue Grenus
1211 Geneve
Tel 31 89 50

Sverige

Librairie C E Fritzes

Regeringsgatan 12
Box 16356
103 27 Stockholm
Tel 08-23 89 00

United States of America

European Community Information Service

2100 M Street, N W
Suite 707
Washington, D C 20 037
Tel (202) 862 95 00

Grand-Duché de Luxembourg

**

Andre lande · Andere Länder · Άλλες χώρες · Other countries · Autres pays · Altri paesi · Andere landen

Kontoret for De europæiske Fællesskabers officielle Publikationer · Amt für amtliche Veröffentlichungen der Europäischen Gemeinschaften
Υπηρεσία Επισήμων Έκδόσεων των Ευρωπαϊκών Κοινοτήτων · Office for Official Publications of the European Communities
Office des publications officielles des Communautés européennes · Ufficio delle pubblicazioni ufficiali delle Comunità europee
Bureau voor officiële publikaties der Europese Gemeenschappen

L-2985 Luxembourg - 5, rue du Commerce Tel 49 00 81

Debates of the European Parliament, published as an annex to the Official Journal of the European Communities, comprises:

- report of proceedings,
 - annual indexes
-

Sales

Annual subscriptions run from March, the beginning of the Parliamentary Year, until February.

Orders may be placed with the Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Payments to be made only to this Office.

Price (excluding VAT) in Luxembourg

Annual subscription 1981/1982: ECU 40,80 BFR 1700 IRL 29 UKL 25.50 USD 59.50

Single issue: price set accordingly in each case and shown on cover.

Prices do not include postage

ECU 13,20 BFR 550 IRL 8.80 UKL 7.70 USD 17.50



OFFICE FOR OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS
OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

ISSN 0378-5041

L-2985 Luxembourg

Catalogue number: AX-AA-81-001-EN-C