

Annex

Official Journal

of the

European Communities

No 1-286

English edition

Debates of the European Parliament

1982-1983 Session

Report of Proceedings

from 14 to 18 June 1982

Europe House, Strasbourg

Contents

Monday, 14 June 1982	1
Resumption, p. 1 — Order of business, p. 2 — Action taken on Parliament's opinions, p. 6 — Immunity of MEPs, p. 10 — EEC-US relations, p. 11 — International carriage of passengers by road (ASOR), p. 18 — Air traffic control, p. 21 — Annex, p. 26	
Tuesday, 15 June 1982	28
Minutes, p. 29 — Fruit and vegetables, p. 30 — Agricultural structures, p. 38 — Belgian presidency and related matters, p. 45 — Question-Time, p. 91	
Wednesday, 16 June 1982	105
Hunger in the world, p. 107 — Question-Time (contd), p. 139 — Science and technology, p. 151 — Votes, p. 153 — Annexes, p. 155	
Thursday, 17 June 1982	187
Minutes, p. 188 — Agenda, p. 189 — Lebanon, p. 189 — Iron and steel, p. 202 — European passport, p. 206 — Internal market, p. 207 — EMS, p. 212 — Aid to 'Caritas', p. 213 — Nicaragua, p. 214 — Science and technology (contd), p. 216 — Programme on the environment, p. 223 — Dangers arising from the use of consumer products, p. 233 — Air transport, p. 236 — Votes, p. 242 — Air transport (contd), p. 244 — Market for electronic products, p. 247 — Inward processing, p. 256 — European coastal charter, p. 258 — Budgetary contribution to the ECSC, p. 260 — Annex, p. 262	
Friday, 18 June 1982	272
Minutes, p. 272 — Privileges and immunities of Community officials, p. 273 — Community energy strategy, p. 274 — Import or export duties, p. 285 — Adjournment, p. 285 — Annex, p. 286	

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: *(DA)* for Danish, *(DE)* for German, *(GR)* for Greek, *(FR)* for French, *(IT)* for Italian and *(NL)* for Dutch.

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

SITTING OF MONDAY, 14 JUNE 1982

Contents

1. <i>Resumption of the session:</i> <i>Mr Pannella</i>	1	5. <i>Relations between the EEC and the United States of America — Interim report (Doc. 1-300/82) by Mrs Gredal:</i> <i>Mrs Gredal; Mr von Wogau; Mr B. Friedrich; Mr Habsburg; Sir Fred Catherwood; Mr Haagerup; Mrs Hammerich; Mr Herman; Mr Andriessen (Commission); Mrs Gredal</i>	11
2. <i>Agenda:</i> <i>Mr Moreau; Mr Hopper, Mr Provan, Mr Andriessen (Commission); Mr Gautier; Mr Curry; Mr Sutra; Mrs Castle; Mr Forth; Mr Bangemann; Mr von der Vring; Mr Balfe; Lady Elles; Mr Boyes; Mr Cottrell; Mr Enright; Mr Balfe; Mr Boyes; Mr Seligman; Mr C. Jackson; Mr Forth</i>	2	6. <i>Carriage of passengers by roads (ASOR) — Report (Doc. 1-182/82) by Mr Buttafuoco:</i> <i>Mr Buttafuoco; Mr Seefeld; Mr Kazazis; Mr Nyborg; Mr Eisma; Mr Andriessen (Commission)</i>	18
3. <i>Action taken on the opinions of Parliament:</i> <i>Mr Wurtz; Mr Andriessen (Commission); Mrs Clwyd; Mr Andriessen; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mr Andriessen; Mr Balfe; Mr Andriessen; Mr Moorhouse; Mr Andriessen; Mrs Squarcialupi; Mr Andriessen; Mrs Cinciari Rodano; Mr Andriessen; Mr Martin; Mrs Vayssade; Mr Andriessen; Mr Van Minnen; Mr Andriessen; Mrs Clwyd</i>	6	7. <i>System of air traffic — Report (Doc. 1-211/82) by Mr Albers:</i> <i>Mr Albers; Mr Seefeld; Mr Janssen van Raay; Mr Moorhouse; Mr Berkhouwer; Mr Buttafuoco; Mr Andriessen (Commission)</i>	21
4. <i>Request for a Member's immunity to be waived — Report (Doc. 1-298/82) by Mr Donnez:</i> <i>Mr Donnez; Mr Pannella; Mr Donnez</i>	10	<i>Annex</i>	26

IN THE CHAIR: MR DANKERT

President

(The sitting was opened at 5 p.m.)

1. *Resumption of the session*

President. — I declare resumed the sitting of the European Parliament adjourned on 14 May 1982.¹

¹ *Approval of minutes — Membership of committees — Petitions — Transfer of appropriations — Motion for a resolution (Rule 49) — Authorization of reports — Referral to committee — Documents received — Texts of Treaties forwarded by the Council: see Minutes.*

I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (FR) Mr President, I just want to put a request to you by way of a procedural motion.

I should like the provisions of Rule 25(2) relating to questions put to our institution to be respected, i.e. for answers to be given within the time limits set out in this Rule.

President. — Your statement has been noted, Mr Pannella. Every effort will be made to respect these deadlines. The Bureau will consider the question you raised this week.

2. Agenda

President. — At its meeting of 11 May 1982 the enlarged Bureau drew up the draft agenda which has been distributed.

At their meeting this morning the chairmen of the political groups instructed me to submit several amendments to the House.

(The President read the amendments to Monday's and Tuesday's agenda)¹

I call Mr Moreau.

Mr Moreau. — *(FR)* Mr President, if I have understood you correctly, the Bureau has reversed the order of debate but is the Hopper report still on the agenda and will it be debated in the presence of the representative of the Council?

President. — That is correct, Mr Moreau. The Hopper report will be taken together with Mr Tindemans's statement on the Belgian Presidency. The report will therefore be included in the discussion but the resolution will be put to the vote.

Mr Moreau. — The vote on the resolution will take place on Wednesday?

President. — That is correct.

I call Mr Hopper.

Mr Hopper. — Mr President, do I understand, therefore, that the Hopper report will be part of the second debate on organizational problems and that it will definitely begin at 3 o'clock; in other words, that the first debate will not be allowed to spill over into the afternoon?

President. — It is not quite possible to fix the timing because the groups have a certain sovereignty, but your understanding about our intentions, Mr Hopper, is perfect.

I call Mr Provan.

Mr Provan. — Mr President, I hope that I can assist you slightly with the log jam that is obviously developing in your agenda.

Not for the first time we have wine as one of the subjects on our agenda today. I refer to item No 100, the

Colleselli report (Doc. 1-278/82). We have got a procedural problem here, I believe, because the Colleselli report is based on proposals that were published by the Commission on 15 October. The Committee on Agriculture decided to go ahead and draw up a report on these proposals, only to be later informed by the Commission that they had now been withdrawn. We have got an assurance from Commissioner Dalsager that we will be consulted on the new proposal which is now coming forward from the Commission.

I would submit to Parliament, Mr President, that we would get ourselves into procedural difficulties if Parliament were to go ahead and adopt the Colleselli report at this time when in fact we should be waiting until we get the new proposals from the Commission. I therefore ask you to refer it back to the Committee on Agriculture, and I would hope that we would be able to deal with it as urgently as possible. Indeed I hope we will get some support in the House to get it through as urgently as possible, because I have got a lot of sympathy for the wine producers.

President. — Mr Provan, I think your request is a very sensible one. But so far I only heard that the Commission and the Council insist that the report by Mr Colleselli (Doc. 1-278/82) is urgent. So if different proposals from the one before us now are being put forward I shall gladly follow your advice. But I have to ask the Commission first if that is the case.

I call the Commission.

Mr Andriessen, Member of the Commission. — *(NL)* Mr President, I can say little more than that the Commission would greatly appreciate the report being dealt with in compliance with the wish expressed this morning and on previous occasions.

President. — Mr Andriessen, the question was whether the Commission has put forward or intends to put forward other proposals as Mr Provan's suggests.

Mr Andriessen, Member of the Commission. — *(NL)* The latter is not the case, Mr President.

President. — Mr Provan asked that the Colleselli report should be sent back to the Committee on Agriculture. I have to honour that request. We can allow one speaker for and one against.

I call Mr Gautier.

Mr Gautier. — I just have one question for the Commission.

President. — I am afraid it is too late.

¹ See Minutes.

Mr Gautier. — Why? I am familiar with the Rules of Procedure. When one Commissioner says one thing and another something else, it would be interesting to hear what the Commission as a college says.

President. — I assume, Mr Gautier, that the Commission speaks with one voice and that Mr Andriessen has spoken on behalf of the Commission. Mr Provan moved that the report be referred back to committee.

I call the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr Curry, chairman of the Committee. — Mr President, at the meeting on 25 May, Commissioner Dalsager undertook to forward the new documents on the wine policy to the Committee on Agriculture. May I inform you that last Thursday, three weeks after that meeting, one copy in French and two copies in Italian arrived at the Committee on Agriculture's secretariat in Luxembourg. Therefore, if the Commission treats this as a matter of urgency, it should have demonstrated more urgency by itself despatching the necessary documents to Parliament.

I would suggest, Mr President, that it would be possible for this item to be placed on the agenda of the committee meeting next week, that we could consequently vote, with your permission, at a special meeting on the Monday of the July part-session and still deal with this matter in the July part-session if that meets with the approval of the House.

President. — You spoke in favour of referral back to the Committee in view of developments that have taken place.

I call Mr Sutra.

Mr Sutra. — (*FR*) I am surprised by this discussion to the extent that it has taken place once before and the Members of the Committee on Agriculture, such as my friend James Provan or the new chairman David Curry, were present and know how strongly I had to protest in the Committee on Agriculture against what I described as dilatory manoeuvres when a Member of the Conservative Group continued the discussion even after he had been defeated in a vote. Our chairman, Mr Curry, then said to him: 'Mr Hord, the matter is closed; we have just voted and you have been beaten'.

I am astonished to see the resumption of these dilatory manoeuvres. The Committee on Agriculture decided with full knowledge of the facts to consider the Colleselli report. It knew perfectly well how far work had progressed. It is true that there have been changes and proposals from the Committee dating back to October; we are acquainted with them and we felt that at this juncture following the Luxembourg compromise the Colleselli report provided a valid instrument for

Parliament to deliver its opinion to the Commission and Council of Ministers.

If we now fail to debate the Colleselli report we shall be in effect refusing to give information to the Council and Commission and one of the three institutions will be absent from the decision-making process. There would then be no new report on the wine-growing sector and I know that is what some Members want. Since they have lost in the debate on the substance of the issue they are now trying to win through a procedural dispute. The Committee on Agriculture reached a decision a fortnight ago: it decided to discuss the report and went on to do so. It took a lengthy vote on all the amendments and today Mr Colleselli is introducing his report on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture with all the amendments which have already been adopted. I therefore ask for the agenda to remain unchanged, Mr President.

(*Mrs Castle asked to speak on a point of order*)

President. — Not at this moment, Mrs Castle.

We have just heard one speaker for and one speaker against the proposal.

I do not think I can permit a point of order just before the vote as that would mean an additional speech for or against the proposal.

(*Parliament approved the proposal to refer the report back to committee*)

I call Mrs Castle on a point of order.

Mrs Castle. — It is now too late. My point of order concerned the vote.

President. — I call Mr Forth.

Mr Forth. — Mr President, I would like to oppose the proposals that you have made to change the agenda and I hope that you will submit them to the vote of the House, as I know you will. I do this partly because I think it totally confuses the substance of the agenda, but also because — and this is a very worrying trend — it is becoming clearer at each session that the chairmen of groups are hijacking the agenda by sitting in secret, and making a substantial number of changes of which we are only appraised less than an hour before the sitting. This means that ordinary Members increasingly have less facility to exercise their rights under Rule 56 to make further changes to the agenda. We are therefore left, as mere mortals, in the position of only reacting to what that secret conclave of chairmen has proposed and being unable to make positive proposals to the agenda for ourselves. And therefore for that reason, if for no other, Mr President — and I

Forth

hope that you will bear this very much in mind — I would like to oppose, and I will vote against the changes that you have proposed to us for Tuesday's agenda.

President. — Mr Forth, of course you are perfectly correct in saying that there was a different agenda proposed but you have to realize that that agenda was fixed a month ago and the Rules clearly state that it is the function of group chairmen to try to bring the agenda up-to-date if the need arises. It is quite clear that in the last month some decisions have been made concerning a number of issues on this agenda, and one of them is, shall we say, closely related to the Hopper report. It is now unavoidable that the President-in-Office of the Council should pronounce on some basic elements of the Hopper report and therefore this morning it was decided by the chairmen of the political groups to include the Hopper report in the discussion on the declaration of the President-in-Office of the Council. It seems to have a certain logic. You propose that we should not do so: that means that we have to vote on it. I have heard your voice; I need now one speaker for and one against. Mr Bangemann, you wish to speak against?

Mr Bangemann. — I want to speak for, Mr President.

As a point of order in advance I would like you to defend us against the charge of holding what was called a secret conclave of group chairmen, as some kind of Mafia.

(Mixed reactions)

Mr President, if I am accused of being stupid, I am quite happy about that. I accept that. But could you please defend the chairmen against this accusation?

President. — Mr Bangemann, I never take non-serious allegations seriously.

(Laughter)

Mr Bangemann. — *(DE)* At any rate, we have a preliminary draft before us. It will and must be changed in the light of the events in the three weeks since it was drawn up. A proposal will then be submitted to the House. Parliament is completely free to accept or reject this proposal.

If we are going to organize our debates during any part-session in such a way that all the committees are satisfied and if we are going to organize them in such a way that we finish at an appropriate time, which is also important for the press, we shall have to do some things which may not please some people.

I too would prefer it if we could meet for two weeks every month and I have said in my group today that

the only solution to all our difficulties would be for this House to agree to have a two-week part-session every month. That would give us enough time to discuss all the various subjects that interest individual Members.

But if we meet for only one week, we must have compromises. In this case, the compromise consists in Mr Hopper's report being included in the debate on Mr Tindemans's statement, especially as the President of the Commission will be referring to it and undoubtedly making a few remarks on the mandate of 30 May. I call on the House to endorse this reasonable proposal.

President. — Do you wish to speak against the motion, Mr von der Vring?

Mr von der Vring. — *(DE)* Mr President, could you please help me out of a situation in which I shall otherwise have to oppose this proposal. I simply wanted to ask you what we are supposed to be voting on now, because I did not understand everything you said.

President. — Mr Forth moved that the agenda be reinstated as originally drawn up. The Bureau, however, felt that in view of the long statement which the President of the Commission was to make, it would be better to reorganize the whole of the morning's debate.

Mr von der Vring. — *(DE)* Mr President, you said 'as originally drawn up'. But I did not understand everything you said after that. Perhaps you could remind us of all the amendments. I do not understand what we are to vote on now. Could you please make this absolutely clear?

(The President again read the amendments to Tuesday's agenda proposed by the Bureau)

President. — I call Mr Balfe.

Mr Balfe. — Mr President, I think it is in the interests of all Members of this House to support this resolution if they are interested in Members of this House having any influence on the structure of debates. It seems to me that each month we come in here the departures proposed from the draft agenda get slightly bigger. We have also reached the point where Question Time is being devalued. We now have Council questions not only appearing on Tuesday instead of Wednesday as they usually do, but the hour is also being changed.

President. — Mr Balfe, there is no change in Question Time. It was proposed and has been withdrawn. You did not hear me propose it.

Mr Balfe. — Question Time is now from 5.30 p.m. to 7 p.m. on this agenda that I have.

President. — That is different.

Mr Balfe. — But none the less there has been a distinct trend to change the agenda quite substantially from the one that is first drafted and circulated. I think it would be a salutary lesson to the Bureau for this resolution to be carried in order that they might show a little bit more decorum in future in the proposals they bring before the House. Because whilst some minor amendments are undoubtedly needed on occasion, I do feel that the Bureau is increasingly treating the House in a very cavalier fashion. I would invite them to support Mr Forth's motion.

President. — I call Lady Elles on a point of order.

(Protests from the Socialist Group)

Lady Elles. — Mr President, I would like to point out to Mr Balfe that it is not the Bureau who alters the agenda or discusses the agenda. It is the chairmen of political groups together with the President. So would he kindly get his nomenclature right.

President. — I call Mr Boyes.

Mr Boyes. — I would like you to give a ruling, Mr President. I would like you to inform the House how you decide who can raise points of order at certain times. The leader of my group, Mrs Castle of the British Labour Party, tried to raise a point of order at a very similar time to which a vice-president of the Parliament, Lady Elles, raised her point of order. Could you tell me why one was allowed and one was not allowed?

President. — Well, Mr Boyes, the answer is simple.

The one caught my eye and the other did not.

(Laughter)

I put to the vote the proposal by Mr Forth to restore the former agenda.

(...)

(The vote was taken)

The agenda as proposed will stand.

Mr Cottrell. — Mr President, can we have an electronic check on this?

President. — If you wish, but it was quite clear. We will vote by electronic vote to see whether we maintain the agenda on Tuesday as proposed now by the chairmen of the political groups.

(The result of the vote was confirmed)

I call Mr Enright.

Mr Enright. — Mr President, I am in no way criticizing your presidency because you always chair these sittings with brilliance, wit and incisiveness. I would nevertheless like to challenge the last ruling on the vote because it is utterly confusing for this House to vote twice on the same motion but have to vote Yes in order to get the result one way on one occasion and No in order to get exactly the same result on the second occasion. I would therefore suggest that the Noes would have won last time if only the Yeses from the previous vote had known that they should have voted No this time.

President. — I call Mr Balfe.

Mr Balfe. — A point of order, Mr President, which follows from Mr Boyes's point of order. I distinctly heard you say to Mrs Castle when you refused to call her on her point of order that she could not be called because a vote was in progress. Now we really must be clear whether or not a point of order can be called after a speech for and against and before a vote. It is important that this House understands whether or not one would be allowed. And I would ask you to give a definite ruling on whether or not you will recognize people as a matter of principle.¹

President. — I think it is a valid point and it would be helpful if the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions could give us some pertinent advice on it. It is my feeling that it should not be done.

(The President read out changes in Wednesdays' agenda)

I call Mr Boyes.

Mr Boyes. — Mr President, concerning Question Time. You appear to have changed questions to the Commission to Wednesday from their usual place on Thursday...

President. — There is some misunderstanding. You have received a written notification that the Bureau would probably propose that questions to the Commission should be taken at the time normally reserved for questions to the Council and vice versa. In the

¹ See Minutes.

President

meantime it has turned out that Mr Tindemans is able — or that the Council is able — to be here on the original day scheduled for questions to the Council. So the Council Question Time will remain where it is, that is on Wednesday, and the Commission's Question Time will remain where it is, that is on Tuesday. There will be no change.

Mr Boyes. — Is that going to be a regular occurrence? One of the things that concerns me, Mr President, is that some people may think that Question Time is an unnecessary interlude, but many of us think it is a very important part of the agenda. We have been finding in the last few months that Question Time is missed out altogether. Recently questions to the Council were cut by 30 minutes, and I notice again that other changes have been made. I just plead with you, Mr President, to realize that Question Time is an important part of the agenda and that the timing must be kept as consistent as possible.

President. — Mr Boyes, there is no proposal whatsoever to diminish in any way the time available for Question Time, or to change the substance in the sense of changing the Council for the Commission.

I call Mr Seligman.

Mr Seligman. — The Council on Wednesday, the Commission on Tuesday. Is that correct?

President. — That is right.

I call Mr Jackson.

Mr C. Jackson. — We all accept that there may need to be changes in the agenda, but I would like to question the change of the debate on the Rabbethge report from Thursday to Wednesday. I can quite understand the rapporteur's view that it is sensible and logical to have all the North-South items taken together. But this could have been thought of weeks ago. It could well have been made known to us all at group meetings, perhaps last week. I wish it had been! But at this stage Members will have made arrangements on the basis of the existing agenda, and changes, as we all know, can cause considerable inconvenience. So, Mr President, may I make some requests?

First, that you use your influence on the group chairmen to keep changes to an absolute minimum. Second, that you re-examine the system for determining the agenda to see whether it is not possible to have an intermediate stage such that groups can be informed of changes proposed to the agenda at group meetings during the week prior to the session. And, thirdly, as Mr Forth has requested, to exert great discipline when it comes to changes to the agenda.

President. — Mr Jackson, I cannot quite promise that because, as the Rules state, for reasons of topicality some changes are inevitable. In this case it was discovered a bit late that there was a relationship, let us say in North-South terms, between the Michel report and the Rabbethge report, so that it was only decided quite late to propose that they be dealt with separately in the same debate. If you want to propose that we do not do so, we shall have to vote on it. If you do not propose that, I shall keep it on the agenda as proposed.

Mr C. Jackson. — Mr President, I am not going to make that proposal, I merely wish to register a protest.

President. — I call Mr Forth.

Mr Forth. — Mr President, could I ask you, following this discussion, whether you could find some way of lengthening the interval between the deliberations of group chairmen under Rule 55 and the ability of Members under Rule 56 to propose a further change in the agenda? I think that a key part of the problem is that those of us who are not privy to the discussions that go on, find that we are very often faced with an entirely new agenda and, therefore, do not have the ability to make the proposals which are allowed for under Rule 56. So really I am asking, Mr President, whether you can find some way of making us aware of what is being proposed at your meeting with the chairmen of groups prior to the session so that we can consider these changes and make further changes under Rule 56. I think that would help.

President. — The problem is how to combine the last-minute events and the events you can calculate a week before. But we will look into it.

(The President read the amendments to Thursday's and Friday's agenda¹ — Parliament adopted the agenda as amended²)

3. Action taken on the opinions of Parliament

President. — The next item is the statement by the Commission on the action taken on the opinions and resolutions of the European Parliament.³

Mr Wurtz. — (FR) Mr President, during the debate on Mr Moreland's report on coal policy at our last part-session I asked Commissioner Giolitti the following question: 'Do you intend to take specific account

¹ See Minutes.

² Deadline for tabling amendments — Speaking time: see Minutes.

³ See Annex.

Wurtz

of the new guidelines of the French Government and of the French Coal Board Management by adopting a general rule to the effect that all countries with coal reserves must step up their production with aid from the Community?'

What action have you taken on the resolution adopted by Parliament after that debate, Commissioner? Can you also confirm that your measures take effective account of the targets of French coal-mining policy, namely the extraction of 30 million tonnes by the end of the 1980s?

Mr Andriessen, Member of the Commission. — (NL) The Commission is giving very serious consideration to the new French energy policy which foresees an accelerated exploitation of France's own energy sources, including coal. As you are no doubt aware, the Commission has, heretofore, repeatedly exhorted the Member States to consider increasing that part represented by coal within their overall energy production where this is economically viable. The latter is a prerequisite. In the Commission's opinion the new French energy policy can make a substantial contribution to the attainment of the Community's energy policy objectives for the 1990s on which the Commission is shortly to present a report. I can therefore assure the honourable Member that the Commission will give its fullest consideration to the measures envisaged by the French Government. I must, however, point out that the French Government has not as yet officially submitted its new energy policy programme to the Commission, and accordingly the latter has not yet conducted an official study of them. But the policy outlines are known and we are endeavouring to take account of them. It goes without saying, and the Commission intends to continue stressing it, that development of one's own energy sources, including coal, wherever economically viable, is of great importance. I shall end by repeating that the Commission's proposals have heretofore gone unheeded due to the conflicting priorities and views of the Member States. Faced with such a situation the Commission endeavoured to put the emphasis more on the use to which coal could be put rather than the production aspects thereof. However, the Commission would be only too happy to adopt those measures it judges positive in the new French programme.

Mrs Clwyd. — Mr President, at the last part-session Parliament voted by a large majority to ask the Council and the Commission to make enquiries and take action on the safety of three British journalists still imprisoned in Argentina. I contacted the Commission some ten days ago to ask what action they had taken. They told me they had taken no action because they felt it was a matter for the Council. I hope that they have revised their opinion on what action they should take. I would be glad if the Commissioner could now confirm that the Commission has pursued this resolution of Parliament actively and with some vigour.

Mr Andriessen, Member of the Commission. — (NL) The resolution in question requested that journalists, in particular, be given suitable treatment while in detention. From the information at the Commission's disposal the safety of the three journalists in question is assured. The resolution requested an additional guarantee which we consider to have already been given and the Commission, under the circumstances, saw no grounds for further action.'

Mrs Maij-Weggen. — (NL) Mr President, page 2 of the Commission's document contains a statement to the effect that, in four cases, the Commission gave its reasons for maintaining its original proposal. One of these is, ostensibly, Mrs Vayssade's report on the steps to be taken to assure the promotion of the equality of women. I would like to make the following observations and/or questions.

Firstly it is misleading to say that the Commission has decided to maintain its original proposal given that it had already amended it before Parliament delivered its opinion. Consequently, I consider that this report does not belong under this heading. Furthermore I would appreciate an explanation by the Commission as to how it can justify amending a proposal before Parliament had addressed itself to the contents thereof.

Secondly, is it not true to say that the Commission did not take account of Parliament's recommendations in their entirety? Two of the amendments in question were submitted to the Council and have indeed been ratified by them. I would therefore suggest that this report is definitely erroneous on two points. I would welcome some action from the Commission on this together with an explanation as to how reports emanating from them can contain such fallacies.

Mr Andriessen, Member of the Commission. — (NL) Mr President, I must admit that the honourable Member is quite right in pointing out the unduly terse nature of the Commission's document. It is true that we have taken account of a number of the points contained in the Vayssade report and intend to make proposals based on them. Mrs Maij-Weggen has quite rightly pointed out that, in this case, a subject has been presented under an incorrect heading.

However, it would be unfair to accuse the Commission of slavishly exploiting the ideas emanating from the parliamentary committees and of incorporating them into its revised proposals. In some cases the Commission has already revised its original proposals even prior to the formal presentation of the parliamentary committee's report on the Commission's original proposal. If the Commission's revised proposals are broadly similar to those of the parliamentary committee there will be a general consensus. Should these revised proposals run contrary to those of the committees then the Commission should have the courage of

Andriessen

its convictions and discuss it with Parliament in plenary sitting.

Mr Balfe. — Mr President, the Commission will recall that at the last part-session this Parliament adopted and forwarded to it a resolution on the use of plastic bullets in Ireland. This resolution had the support of all of the parties in this House other than the British Conservative Party. Following that, the Commission may have noticed that the British Government has announced that it is going to use even bigger plastic bullets and take no notice of this Parliament. I wonder if the Commission could let this Parliament know what it has done with the resolution and, more importantly, whether it will be in a position to report back to this Parliament, maybe next month or in September, on the steps it has taken to implement the resolution.

Mr Andriessen, Member of the Commission. — (NL) Mr President, if I recall correctly, this resolution was directed at a number of Member States rather than at the Commission itself. No specific action was requested of the Commission. We have therefore taken no action, nor do we envisage taking any in the future. Should the House formally instruct the Commission to act on this matter, we shall not hesitate to do so.

Mr Moorhouse. — Mr President, at the April part-session we adopted a resolution on the financing of a fixed link across the Channel, expressing the view that we were convinced that the Community must be involved in the decision on the construction of a fixed link across the Channel and calling upon the Commission to submit within one month the specific report requested by Parliament in 1981 on the problems of financing the link and the possibilities of Community assistance and to put forward specific proposals to secure such Community assistance. When Mr Contogeorgis, the Commissioner responsible, replied, he agreed to provide this report within one month. I am speaking about the April plenary part-session.

Now since we know that this report is indeed available — we were so informed in the Committee on Transport — may we be told when the report will be made available to Parliament as a whole? This, as I am sure Commissioner Andriessen will appreciate, is a very important matter, because we have some reason to suppose that the findings of the Anglo-French study group are about to be published. Furthermore we know from the meeting of the Council of Transport Ministers last week that considerable interest — one may even say enthusiasm — was shown by some members of the Council in the setting-up of a common transport infrastructure fund. So we have this urgent matter and we are looking for the paper promised by the Commissioner.

Mr Andriessen, Member of the Commission. — (NL) Mr President, to the best of my knowledge this report has already been made available to Parliament and should by now be in the possession of the honourable Member. It is possible that there has been a hitch in the distribution by Parliament's secretariat, but, as far as I am aware, the Commission has completed its task.

Mrs Squarcialupi. — (IT) Mr President, I wish to recall the Commission's attention to Mrs Scrivener's report on the fight against drug abuse. In this report Parliament had asked to participate in the United Nations' initiative for reconversion of the cultivation of opiates. The United Nations body responsible for combating drug abuse has asked the European countries, particularly those countries most severely affected by the drug problem, to collaborate in this programme.

I therefore wish to ask if the Commission has already contacted this international body, and I would also like to be informed regarding the way in which these contacts are generally initiated, so as to be sure that Parliament's requests are being followed by practical measures.

Mr Andriessen, Member of the Commission. — (NL) Mr President, I am unable to confirm whether the Commission has already begun discussions on this matter. On the basis of Mrs Scrivener's resolution the Commission is currently examining the priorities involved. Its tentative line of thought is in the direction of cooperation with other international agencies involving the pooling of information, experience gathered, statistics as well as the promotion of studies and research which forms part of what the honourable Member has just stated. As soon as the Commission has finished its deliberations it will contact the relevant bodies.

Mrs Cinciari Rodano. — (IT) Mr President, I would like to return to the question raised by Mrs Majj-Wegen, to which the Commission has not given an answer.

The Commission's text was altered before Parliament expressed its opinion. It appears that the Council reached its decision on the basis of a text which differed from the one approved by Parliament, without the latter having been informed. The Commission apparently agrees that it happened this way, and for this reason I would be grateful for a precise response on its part.

The Commissioner has also affirmed that the text of the document which was distributed to us is not completely accurate. In that case I would like to know what the Commission has done, considering that both the Commissioner, here in the Chamber, and Presi-

Cinciari Rodano

dent Thorn, before the Committee of Inquiry into the Situation of Women, declared that they shared Parliament's views and considered it particularly useful for the measures the Commission intended to take in order to overcome the resistance of the Council.

Which text did the Commission follow, then: the first, the second, or Parliament's? Which text did it finally defend before the Council?

Mr Andriessen, Member of the Commission. — (NL) Mr President, I hope the House will not hold it against me that I do not have at hand the exact text submitted to the Council but I am prepared to provide the House with a written answer as soon as possible.

Mr Martin. — (FR) Mr President, I have noted the information given by the Commission on disaster aid made available since the last part-session. In view of the urgency and extreme gravity of the situation, I should like to know what the Commission intends to do to assist the peoples of Lebanon and Palestine who are the victims of savage Israeli aggression. Under the Israeli bombs . . .

President. — Mr Martin, I must call you to order since that has no connection with the resolution adopted last month. If you wish to speak on this topic, you must do so during the debate on urgency or the joint debate tomorrow with the Council.

Mrs Vayssade. — (FR) Mr President, I should like to return to the position adopted by the Commission on the action programme and to supplement Mrs Cinciari Rodano's question by asking the Commission to be more specific about the action it proposes to take on Parliament's vote concerning the content of the action programme without simply referring to the Council's proposal adopted on 27 May. In short, does the Commission intend to act on the requests relating to education and health problems put forward by Parliament in its resolution?

Mr Andriessen, Member of the Commission. — (NL) Mr President, the House will recall that the resolution in question contained a considerable number of suggestions which are being given careful consideration by the Commission with a view to elaborating an effective course of action. As I have already stated, some of the points contained therein could have been formulated better. I can assure Mrs Vayssade that the Commission intends to follow up a number of these suggestions in the near future and her committee will shortly be receiving the report of the Commissioner specifically responsible for this matter.

President. — The first part of Question Time, questions to the Commission, is now closed. I call Mr Van Minnen on a motion of order.

Mr Van Minnen. — (NL) Mr President, my point of order goes back to the Commissioner's answer to Mrs Clwyd's question on the British journalists currently being detained in Argentina. As President, you have correctly stated that debates have no place in Question Time to the Commission. My point of order is that, when questions are asked, they should be answered.

This House adopted a resolution on which the Commission was requested to take action; the Commissioner has just deemed such action to be superfluous in view of the fact that the journalists in question are being handled with kid-gloves. It is only logical that the Commissioner should elaborate on this bewildering, entirely unexpected and, if true, heart-warming news.

President. — Mr Van Minnen, I rather doubt that your remarks have the character of a point of order. Furthermore the Commission did not say that the journalists in question were being handled with kid-gloves. Such paraphrasing of an answer is carrying things a little too far. Would you care to comment, Mr Andriessen?

Mr Andriessen, Member of the Commission. — (NL) Very briefly, Mr President, I have informed the House on the basis of the information in my possession. I am not at liberty to reveal my source at present. Nor was this requested. The question was whether the Commission had taken action on the resolution adopted by Parliament. I have answered that question and I am at a loss to understand why Mr Van Minnen has to make it a point of order.

President. — I call Mrs Clwyd on a point of order.

Mrs Clwyd. — Mr President, on a point of order. We are left in a situation where we are unable to ask the Commission supplementary questions. I think it is quite frustrating to put a question to the Commission, hear the answer and not have the opportunity to come back with a supplementary. Now I would hope that the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions would look at this situation because it is unsatisfactory for those of us who really want to get to the bottom of the action or non-action taken by the Commission.

President. — Mrs Clwyd, I think you are wrong. The system has only been in operation on a trial basis for one month. But there is still Question Time where you have every opportunity of putting supplementary questions to get the maximum information out of the Commission. If you are not satisfied with the answers I think you can insist further during Question Time.

4. Request for a Member's immunity to be waived

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-298/82) by Mr Donnez, on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee, on the request for a Member's immunity to be waived.

I call the rapporteur.

Mr Donnez, rapporteur. — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I do not think that there is any need for a long debate on this request for the parliamentary immunity of our colleague, Mr Pannella, to be waived. It seems to me that the report which I am presenting to you on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee and above all the decision already taken by our Parliament on 9 March last in connection with a similar case are sufficient in themselves.

In my report, the Legal Affairs Committee is in effect asking you to maintain the precedent established by Parliament on 9 March 1982.

The accusations made against Mr Pannella by the competent Italian judicial authorities relate to press articles which our colleague caused to be published on 29 March 1982 in his capacity as editor of an Italian publication. Following these press articles the competent Italian courts sentenced our colleague primarily for inciting young persons to refuse military service. Mr Pannella appealed against this verdict and the case is now pending before the Appeal Court in Rome. The public prosecutor of that Court has asked us to waive Mr Pannella's parliamentary immunity to enable proceedings to be taken against him pursuant to Italian law. Such are the facts.

As to the legal aspect, I would remind you that Article 10 of the Protocol on the Privileges and Immunities of the European Communities stipulates that, for the duration of parliamentary sessions, Members of our Assembly shall benefit on their national territory from the immunities granted to Members of the Parliament of their respective country; a further relevant consideration is the ruling by the European Court of Justice that the European Parliament holds an annual session and account must not be taken of the intervals between sittings or part-sessions.

Pursuant to the jurisprudence of the European Parliament, Mr Pannella benefits from the immunity recognized to members of the Italian Parliament by virtue of Article 68 of the Italian Constitution which — and I am merely noting the legal facts — does not allow Mr Pannella the right to waive his immunity.

I must remind you that Mr Pannella personally wishes to renounce the parliamentary immunity from which he benefits. He put his request to the Legal Affairs Committee which heard him at length. He put forward

his arguments but they were not accepted by the Legal Affairs Committee which is of the opinion — following the decision taken by you on 9 March 1982 in connection with a report by our colleague Karel de Gucht on a similar case — that the primary purpose of parliamentary immunity is to guarantee the integrity of our parliamentary institution and the independence of its members. It follows that immunity cannot be waived for reasons relating solely to the political activities of an individual member. Of course immunity does not imply impunity. The purpose of immunity is to protect our institution, to protect Parliament and not to grant a privilege to one or other of its members.

After due consideration the Legal Affairs Committee, consistent with its own previous practice, held that it was not in the interest of our parliamentary institution for the parliamentary immunity of Mr Pannella to be lifted. I personally regret the decision of the Legal Affairs Committee as far as he is concerned because he wanted his parliamentary immunity to be lifted. But I also believe that this decision accords totally with the principles of our jurisprudence and ultimately reflects the interests of this parliamentary institution of ours. Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I therefore call upon you to confirm the decision taken by the Legal Affairs Committee and to refrain from waiving Mr Pannella's parliamentary immunity.

IN THE CHAIR: MR LALOR

Vice-President

President. — I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (FR) Mr President, with your permission, I should like to comment briefly on the statement by our esteemed colleague, Mr Donnez.

First of all, this whole matter comes under the appeal jurisdiction of the Assize Court. In principle, the public prosecutor could have asked for me to be sentenced to well over 15 years in prison. I was acquitted by the Assize Court on the accusation of substance and sentenced to four months for a minor offence. But the prosecutor — who had already pleaded against me — lodged an appeal. As a result, Mr President, they wish to judge all my offences in the Assize Court. I might even say my crimes since after all it is an Assize Court.

Now, Mr President, in the name of the rights of each individual, I must call upon all our colleagues to show a measure of prudence. Mr President, each one of us has an inalienable right which is an integral part of

Pannella

ourselves, of our history and of our truth: an individual right.

When an occasion arises on which there is a contradiction between the corporative interests of an institution and the fundamental rights of an individual, are we always to rule in the same way as we have done up to now? I do not think so, Mr President. I am asking you — on my own behalf and also for the benefit of others in future — to recognize that I have the right to a public acquittal: the right to see unmasked a procedure which was politically based and tantamount to persecution, the right to be judged in the name of my own people, the people of Italy. That right cannot be taken from me in the name of the prerogatives of our colleagues. The corporative prerogatives of an institution cannot be allowed to prevail over the fundamental right of an individual.

That is why I am asking you, Mr President, to allow me to be judged in my own country in order to denounce the use of the law by public prosecutors who do no honour to a constitutional State.

I ask you, ladies and gentlemen, to allow me to stand judgment. I think we all subscribe to the same principles of law. They will allow me to say that I have defended at one and the same time the prestige of our Assembly and my own fundamental rights. I hope that I shall be authorized to do so, Mr President, because a very serious process is under way in Italy: only a few days ago — and I say this publicly to the Legal Affairs Committee — an Italian magistrate appealed to the constitutional courts against the prerogatives of our Assembly since our Assembly had not responded to the initiatives of the Italian magistrature after the immunity of an Italian Member of Parliament had been lifted for one year.

I therefore hope that a different decision will be taken in my case and, moreover, that more attention will be paid in future to the rights and duties of the individual.

Mr President, thank you for allowing me to express my views clearly in this way. I am aware that I owe this opportunity to your own sensitivity and am infinitely grateful to you.

President. — I call the rapporteur.

Mr Donnez, rapporteur. — (FR) I assume, Mr President, that the Assembly would like the rapporteur for the Legal Affairs Committee to give certain clarifications following the latest statements by Mr Pannella.

I do not seek to dispute the explanatory observations made by Mr Pannella and I willingly take note of them. I did not want to say so myself but it is perfectly true that the public prosecutor of the Italian Republic has lodged an appeal in respect of three charges on

which Mr Pannella had been found not guilty by the first judge. Mr Pannella was acquitted on the fundamental charges but sentenced to four months' imprisonment for offences which he qualifies as minor or, more specifically, crimes which he qualifies as minor. I am using Mr Pannella's own terminology here.

The only question which arises in this instance is to ascertain whether there is not sometimes a conflict of interests between the rights of a Parliamentarian and the rights of Parliament. Of course a Member of Parliament as an individual citizen has the right to stand trial. I did not fail to draw the attention of the Legal Affairs Committee to this major disparity which may exist between the right of a Parliamentarian to have his own innocence recognized by the competent courts of his country and the right of Parliament to protect our own institution. There may be a contradiction here and Mr Pannella alluded to this contradiction a moment ago. But, in the light of the decision taken by the Legal Affairs Committee, I do not believe that the contradiction exists in this particular case and I wish now to give you an example which Mr Pannella can verify for himself.

When he was a member of the Italian Parliament other legal proceedings were instituted against him. By reason of his capacity as an Italian Parliamentarian, the Italian Parliament had to consider a request made by the competent authorities for his parliamentary immunity to be waived. On four occasions out of five that request was rejected. This means that even the Italian Parliament, applying the Italian Constitution, reached the same decision as the Legal Affairs Committee is now asking you to take in four cases out of five — the fifth instance being a special case. I am sorry to some extent that Mr Pannella cannot have an opportunity to explain his own position to the competent courts but the mere fact of our decision not to waive Mr Pannella's parliamentary immunity suggests that we consider him perfectly innocent. That at least is my interpretation of the situation.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

5. Relations between the EEC and the United States of America

President. — The next item is the interim report (Doc. 1-300/82) by Mrs Gredal, on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee, on the political aspects of relations between the Community and the United States of America.

I call the rapporteur.

Mrs Gredal, rapporteur. — (DA) Mr President, since 1972 there has been a constant succession of meetings between the US Congress and the European Parliament. After the last meeting in The Hague last January and following a discussion in the Political Affairs Committee, it was decided that a report should be prepared on relations between the USA and Europe. I wish to stress that this document must be viewed as an interim report. It should be regarded as the political signal we wish to give to the US Congress at the meeting which is to be held with the Congress and is due to begin next week. A political signal which gives some indication of where we stand. A more extensive report will be prepared at a later date which will also cover economic, currency, agricultural and other matters, in addition to the political aspects, thus providing a systematic review of all the problems in our relations with the USA.

I am old enough to remember the part played by the United States and the American people in the Second World War. But many young people today, both in the USA and in Europe, have not had this experience — fortunately, it might be added. It is our duty, therefore, in my opinion, on both sides of the Atlantic to ensure that the historical facts of this interaction be passed on to the new generations. But that does not mean that we cannot express concern. It does not mean that we should ignore and overlook a number of questions and problems of both an economic and a political nature. On the contrary, we should draw attention to them.

The decision of the Political Affairs Committee to submit to Parliament a motion for a resolution on transatlantic relations is based on the view which is very prevalent in Europe that it is time to launch a new kind of dialogue aimed at clearing up mutual misunderstandings and at strengthening solidarity between the USA and the countries of the European Community. This was a feeling which came across strongly at the Hague meeting in January 1982, to which I have referred. We also noted at this meeting that there were a number of differences, not only among the Europeans but between Europeans and Americans, and we were able to see and to gauge the very strong political will on both sides of the Atlantic to renew and strengthen dialogue and cooperation.

We face problems in the world which may seem insurmountable. World peace, for which both sides bear a heavy responsibility, is under constant threat. The debate in Parliament this week will no doubt reflect this. It is therefore particularly necessary that the two sides understand each other's actions and lines of approach. Unfortunately, this has not always been the case, and I would therefore emphasize point 2 in my motion for a resolution, which reads:

Parliament is of the opinion that the partners, on questions regarding world peace and security must recognize that they are of equal importance, even

in situations in which their interests conflict; the partners must not therefore take unilateral decisions on questions affecting world peace and security: the principle of equality requires a comprehensive exchange of views and early consultation in connection with all decisions.

Through the years there has been close cooperation between the USA and the Community at different levels. I would emphasize what is particularly necessary in closer cooperation between the democratically elected representatives. It is not a question of the European Parliament having powers to negotiate with the US Congress. That is not necessary. Our main task is to influence one another, have our lines of action mutually understood and perhaps change them in the process.

President Reagan has just visited Europe. We shall discuss the results of this visit with our American colleagues next week in Washington, and our question to them will most certainly be: do you now have a more understanding attitude towards the independent stance which is developing in Europe and which is determined in many cases by a political, geographic and economic situation which is different to that of the USA?

I shall not concern myself with details in my introduction, Mr President, but I must say that the failure to reach a mutually satisfactory settlement of a question as important as that of trade in steel is bound to be cause for concern in Europe.

The Political Affairs Committee has adopted this report by a large majority but, as I have said, it is an interim report. Personally, I should have liked to see certain points omitted, but it is especially important to me that the European Parliament express its views as unanimously as possible on relations with the USA. This also applies to critical views — after all, we cannot always come out in agreement on US policy, since attitudes in this respect vary from one political group in Parliament to another. But it is especially important in my view, as I have said, that we express our opinions on a basis as close as possible to unanimity.

President. — I call the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs.

Mr von Wogau, draftsman of an opinion. — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the visit by the President of the United States of America to Europe was a welcome occasion to cement the friendship between Europe and the United States. But a few days later we then had the American decision on steel imports, and the newspapers are now talking about a trade war between the Community and the USA, albeit in quotation marks. Next week the European Parliament's delegation will be leaving for Washington, and one of its tasks will be to help to resolve this dispute.

von Wogau

What, then, has happened in the last few weeks and months to the Community's trade policy towards the United States? On 12 January seven American companies complained of 92 cases of dumping in the steel sector. Many of these complaints have since been withdrawn, but in the cases that remain anti-dumping duties have now been imposed, and the Commission's intensive efforts in the last few weeks to achieve a negotiated settlement have obviously failed.

We very much regret this, because we all know that action of this kind has the tendency to produce counteraction. The European companies are accused of enjoying export advantages through the subsidies they receive. But subsidies are also granted in the United States in certain sectors, the chemical fibre sector, for example, where the split gas price for US companies produces a considerable competitive advantage. The question that could and should be asked here is whether the European Community should not take corresponding measures.

There is a serious danger now of our getting into a situation in which action by one side prompts the other to take further action, thus aggravating the dispute. There is after all no shortage of critical economic questions in relations between the United States and Europe, an example being agricultural exports, where the Europeans are accused of protectionism. And then there is the question of trade with the Eastern Bloc, the United States' policy of high interest rates and its exchange rate policy — these are all items that will be on the agenda when our delegation goes to Washington.

The European Community is the competent organization for these trade policy questions, and it has the ability to take action. The Community is the body with which the United States must negotiate. That is the very reason why parliamentary control of the current negotiations is particularly important, and that is also why the delegation has a particularly important task to perform in the United States.

We must make it clear on the other side of the Atlantic that, despite the protectionism we are constantly accused of, we are still the United States' largest customer for agricultural products. We must also point out that the agricultural subsidies granted in the United States, albeit in a different way, are at least as high as they are in Europe. According to the calculations we have, the agricultural subsidies granted on both sides of the Atlantic total something like 1% of gross domestic product.

We must further point out that the United States' policy of high interest rates has a very marked effect on us Europeans and that it is slowing down growth throughout the world. Of course, we must also remember that this policy was introduced after complaints from Europe that the Americans should at last do something about their high rate of inflation. The

problem of inflation has now been largely solved in the United States: inflation rates have fallen.

Today the administration is keeping interest rates up by making excessive use of the capital market, an accusation which must, however, be levelled at the Europeans as well. I believe we must try to have a policy to terminate the period of high interest rates adopted on both sides of the Atlantic. We must also see to it that a coordinated policy on exchange rates is pursued on both sides of the Atlantic. The exchange rate policy of the Federal Reserve Bank is having an extremely adverse effect on trade throughout the world because short-term erratic fluctuations are not being offset. Something must be done about this both in Europe, through greater concentration under the European Monetary System, and in the United States.

Above all, we must join in emphasizing that protectionism is harmful, that, in economic policy terms, it is the brother of isolationism. Let us remember the similar political situation between 1919 and 1930, when the United States and Europe drifted ever further apart not only in economic policy but in all policies, with the catastrophic consequences for economic and also for general policy with which we are all familiar. We must now do everything we can to prevent a recurrence of such mistakes.

Mr Bruno Friedrich. — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Socialist Group welcomes the fact that this report is being debated today, immediately before the departure of Parliament's delegation to the USA. We should particularly like to thank Mrs Gredal for the care she has taken over this report and for the balance she has struck. It was approved by a large majority in the Political Affairs Committee.

After President Reagan's visit to Europe and the summit talks in Versailles and Bonn it is important for our Parliament's delegation to know that it has the support of the widest possible spectrum of political opinion in this Parliament before it leaves for the USA next week, since this will help in its difficult talks there. We, therefore, hope that a large majority will vote for this report.

In the last few weeks in particular, however, there has been repeated talk of a crisis between the USA and Europe, and as a result of a decision taken by the majority of the Political Affairs Committee, the report also contains a reference to the danger of a split between Europe and the USA, caused by the Soviet Union. The Socialist Group considers such fears exaggerated, and we shall therefore be voting for the deletion of this sentence. Why?

The peoples of Europe will never forget that the USA has twice this century, in two World Wars, saved the democracies of Europe from dictatorship. Joint de-

Bruno Friedrich

fence and also the further development of democracy and human dignity still form the common foundations of our relationship. That is why Europe welcomed the American President's visit.

His visit was necessary because for the first time since the end of the Second World War a world economic crisis and a world-wide arms race have now both occurred within the space of 10 years. We should not forget that in the 1930s it was the same combination of economic crisis and arms race, accompanied by unbridled national egoism, that led to the Second World War. Nor should we forget that this disastrous combination of an arms race and economic crisis is further aggravated today by hunger and other problems in the Third World. In a situation that has changed so dramatically the European Community and the USA must accept their joint responsibility for world economic stability and the stabilization of world peace.

We welcome the fact that Mrs Gredal has said in her report that the European Parliament should not leave it at the general definition of principles. The Socialist Group, therefore, welcomes the determination with which President Mitterrand called in Versailles for measures to fight unemployment. High-interest-rate policies, the inability to cooperate in monetary matters and protectionism motivated by national interests do not strengthen the Western alliance; they weaken it.

In plain language, it came as a disappointment for the countries of the European Community — and for the European Parliament, I would add — that only a few days after the Versailles summit special duties were imposed on steel imports from the European Community into the USA. In even plainer language, Mr President, Defence Secretary Weinberger calls on the Europeans not to supply the Soviet Union with steel pipes. His colleague the Trade Secretary calls on the Europeans not to supply steel pipes to the USA. But the Europeans are supposed to buy American soya beans, there's nothing wrong with that. But Europe's steel workers cannot unfortunately live on American soya beans. In short, in relations between the USA and the European Community each side should treat the other as an equal partner, this being, as the report points out, the common basis of their relations. We cannot accept the dominance of the national interests of either side.

The Socialist Group also sees the need for this equality of partners in questions of security and disarmament. Federal Chancellor Schmidt was right when he emphasized at the summit meeting that security is conceivable only if both East and West understand that the loss of balance between the superpowers is a threat to peace in the world. We therefore see the American President's readiness to negotiate on practical action to achieve disarmament as a step in the right direction.

The European Parliament's delegation will undoubtedly also be asked in the USA next week about the

criticism being voiced by the younger generation in Europe. It is the strength of democracy that it guarantees the younger generation the chance to protest. Major peace movements are to be found only in Europe and the USA. There is none in the Soviet Union. All of us in the European Parliament should therefore regard the joint search for a stable peace, particularly among the younger generations of Europe and the USA, as an opportunity to begin a new and urgently needed European-American dialogue.

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

Mr Habsburg. — (DE) Mr President, on behalf of the European People's Party I welcome Mrs Gredal's report and motion for a resolution, particularly those parts which were contributed by the majority of the Political Affairs Committee and not least the reference to the fact that the Soviet Union and those it has taken under its wing will do anything to separate Europe from America.

In the last few days there have been two events that must be looked upon as extremely positive in this connection. First, President Reagan's visit, which at last showed the Europeans the real Reagan and not the distorted picture they are all too often presented. Second, those impressive proclamations in Germany of friendship for America, organized by the CDU and CSU in Bonn and Munich to show what the Europeans, and particularly the younger generation, really think of the United States. The younger generation cannot, after all, be equated with what is known as the peace movement. Very many young people have joined the camp of those who want a positive peace policy. We saw — or at least I saw on the Königsplatz in Munich — that the younger generation remember quite clearly what we owe the United States, that we must be grateful to the United States for the preservation of peace in Europe.

Of course, there is tension between us from time to time. Reference has been made, for example, to what has happened in the steel sector. On that subject I should at least like to say this: the report of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs contrasts the pressure exerted by the Americans as regards credit granted to Eastern Bloc countries with the sale of American foodstuffs to the Soviet Union. My personal comment on this is that I have no objection to the sale of foodstuffs because it at least means that Soviet money is being spent constructively on the people of the Soviet Union, whereas loans from us would make it only too easy for that country to pursue its insane armaments policy.

The tensions that have occurred between America and Europe, particularly a few years ago, have been due, on the one hand, to something of a European inferior-

Habsburg

ity complex, because we have simply not made progress towards unification fast enough. On the other hand, we have had the unpredictability of American policy, especially at the time of President Carter. In both respects there has now been a fundamental change for Europe, since, despite all the pessimistic statements, we have made great strides towards unification. After all, we have shown in the Falklands crisis, for instance, how united Europe can be, and we have also shown that it is possible to find a way of making a constructive change to the unfortunate Luxembourg Agreement. On the American side the advantage is that the United States has now become predictable. This is a good basis from which to begin. The balance is slowly being restored. For the first time for many years we can now speak to each other as equals, and that is why the mission is particularly important.

In conclusion, I should like to wish the members of the delegation a great deal of success in Washington and in particular to express the hope that this interim report will very soon give way to a clearly worded final report which puts forward practical proposals for an extension of the dialogue.

President. — I call the European Democratic Group.

Sir Fred Catherwood. — Mr President, the first time I heard Mr Habsburg speak, he said that Europe should be independent of America. If he is still saying the same thing, I agree with him. But I think that we really must not be in the position where we cannot discuss economic issues with them because we are dependent on them, beholden to them and anxious that we do not get split from them by the Soviet Union.

I really would like to remind Mrs Gredal of the saying that the business of America is business. I entirely agree with everything that is in here, but I think that we, in our Group, would like to point out to her that if you do not take up business items with the Americans when there are business issues, they will take it that you agree with all the things that they are doing and have no objection to them. The fact of the matter is that we disagree most profoundly with some of the things that they are doing at the moment.

Therefore I would like to support very much what Mr Bruno Friedrich and Mr von Wogau have said. I would simply like to put it like this. The Americans have, for reasons of their own, decided to rearm massively without raising taxes, and they have to find the money from somewhere. So they have to raise about a thousand million dollars on the market. That means to say that they have got to have colossal interest rates, which are at a record high. I think they are now 10% over the going rate of inflation.

When you talk to people like the Saudi Arabians you find that they really think that they have never seen

anything quite so marvellous as the fact that they can get 10% over the real rate of inflation. So naturally they pour their money in there, and the rest of us are left with 10 million unemployed. Now that is not a stable situation.

I think what needs to be said very clearly to the Americans is that if you go on with this economic policy, you are producing an unstable situation in America. How long are the American Blacks going to put up with the colossal rate of unemployment that they have? You are producing an unstable employment situation in Europe and that is not good for anyone, least of all for the free industrial democracies. You are putting enormous strain on the entire world economic system, because that system depends on free trade. If you do not sustain stable exchange rates — Mr von Wogau referred to benign neglect — if you neglect the exchange rate and you allow it to go up and down, you put enormous and intolerable pressure on trade and on the ability of countries and groups of countries to agree between themselves on trade.

So from unemployment you get colossal pressure for protectionism, and from uncertainty in exchange rates you get enormous pressure on the whole general agreement on tariffs and trade. I think the position now is that unless they can change their economic policy and unless they bring greater stability into the situation, they are going to make it extremely difficult to maintain the entire post-war Bretton Woods system. I think that the President, who comes from California, and the Administration have got to be made to face the international consequences of the domestic, political and economic policies that they now have. I hope Mrs Gredal will put this view very forcibly as a view of this Parliament.

President. — I call the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Haagerup. — (DA) Mr President, I think it should be stated plainly — as has already been said in a number of quarters here in Parliament — that we should neither seek to trivialize nor ignore the conflicts of interest which may arise and which in actual fact generally have arisen between the USA and the European Communities.

Several speakers, including Mr von Wogau and Mr Friederich, have referred to these conflicts of interest, most recently in the steel sector. We should also not underestimate their seriousness, and I would point out to Sir Fred Catherwood, with whose remarks I am in broad agreement, that I do not think he has any reason for concern that we shall not get an open discussion with the Americans of the points which separate us.

I was previously a member of Parliament's delegation to the USA, and it would be untypical of the Ameri-

Haagerup

cans — and I would hope of ourselves also — to try to sweep disagreements under the carpet instead of discussing them openly. I therefore feel that we should face up to the fact that we have these disagreements. We are sending a delegation to Washington at a time when, let us face it, there will be emotional grounds for adopting quite conflicting views on some issues which are of vital concern to the Community, to our Member States and to our peoples. But, having said that, I would add that all these matters should be viewed in relative terms and that we should keep a certain sense of proportion. It is against the background of our desire to maintain this sense of proportion and to show that there are things which link us very closely with the United States and that we want to be able to discuss them openly with our friends in America, that we decided by an overwhelming majority in the Political Affairs Committee to give what Mrs Gredal called a signal, a political signal at the time of our departure and our arrival in the United States. I think that is important. On behalf of my Group, therefore, I urge that we adopt this motion, which bears witness to the very strong bonds which link us with the United States, irrespective of the disagreements which may arise between us. It is against the background of this full recognition of the strong bonds between us that the delegation will be conducting its negotiations next week in the USA.

President. — I call the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members.

Mrs Hammerich. — *(DA)* The first draft of Mrs Gredal's report was loosely formulated and quite harmless. It was mostly a collection of eulogizing references to the great importance of the USA to Europe, the world and peace, and to the great importance which Mrs Gredal attaches to the delegation's mission. But Mrs Gredal's text took on an ugly cold-warmongering aspect when the Political Affairs Committee set to work on it, and that is not so remarkable, for it is well known that, when a peaceable person puts a peaceable proposal before Parliament and its committees, it emerges at the other end of the process as something resembling a declaration of war.

A number of amendments were adopted to make the text more pro-American and to shift the emphasis from generalities to matters of security policy. The external threats to the Community were mentioned, the USSR was singled out as the enemy and in addition — worst of all — point 1 was reworded to include a sentence expressing 'hope that the Community's active role in the Atlantic Alliance... would be extended in consultation with the United States;' That is a very serious matter which I do not think Ireland will go along with and which will not be especially pleasing to the Danish Government.

The People's Movement against the EEC also submitted an amendment. In it we asked the delegation to stay within its powers and to impress upon the US congressmen that defence and military matters do not fall within the scope of these powers and that the European Parliament is not the political arm of NATO.

One of my reasons for moving this amendment was that there is evidence from the official reports of past US delegations of attempts on the part of US congressmen to exert pressure during these missions for a greater effort of armament and of a lack of resistance to this pressure on the part of the delegations.

Now this delegation is to make its journey on the basis of this document which, to begin with, is virtually 100% pro-American, secondly, has been given an anti-peace slant and, thirdly, goes way beyond the competence of the European Community, in that it contains a statement calling for the Community to play an active role in NATO. This goes far beyond the wishes of the Danish Government. It goes way beyond the powers of the Community and, I would have thought also, far beyond Mrs Gredal's political position. I call on her to reconsider whether it is right for her to make the trip as the delegation's chairman on the strength of this document, which has been given such untoward overtones and which falls outside the powers of the European Community.

President. — I call Mr Herman.

Mr Herman. — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I share the view of a number of other Members that we must definitely broach our economic problems, especially those on which there are differences of opinion, with the Americans. I therefore wish to comment briefly on the problem of interest rates with particular reference to the dollar.

I think we would be better advised to deal with the problem of monetary cooperation and of the dollar rather than with that of interest rates. Why? Because we cannot ask the Americans at one and the same time to fight inflation and to reduce their interest rates. We cannot ask them to reduce the deficit on their public finances if we are not resolved to take similar action in our own countries; neither can we ask them to guarantee our security while at the same time reducing their budgetary effort in that sector. We are therefore not in a strong position to raise the subject of interest rates. On the contrary we are on much firmer ground when we raise the subject of international monetary cooperation. It is in the interests of the United States and of us all to have a world in which international economic relations are not disturbed and threatened as they are today by fluctuations in interest rates. While stressing the fact that the world cannot be left at the mercy of fluctuations in the value of the dollar which

Herman

is the principal reserve currency, we cannot just let things slide today especially as we, like the Americans, pay lip service to the need to fight inflation effectively. Today the potentially most dangerous inflationary situation resides in the lack of international monetary order and in the fact that the international banking system is able, without any form of control or criteria, to generate international liquidity which is the root-cause of inflation. In this particular area we have a strong case and I hope we shall make our views known clearly.

President. — I call the Commission.

Mr Andriessen, Member of the Commission. — (NL) The Commission considers that the Gredal report goes a long way towards improving the climate of relations between the Community and the United States and therefore supports the views expressed therein. It is a timely initiative, coming as it does, at a moment of ever-increasing need, on both sides of the Atlantic for a closer dialogue and a reaffirmation of our mutual bonds. It is undeniable that in recent years serious misgivings have emerged on both sides regarding the sincerity and intensity of our traditional Atlantic cohesion and collective destiny. It is clear that such misgivings have hampered the resolution of a number of points of conflict between the United States and the Community involving international monetary, commercial and development issues. The current dispute over steel and agriculture is a typical example of this. Monetary and interest rate policies, on which almost all of the honourable Members have spoken, attest further to the deterioration in the economic climate.

Yet many of these issues are of a technical rather than a purely political nature and it should be possible to seek technical solutions to them. The international and bilateral instruments and procedures are certainly not lacking. What is lacking — and this is where issues of a technical nature become politicized — is a political climate of mutual trust, so essential for thrashing out conflicting issues. Were these conflicts to intensify, they could place serious strains on bilateral relations. In this respect the Commission deplores the measures introduced by the US Department of Commerce on 10 June 1982 to levy countervailing charges on certain steel imports from the Community and regrets its inability to prevent such measures despite the lengths to which it went and the good will it displayed. The imposition of these measures could pose further serious problems for existing commercial ties and aggravate an already tense situation. I believe that such a dangerous evolution can only be avoided by initiatives and signals — and I deliberately use the word 'signal' because, in introducing her interim report, the honourable Member referred to 'a signal' before the delegation leaves for the US. It should be a political signal designed to demonstrate clearly to our American partners that the Community is ready to minimize the dif-

ferences of opinion to what they really are instead of exacerbating them. We wish to resolve differences of opinion in an atmosphere of dialogue by stating the Community's own point of view because business is business and, as such, should be handled in a business-like manner.

I can only hope that the initiative of the Political Affairs Committee and, if possible also, of the plenary sitting, will provide one of these signals and that the visit of your delegation to the USA will contribute to an improvement in the political climate. I can assure you that the Commission fully supports this initiative and is actively looking forward to the committee's final report and proposals.

The Commission is prepared to provide information to Parliament should such be required. Whether that embraces direct assistance from our Washington representative office, as requested in the resolution, or that such information would be channelled via the Commission, is another matter; but the Commission is quite prepared, as requested by Parliament, to provide all the information necessary for the elaboration of the delegation's visit.

President. — I call the rapporteur.

Mrs Gredal, rapporteur. — (DA) I should like to thank Members for the contributions they have made today. I should like in particular to refer to Sir Fred Catherwood and to Mr Herman, who were involved in the discussions specifically concerned with trade policy questions.

I am fully aware that 'business is business' in the United States. The motion for a resolution which I have drafted does not specifically address questions of trade, economy and currency; as has been said, that will come later, but that does not prevent us from having several important discussions during the course of our visit on trade policy and currency questions. It forms part of our programme, as I have indicated in discussions with your Committee, Sir Fred.

I would say to Mrs Hammerich that, if she had listened to my speech, she would have heard me say that there were certain things in the resolution that I was not entirely happy with personally. But in the interests of having an all but united Parliament behind a stance *vis-à-vis* the United States, I accepted the draft which emerged from the work of the Political Affairs Committee.

We are not making this trip on the basis of this piece of paper but on the basis of a programme which will be put to our meetings in the United States, and I feel under no compulsion to stand down as chairman of the delegation. If one wishes to be absolutely immune to all possible influence, then yes: one should simply

Gredal

withdraw and abstain from all votes on the various issues.

I shall not withdraw, I want to exert an influence on our relations with the United States, positively as well as negatively. I have my own views but, as chairman, I shall express the views of Parliament as a whole.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

6. Carriage of passengers by roads (ASOR)

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-182/82), by Mr Buttafuoco, on behalf of the Committee on Transport, on

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-901/81 – COM(81)617 final) for a decision concluding the Agreement on the international carriage of passengers by road by means of occasional coach and bus services (ASOR).

I call the rapporteur.

Mr Buttafuoco, rapporteur. — (IT) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the document which it is my privilege to present, by virtue of the unanimous wish of the Committee, concerns the agreement between the European Community on the one hand and Austria, Finland, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, and Yugoslavia on the other. This agreement deals with the liberalization of the international carriage of passengers by road by means of occasional coach and bus services.

This agreement was pursued through negotiations conducted with these countries on the basis of Article 4 of EEC Regulation No 117/66 of 28 July 1966, which is echoed in the report presented by Mr Van der Gun on behalf of the Committee on Regional Policy and Transport. It applies, as has been said, to the international carriage of passengers by road by occasional services which do not meet the requirements for either regular or shuttle services as laid down in the agreement itself. The measures for liberalization in the field of transport and the documents required today, and there are many of them, are to be replaced by a single control document, while the administrative tasks are to be entrusted to the European Conference of Transport Ministers.

The agreement, which is to last for five years — and it is possible to modify it within three years of its being put into effect — will bring about a better and more rational management of these services, speeding up administrative formalities by means of standardized

controls and thus considerably reducing the time needed to cross the frontiers.

At this point it would be well to stress the economic aspect of the proposal, which is definitely favourable, and the accompanying increase in tourism, which will certainly be considerable. Particularly noteworthy, however, is the political significance implicit in the adoption of this agreement, which is the first regulation in the context of the common transport policy to extend beyond the geographical boundaries of the Community and establish a system which is binding for other countries as well.

In conclusion, I express the hope that the reservations on the part of Yugoslavia, which we heard about only through an oral communication from the Commission, have been overcome, for this country is especially important by virtue of its position as a compulsory route for such services to and from Greece. I further hope that the agreement will be extended to cover categories of transport not yet included, in order to obtain a significant improvement in transport by road in the frontier regions.

As you can see, ladies and gentlemen, the agreement is definitely positive, and I hope that its aspects, all of them encouraging for a common transport policy, can be widely accepted in this Parliament, and that the unanimous approval obtained by this proposal in committee will find significant support here.

(Applause)

President. — I call the Socialist Group

Mr Seefeld. — (DE) Ladies and gentlemen, we were unanimous in our approval of this report in the Committee on Transport of the European Parliament, which, of course, means that it also had the support of the members of the Socialist Group. I should therefore like to thank Mr Buttafuoco for his report and tell him that my colleagues and I will again be voting for it here in the Chamber.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have two or three comments to make. We feel the Commission should explain to us today whether it has been possible to settle the disagreements with Yugoslavia to which the rapporteur has just referred. We believe this is necessary because we know that in the coming summer months tourism will again be playing an important role in Yugoslavia and that many of the difficulties that occur when people cross the frontiers with this country could be removed if by that time the directive had reached the stage where Yugoslavia's difference of opinion with the Commission, with us, with the European Community could be overcome.

This is also important for us because we have obligations to our fellow member country Greece. I believe

Seefeld

that we must therefore make very sure that anything which might be an obstacle to traffic to and from Greece is eliminated, Yugoslavia being an important transit country.

Mr President, we also feel that a directive of this kind cannot be approved here without a reference to the fact that, although this is a positive step because it is a Community transport policy measure whose effect will be felt beyond the Community's frontiers, there are still a number of difficulties in transfrontier transport. I cannot therefore let this opportunity pass without referring to the many inadequacies that exist at the Community's internal frontiers. Much as I welcome the improvement in the situation as it concerns third countries — and I have said we approve this report — I would nevertheless point out that we must also do everything we can to bring about a significant simplification in transfrontier transport by bus.

Ladies and gentlemen, here in Strasbourg of all places it should be pointed out that pointless checks are still made on fuel tanks and that buses are occasionally held up even at the Community's internal frontiers.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, to cut a long story short, we must do everything we can to help make it easier to cross frontiers because in the holiday months in particular the citizens of this European Community hardly have a better opportunity of seeing what progress we are making, if any. Seen from this angle, what Mr Buttafuoco has presented here on behalf of the Committee on Transport is a positive decision. I can only hope that you will all vote for this resolution.

Mr Kazazis. — (GR) Mr President, I too would like to congratulate Mr Buttafuoco for his excellent report, with which I find myself in total agreement on all counts and which the group of the European People's Party will of course support with its vote.

This agreement, the ASOR agreement for short, will without doubt contribute to reducing the obstacles that arise at the internal frontiers in the Community in the area of passenger transport by road, and its adoption will achieve one of the fundamental aims that motivated the formation of the common market, which is referred to in Article 3c of the Treaty, and by this, of course, I mean the elimination of obstacles to the free circulation of people within the Community. The basic aim of the ASOR agreement is, of course, to eliminate the differences existing between the various legal situations that govern the unscheduled international passenger routes that are being created between areas that are party to the agreement. For this reason it is proposed to simplify — frontier checks and the administrative formalities by establishing a single control document. However, the most important result of the liberalizing measures will doubtless be the development of the passenger routes and consequently an

increase in the flow of tourist traffic. Indeed, for countries like Greece and Italy for which tourism is a prime factor of development, this agreement is particularly important.

Mr President, we want to see further liberalization of passenger transport by road, and urge the Commission to continue its efforts in this direction with a view to extending the agreement to transport categories that are not yet included, and especially to the regular and scheduled routes; this would bring about a considerable improvement of road transport to out-of-the-way places. However, I was very sorry to learn that the fears expressed by Mr Buttafuoco in his report in connection with Yugoslavia's doubts about becoming a signatory to this agreement were justified. Indeed, on 26 March in London the ASOR agreement was signed by the Community and by the other third countries, while Yugoslavia declined to become a co-signatory to it. This fact is very worrying for the following reasons:

Firstly, Yugoslavia itself is a tourist country visited by many tourists from all over Europe. Thus, while the agreement is in force it will have only limited results for that country.

Secondly, Yugoslavia is very much a through-route for road transport. It is a compulsory route for road traffic to and from Greece.

Thus, while Yugoslavia persists in refusing to sign the ASOR agreement, Greece, which is a peripheral and distant country with many problems in the transport sector, will find itself involuntarily and unjustly at a disadvantage. Mr President, I need not remind you about the other problems that Greece has to face in connection with transport owing to our geographical position. I would just like to refer to the enormous problem of securing for Greece a large enough number of transit permits for trucks passing through Yugoslavia, and the annual negotiations that take place with that country to satisfy the Greek hauliers. For this reason it is vitally important, and I ask the Commission and the Council to take note of this, to do all we can to persuade Yugoslavia to become a co-signatory of the ASOR agreement so that a situation of discrimination against Greece may be avoided. Let us not forget that the Community has already granted loans to Yugoslavia in connection with the recent construction works on its motorway. In addition, within the framework of the negotiations for regulating the quantities of baby beef that could be imported into Greece at a reduced rate of duty, the Community showed understanding for the Yugoslavian demands. Thus, the Commission and the Council must associate the matter of the agreement with other matters that may constitute future subjects of negotiation with Yugoslavia.

President. — I call the Group of the European Progressive Democrats.

Mr Nyborg. — (DA) Mr President, I heartily welcome Mr Buttafuoco's report. It is decidedly a step in the right direction. It is the first time that the Community has made use of its external powers in the transport sector and, by invoking Article 228 of the Treaty, has pursued its interests with one voice. Secondly, there is no doubt that the proposed arrangement will assist transport operations in practice by cutting down the time it takes to cross frontiers, which is urgently needed. The administrative formalities involved in crossing a frontier will be reduced by this means, which will be warmly welcomed by the firms providing the transport services referred to. This measure will at the same time create the conditions for better and more rational administration of occasional passenger transport services, to the advantage of both the carriers and the passengers.

As was pointed out by previous speakers, the arrangement only applies to the occasional transport of passengers and, along with Mr Seefeld, I should like to see it extended to line and shuttle services — which would be of interest, particularly in regard to transport problems in frontier areas, including the Community's internal frontiers. Might I remind the Commission in this connection that I put a question to it here in Parliament on 12 December 1978 asking if an effort would be made to eliminate discriminatory national rules so that barriers to the transport of goods and passengers by road in the EEC might thus be removed and, if so, what the Commission proposed to do? I said at the time that, unfortunately, it was impossible to list the many instances of distortion of competition present in our Member States, but I was not quite so delicate as Mr Seefeld was just now when he avoided mentioning names. On that occasion, I put to the Commission the concrete question whether it did not consider it unacceptable and a distortion of competition for a charge to be made, as is done in Germany, per passenger-kilometre for passengers transported by bus or coach, either in Germany or through Germany — an arrangement which thus applies to buses coming from countries other than Germany. The Commission's answer was a promise from Commissioner Giolitti that something would be done on the matter. I have not seen anything on the subject since.

I am, of course, pleased that the Commission has concluded an agreement with a number of third countries which will bring about an improvement in customs problems *vis-à-vis* countries outside the Community, but I hope Commissioner Andriessen will forgive me for drawing the Commission's attention at the same time to the need for an improvement in regard to rules providing for dues and charges for tours within the Community. There is an old saying to the effect that you should put your own house in order before trying to put someone else's house in order!

President. — I call the non-attached Members.

Mr Eisma. — (NL) Our group welcomes the signing of this agreement on the international carriage of passengers by road by means of occasional coach and bus services (ASOR) and the reduction in delays at frontier crossings which will result from it. An additional welcome measure would be the abolition of the obligation, still in force in some European countries, to provide a passenger list to the relevant authorities, as with, for example, passenger traffic to and from France, Spain, Switzerland, Austria and several other countries. Most countries only require the communication of the total number of passengers carried; Article 10 of the ASOR makes provision for this to be effected on a bilateral basis as is the case, for example, between Austria and the Netherlands. It is of course ridiculous that such constraints should still exist between France and its EEC partners. Mr President, as commendable as are the Commission's efforts in removing barriers restricting trade with third countries, how much more disquieting is the continued existence of such barriers inside the Community against which no action has been taken to this very day. The rapporteur draws attention to this in section three of the introduction. Of even greater worry is the reinforcing of some of these restrictions as I intend to demonstrate.

Non-Belgian coach and bus traffic travelling in Belgium is legally subject to VAT on the amounts spent in that country. The administrative formalities concerned being so complex and costly, coach company operators prefer to pay the so-called 'fine' of BF 300 on arrival at the Belgian border and thus dispense with the whole paraphernalia. On entering the Federal Republic of Germany coach and bus traffic is subject to a sort of road tax calculated per passenger-kilometre. This is shortly to be increased by 67%. The procedure involved here is also very time-consuming, often causing additional delays on the border. A third example in this area of just how far things can go within the Community is that both France and the Federal Republic have a tax and duty free maximum import quantity of 100 litres of fuel present in the vehicle. Quantities in excess of this are subject to additional excise duty. This is also time-consuming as additional fuel-stops must be allowed for in the vehicles' itinerary. A final example: the United Kingdom still maintains such entry formalities for coach and bus traffic that most Continental coach operators are obliged to fit their vehicles with special equipment, more often than not British, to qualify for entry to the U.K. I must say, and not without a little national pride, that occasional international passenger traffic by road in the Netherlands is entirely free of restrictions.

We would like to hear when the Commission intends to deal with these and other impediments among the Member States. Like the rapporteur and Mr Seefeld and a lot of other speakers we are also uneasy about the difficulties that have recently arisen with Yugoslavia, in particular as this could have serious consequences for one of our Member States, namely

Eisma

Greece. Apart from an oral declaration in the Committee on Transport we are still officially in the dark regarding the nature of the differences of opinion between Yugoslavia and the Commission. I would ask the Commission to provide a more detailed answer and to state whether any progress has been made in the meantime in the search for a solution to the conflict with Yugoslavia. We hope that the Commission will deal fully with the questions and comments of the Members of the House. On a previous occasion I had reason to express my displeasure at the answers given by the then Commissioner responsible for transport policy and I trust that, after Commissioner Andriessen's answer, such a measure on my part will not be called for again.

President. — I call the Commission.

Mr Andriessen, Member of the Commission. — (NL) Mr President, first a few remarks on the resolution under discussion and then one sole remark on the introduction by Members of matters not formally part of the agenda, that is, which are unrelated to passenger traffic within the Community.

On the first point, the Commission is heartened at Parliament's positive reception, as seen from today's debate, of the agreement on the international carriage of passengers by road by means of occasional coach and bus services (ASOR). This agreement represents a first step towards a closer cooperation between the Community and other European States and is also the first international agreement of its kind. It furthers the development of tourist traffic and, as such, of the economic expansion of a number of Member States and other countries and is, as a number of speakers noted, the first application of the Community's exclusive powers concerning external relations in transport matters.

The Commission shares the wish expressed in the resolution that this is but a first step in a much longer process. I can also inform the House that the Commission has very recently approved a motion for a resolution by the Council which authorized the Commission to begin negotiations on an agreement between the EEC and third countries concerning the regulation of international road passenger traffic by commuter bus services and special forms of regular transport. This second dossier has been presented to the Council and we are currently awaiting a decision on it.

Mr President, as most Members of the House, the Commission regrets Yugoslavia's inability at present to comply with the terms of the ASOR agreement despite its participation at the negotiations. The problems are compounded by Yugoslavia's desire to be involved in the transport of Yugoslavians from the Community States in which they work to Yugoslavia for periods as short as several days. This gave rise to a number of

technical problems which I am at present unable to clarify for the House, but I can assure the Members that my fellow Commissioner who is responsible for transport will provide the House with details. I can assure the House that the Commission has done everything within its power and is still continuing its efforts to prevail upon Yugoslavia to ratify the ASOR agreement. The Commission does not rule out success and Yugoslavia has reaffirmed its desire to find an interim solution for the flow of traffic to and from Greece via Yugoslavia until the latter's adhesion to the ASOR agreement. This is a point of some relevance to the remarks made earlier by Mr Kazazis.

Then, Mr President, as expected, most of the Members raised the issue of passenger traffic within the Community, in some instances, as with Mr Eisma, illustrating their comments with examples of existing anomalies. I am afraid I have no answer to the question as to whether the Commission, following the questions put to it on 12 December 1978 by Mr Nyborg, had resolved to take action on the matter and, if so, what action they have taken. I fear that going into this matter will not take us very much further as regards resolving the aforementioned anomalies. It would be of more practical value if I reassure the House that my fellow Commissioner in charge of transport policy will hold discussions in the near future with the House Committee on Transport on the measures he envisages to combat the problems existing on this point in various Member States and the realistic chances of reaching a solution in the near future.

I fully support the comments already made. One must not limit the measures in this sphere to the Community/third countries context but rather one should, as Mr Nyborg expressed it so colourfully, first put one's own house in order before attempting to win over others to one's point of view. Consequently I feel that, as far as this is concerned, the pressure the House is bringing to bear can be no more than an inducement to the Commission to take action on this matter. I shall do my best to persuade the Council to look favourably upon the request for action.

Mr President, on the second subject I would like to reassure the House that the Commission is pursuing its endeavours and hopes to be in a position to discuss the relevant details with the Committee in the near future.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

7. System of air traffic

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-211/82), by Mr Albers, on behalf of the Committee on Transport, on the improvement of the European system of air traffic control.

President

I call the rapporteur.

Mr Albers, rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, one may very well ask oneself whether it is really necessary to present yet another report on the improvement of the European system of air traffic control, given the fact that Parliament has given ample consideration to this subject over the past years. I am thinking of the public hearings organized by the Committee on Transport following the reports of our former colleague Mr Noè in 1978 and 1979, and that by Mr Janssen van Raay which was dealt with by the directly-elected Parliament in 1980. Notwithstanding this, Mr Janssen van Raay deemed it necessary, and rightly so, to present a further draft resolution the following year (1981), for it appears that despite political pressure from Parliament and despite unfavourable reception given to the various proposed measures by individual national parliaments such as the Lower Houses of the Netherlands Parliament, and of the Federal Republic, there is little readiness to harmonize air traffic control and air traffic Europe-wide. On the contrary there is a clear tendency to renationalize despite the commitments referred to above and the wishes of those most affected — air passengers, airlines, IATA and the military authorities.

The publication in the summer of 1981 of the results of a feasibility study commissioned by Eurocontrol's Standing Committee showed a positive reception of the idea of extending the Maastricht centre. This led to immediate outcries from various national governments which resulted in the Standing Committee commissioning a further report, this time from a consultative working party comprising experts from the three Benelux countries and the Federal Republic, with the addition of some military personnel as observers. Their findings, although published some time between the end of April and early May, were not made available to us until later. It outlines five possibilities: the third can be called the maintenance of the status quo which distinguishes between high- and low-flying aircraft. The fourth is a variation on the same theme. The second would mean a total concentration of air traffic control including that of approach traffic while the fifth would involve a resumption by national authorities of responsibility for air traffic, that is a renationalization. Finally the first possibility proceeds from the continuation of the Maastricht Control Centre with, in addition, the entire ongoing air traffic control back-up services and would entail transferral of certain services from Amsterdam to Maastricht. It is particularly heartening that the Dutch Secretary of State in a letter to the Lower House of the Netherlands Parliament of 27 May 1982 opted for the first of the five aforementioned possibilities as being the most meritorious. This followed consultations he had on the matter with his European counterparts on 18 May 1982. In the case of Belgium and Luxembourg it is regrettable that, although giving the edge to concept one, they have made no final commitment in view of the Federal

Republic's reticence regarding concept one and its evident preference for either concept four or five. The latter would involve transferral of current services from Maastricht to Bremen, Düsseldorf and Brussels. In the choice of a site it is obvious that investment costs play only a secondary role to that of personnel costs and personnel ramifications. The latter may be summarized as follows: concept one involves a workforce which would be 700 less than concept four and 400 less than concept five. But upon examination a number of questions become apparent regarding the juggling of the figures and one wonders if the report does not even contain demonstrable errors, in particular whether the phenomenon of natural wastage has been fully taken into account. After all, we are talking of a scheme which will be spread over a period of 10 to 15 years and air traffic controllers work on average to 55 years. In the opinion of the Committee on Transport it is vitally important that the way to a European solution must be kept open and this has led us in our report to strongly oppose the disintegration of the Eurocontrol centre in Maastricht.

Generally speaking one can say that air traffic control and regulation is clearly of a dimension which, as such, should be consolidated and not parcelled out. Security and regulation of air traffic should be coordinated and integrated as is the case in the United States. This would result in spin-offs for the European electronic and computer industry. Eurocontrol has the know-how, experience and the very finest equipment imaginable.

On this coming 29 June 1982 the Standing Committee reconvenes. The Committee on Transport's report is therefore a timely one given that we may not realistically expect a final decision to emerge from that meeting which will undoubtedly delve further into the aforementioned five possibilities. One should keep in mind that the participants, as ministers responsible for transport matters in the Community have a responsibility, under the Treaty of Rome, for the development of a Community transport policy. The Committee on Transport considers air traffic to come under this heading.

Consequently, in section three of our report we appeal to the Standing Committee of Eurocontrol to affirm the future of the Maastricht Control Centre. In section seven we exhort the Council of Ministers to counter any tendency towards renationalization of air traffic control and in section eight we ask the Council to empower the Commission to develop an integrated Community-wide air traffic system and in like manner to stimulate open negotiations for cooperation with third countries.

As matters are now entering a crucial stage it would be judicious for the House in its turn to empower the Committee on Transport to continue its efforts in collaboration with the relevant bodies and with our col-

Albers

leagues of the national parliaments, to find an optimal solution.

Mr President, I would like to mention that the report bearing my name was adopted unanimously by the Committee on Transport. I can only hope that the House follows the example of the Committee on Transport in its vote on the report.

President. — I call the Committee on Transport.

Mr Seefeld, chairman of the Committee on Transport. — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I am really very sorry to have to speak yet again in a debate on Eurocontrol. 1978, 1979, 1980, 1981, 1982 — year in, year out, this Parliament has raised its voice and called for the continuation of Eurocontrol, but the sword of Damocles still hangs over this important European organization.

For me the fact that we are again having to discuss Eurocontrol today is proof that there is still no cohesive European transport policy. If there were, major importance would have to be attached to air transport policy, and an air transport policy without air safety would be absolutely inconceivable. The Commission and the Council of Ministers have made a start. The Council has looked into the question of noise pollution caused by aircraft. But no one has yet taken any interest in the question of how safety in the air is to be ensured and how existing organizations should be completely integrated into a concept of this kind.

Years ago the European Parliament's Committee on Transport organized a hearing at which experts, pilots' and military representatives, IATA and air traffic controllers spoke, experts from every sector therefore, and they told us about the growing number of aircraft in the air, the ever higher speeds at which they fly, the rate at which air space was becoming limited and the need to try to achieve the highest possible level of safety in the smallest possible space.

What they had to say about Eurocontrol was positive. But what do the governments concerned do?

They ignore all that. Some who were involved have the great idea of nationalizing certain things. Others, who are members of Eurocontrol, make no use of it all because they are afraid of disclosing various national secrets.

One of the most atrocious answers I have ever heard was given to me by a former French Minister of Transport. In a letter, which I have before me, he said he could not imagine French air space being controlled by other than French air traffic controllers. The man should have asked for his tuition fees back. He could have found out very quickly that, for example, the Eurocontrol centre in Karlsruhe, which is unfortun-

ately not responsible for the place at which we are meeting today, could very easily monitor any aircraft over Strasbourg on its radar screens. But no, it must not be done from there, a separate organization has to be set up.

Someone said recently that even after 25 years of the European Community we still unfortunately have the nonsense of air space frontiers in Europe. I therefore feel we should take Mr Albers's report as an opportunity to urge this Parliament once again to be untiring in raising its voice and protesting against the unwillingness to allow an organization that operates so magnificently to continue to exist in its present form.

On behalf of my group I wish to say that we fully agree with the contents of Mr Albers's report. But we also endorse the view of the trade union representatives of the Eurocontrol staff that the application of the convention and the work of the organization should be subject to permanent parliamentary control, a kind of political supervision, as it were. I feel we are best suited to this task, since our national colleagues are unfortunately often entangled in national considerations.

The Eurocontrol agency is a European institution which works. Eurocontrol is an institution which is capable of doing more. Eurocontrol is an agency which should not be destroyed out of hand, and I therefore take this opportunity to appeal to the Member States which do not make use of Eurocontrol to overcome their national egoism and to let it become fully active for them, the signatories.

I appeal to the new Member States to join Eurocontrol, as some have already done, and I appeal to those who now refer to national considerations to support Eurocontrol, not to neglect it.

Eurocontrol should be expanded, not demolished.

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

Mr Janssen van Raay. — (NL) Mr President, colleagues, the Janssen van Raay resolution could not have had a better rapporteur than my colleague and friend Mr Albers. The Group of the European People's Party is pleased to give full and unanimous support to his report. That is the first point.

Secondly, the moment is an opportune one for an oral debate on ex-Secretary of State, Mr Van den Doef's letter of 27 May 1982, to which Mr Albers has already referred, is scheduled for tomorrow in the Lower House of Parliament of the Netherlands. A timely moment indeed for this House to take up the matter once again.

Janssen van Raay

After years of reticence by the Dutch Government in complying with the Eurocontrol convention's decision on the transferral of air traffic control responsibilities from Schiphol to Beek ex-Secretary of State, Mr Van den Doef, gave the first positive signals from a Dutch Government. Let me repeat: for years Dutch Governments steadfastly refused to comply with a contractual commitment; in a letter of 6 May 1982, Mr Van den Doef came out for the first time in favour of Beek. Given the long delay in getting round to the matter it should come as no surprise that when a vote was eventually taken on it in the Lower House of Parliament in the Netherlands it received all-party support, embracing such differing ideologies as those of the Socialists, Christian Democrats, Democrats 66 and the Liberals. Quasi-unanimity in no way detracts from the work of ex-Secretary of State Van den Doef. The Group of the European People's Party still considers the optimal solution to lie in the integration and consolidation of all air traffic control in Beek whilst accepting that this is somewhat difficult at present. We welcome the fact that the Secretary of State has come out in favour of option one, which foresees the complete integration and consolidation in Beek of air traffic control with the exception of the approach control.

Just a word on the Germans' evident preference for option four, that is, an integrated air traffic control for traffic above flight level 300. For numerous reasons we find this unacceptable. Here are two of them. An example of military/civilian cooperation takes place under flight level 300. This would be squandered if we approved option four. Secondly it would involve restituting present responsibilities for air traffic control to the national governments and national authorities. Mr Seefeld correctly pointed out that we should expand rather than restrict Eurocontrol.

I promised to keep it short but may I just end with a remark for Dutch ears? Mr Van Zeil, Minister in charge of Middle Class Affairs in Prime Minister Van Agt's second government, has just been given the Social Affairs portfolio in addition, in Van Agt's third government formation. My advice to the new Dutch Government would be to give Mr Van Zeil, preeminent in aviation matters, a third portfolio by naming him Secretary of State for Traffic and Waterways and Drainage with a brief to assure the completion of the Dutch Government's official policy study on the choice of air traffic option. This must be done between now and the formation of a new cabinet in the aftermath of the forthcoming parliamentary elections in the Netherlands and they must choose option one.

President. — I call the European Democratic Group.

Mr Moorhouse. — Mr President, Mr Albers can certainly count on our full support and we are extremely grateful to him for his continued efforts to keep the concept of Eurocontrol alive. Now we are certainly

faced, I think, with a very disturbing situation as has already been said by a number of speakers, because the proposed new convention on Eurocontrol appears to go right against the best interests of the European air traveller and of the airlines which carry them. Air transport costs in Europe are already higher than in the United States and there is absolutely no justification for further penalizing the air transport sector. It is doubly disturbing that the new proposed convention appears to go right away from the conclusions we ourselves have reached on the basis of the excellent Janssen van Raay report of two years ago. And then again, the new convention runs contrary to the whole spirit of the common transport policy and in particular of the new Community air transport policy that is beginning to take shape at this very time.

Now how can this be? Is it a triumph of the bureaucrats over democracy? For certainly the powers-that-be seem very impervious to the voice of this Parliament or, indeed, of any other and indeed they seem anxious to avoid overmuch debate.

Now the facts of the situation are that under the present system it is a penalty on the airlines insofar as they are obliged to fly far greater distances than they need to and I very much doubt whether the proposed new convention would obviate that. We have also the further problem that there are long delays, we had, as you know sir, only today a delay of 50 minutes at Heathrow, so I think we can hardly say that the situation is satisfactory. Therefore we would contend that we cannot really allow the authorities to get away with this without further debate and we would therefore argue strongly for a fresh look at this situation, and I hope that we shall get a robust reply from the Commission.

President. — I call the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Berkhouwer. — (NL) Mr President, I too would welcome a robust answer from the Commission for a change but I have my doubts that anything will come of it. The man with the responsibility in question is anything but robust. We are confronted here with one of the most striking examples of our national States taking retrograde steps by doing exactly the opposite of that which technology demands of politicians — in so far as the latter could be said to be really bent on creating political dimensions, in an age of planetarization, namely, that which complies with the dimensions imposed upon us by technology. I hope Commissioner Andriessen understands my remark. It is almost a Catholic People's Party refrain from Romme's time and I hope that the Commission, just for this once, will desist from the usual nonsensical answers they provide us with. For there exists here for all true representatives of the people of Europe a duty to tell the national political instances that they are blind with their eyes open and deaf in one ear; in other words, that they run about with blinkers.

Berkhouwer

Mr President, that is the political point I wished to make and all these technical details are beyond me. The whole drama around a European air traffic control has, in these days, taken on more the appearance of a sort of Black Peter game in which the participating countries take turns in accusing the others while completely ignoring the crying necessity for a real international European solution. Once it seemed as though the Netherlands was the naughty boy; now it would seem that it has passed on the dubious distinction in an easterly direction but the essential point is this: the real control of the air above 9 500 meters reverts to national hands; in other words, Eurocontrol as an institute would be kept on but it would be stripped of its most important task and Maastricht is in danger of being closed down.

Mr President, I can only repeat the sentiments of the speaker who preceded me. I should now like nothing better than for the Commission, the existing European Commission, to summon up its courage and give us for once a robust reply and in so doing to prove that it is a European institute rather than a group of ambassadors from national governments.

President. — I call the non-attached Members.

Mr Buttafuoco. — *(IT)* I simply wish to support very rapidly the protests which have been made here which stress the lack of a common transport policy and, on my own behalf and on behalf of my colleagues, express our full support for Mr Albers's report.

President. — I call the Commission.

Mr Andriessen, Member of the Commission. — *(NL)* Hoping that in the eyes and ears of the honourable Member, Mr Berkhouwer, I refrain from speak-

ing rubbish this time, I too, should like to keep my contribution to this debate very short.

As the House is well aware the Commission has, in the past, always had the same attitude to air traffic as that expressed by so many speakers today, and in particular to the arguments so convincingly expressed in the Committee on Transport's resolution. That is not the problem and, unfortunately, Mr President, it is less a problem of robust replies from the Commission than one of political willingness of the Member States, that is of the Member States' parliaments. If one has felt it necessary to stress in this House tonight the importance of tomorrow's debate in the Dutch parliament then the robust answers should be emanating from national parliaments and governments in this area.

The views of this House and those of the Commission are very clear. I feel therefore that as far as this goes my answer can be very short and very vigorous. I totally agree with the manner in which the problem is presented in Mr Albers's report, a sober, clear but, in my opinion, scarcely convincing manner. I subscribe to the view that a lasting appeal must be made to those who, in the final analysis, have the decision-making responsibility, and I can assure the House that where the Commission can be of any help it is not blind to aviation problems. Mr President, this should be clear from the fact that discussions are currently taking place on a wide range of Commission proposals in other areas. Mr Moorehouse rightly pointed this out. From this it should be clear that the Commission, for its part, will do everything possible to contribute to the solution which it also esteems to be the only justifiable one.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

(The sitting was closed at 8 p.m.)¹

¹ *Agenda for next sitting: see Minutes.*

ANNEX

Commission action on opinions on its proposals delivered by the European Parliament at its May 1982 part-session

1. As agreed with the Bureau of Parliament, the Commission informs Members at the beginning of every part-session of the action it has taken on opinions delivered at the previous part-session in the context of parliamentary consultation.
 2. At its May 1982 part-session the European Parliament delivered 13 opinions on Commission proposals in response to Council requests for consultation.
 3. At the part-session four matters were discussed in connection with which Parliament delivered favourable opinions on or did not request formal amendment of the proposals mentioned below.
 - Report by Mr Ghergo on a directive on material and objects made of regenerated cellulose film intended to come into contact with foodstuffs;
 - Report by Mr Clinton on the proposals for:
 - (a) a fishery arrangement between the EEC and Sweden,
 - (b) measures to be applied in respect of vessels flying the Swedish flag;
 - Report by Mrs Quin on a proposal for an agreement between the EEC, Norway and Sweden on fishing in the Skagerrak and the Kattegat;
 - Report by Mr Moreland on a communication on the role of coal in the Community's energy strategy.
 4. In nine cases the European Parliament asked the Commission to alter its proposals under the second paragraph of Article 149 of the Treaty, and in five cases the Commission accepted the proposed amendments:
 - Report by Mr Geurtsen on the fifth directive on the structure of *sociétés anonymes* and the powers of their organs
 - The Commission is studying the implications of Parliament's opinion for the fifth directive and what action it can take on it. The Commission will inform Parliament this summer of the results of its deliberations.
 - Report by Mrs Weber on a directive laying down basic measures for the radiological protection of persons undergoing medical examinations and treatment
 - The Commission is preparing an amended proposal in line with most of Parliament's proposed amendments.
 - Report by Sir Peter Vanneck on a proposal concerning wastes from the titanium dioxide industry
 - The Commission is preparing an amended proposal which will be sent to the Council and the European Parliament as soon as it is adopted.
 - Report by Mr Helms on a proposal providing for certain technical measures for the conservation of fishery resources
 - The Commission has already taken into account the two proposed amendments accepted when a revised version of its proposal was presented in January 1982.
 - Report by Mr Vié on a proposal concerning direct tourist insurance
 - The Commission will be presenting an amended proposal shortly which will then be sent to the Council and the European Parliament.
- In the four other cases, namely in connection with the
- Report by Mrs Vayssade on the proposals for a new action programme on equal opportunities for women,

Report by Mrs Salisch on a proposal for the harmonization of provisions concerning the taxation of incomes in relation with the free movement of workers,

Report by Mrs Fullet on a proposal for special action on housing in Northern Ireland in the framework of an integrated operation in Belfast,

Report by Mr Rogalla on a communication concerning investment for the rational use of energy,

the Commission explained at the discussions why it preferred to maintain its proposals.

5. The Commission also expressed its views during discussions concerning it and took note of the European Parliament's opinions on the

Resolution on Argentina's failure to apply Resolution 502 of the United Nations,

Resolution on the safety of three British journalists in Argentina,

Resolution on the operation of the Stabex system in 1981,

Report by Mr Saby on the European Parliament's estimated revenue and expenditure for 1983,

Resolution on the absence of a Council decision on the 1982/83 farm prices,

Four resolutions on the use of plastic bullets in Ireland,

Resolution on the setting-up of a Centre for Friendship between Peoples and the Promotion of Studies on anti-Nazi Resistance at Anogia, Crete,

Report by Mrs Perry on the coordination of maritime inspection and surveillance operations,

Report by Mr Nord on financing the common policy on transport infrastructure out of the taxes on hydrocarbons,

Report by Mrs Viehoff on combating illiteracy,

Report by Mrs Scrivener on anti-drug measures.

6. The Commission took the opportunity to inform the European Parliament of the disaster aids and the financial and food aids that had been granted since the previous part-session.

(a) *Emergency financial aid*

1 000 000 ECU for Madagascar to repair hurricane damage,

1 000 000 ECU for Zimbabwe for drought victims,

1 300 000 ECU for Tongo for hurricane victims,

150 000 ECU for China Sea refugees,

200 000 ECU for flood victims in Nicaragua,

200 000 ECU for flood victims in Honduras,

7 500 000 ECU for Poland through the NGOs;

(b) *Food aid*

5 000 t of skimmed-milk powder for Botswana,

2 000 t of cereals, 100 t of skimmed-milk powder and 400 t of red beans for Nicaragua,

100 t of skimmed milk powder for Honduras.

SITTING OF TUESDAY, 15 JUNE 1982

Contents

<p>1. <i>Approval of the Minutes:</i> Mr Moreland 29</p> <p>2. <i>Fruit and vegetables — Report (Doc. 1-279/82) by Mr Maffre-Baugé:</i> Mr Maffre-Baugé; Mr Wettig; Mr Kaloyannis; Mr Hord; Mr Vitale; Mr Delatte; Mr Vernimmen; Mme Poirier; Mr Adamou; Mr Sutra; Mr Dalsager (Commission); Mr Maffre-Baugé 30</p> <p>3. <i>Agricultural structures — Report (Doc. 1-184/82) by Mr Dalsass and oral questions with debate to the Commission (Doc. 1-256/82) by Mrs Barbarella and others and (Doc. 1-337/82) by Mr Papaefstratiou and others:</i> Mr Dalsass; Mr Eyraud; Mr Papaefstratiou; Mr Provan; Mr Kyrkos; Mrs Ewing; Mr Bocklet; Mr McCartin; Mr Dalsager (Commission); Mr Dalsass 38</p> <p>4. <i>The Belgian presidency and related matters: Reports (Doc. 1-296/82) by Mr Israël and (Doc. 1-201/82) by Mr Haagerup:</i> Mr Tindemans (Council); Mr Ortoli (Commission); Mr Israël; Mr Haagerup; Mr Glinne; Mr Barbi; Mr Fergusson; Mr Bonaccini; Mr Bangemann; Mr de la Malène; Mr Vandemeulebroucke; Mr Psemazoglou; Mr Moreau; Mr Pearce; Mr Beumer; Mr Croux; Mr Wurtz; Mr Haagerup; Mr Romualdi; Mr Ripa di Meana; Mr Bournias; Mr Ephremidis; Mrs Spaak; Mr De Goede; Mr Thorn (Commission) 45</p> <p><i>Report (Doc. 1-307/82) by Mr Hopper and oral questions with debate (Doc. 1-156/82) by Mr Beumer to the Council, (Doc. 1-157/82) by Mr Beumer to the Commission, and (Doc. 1-341/82) by Mr Møller and others to the Commission:</i> Mr Hopper; Mr Beumer; Mr Møller; Mr Tindemans (Council); Mr Moreau; Mr Giavazzi; Mr Ruffolo; Mr Purvis; Mrs Boserup; Mr Delorozoy; Mr Bøgh; Mr Psemazoglou; Mr Papantoniou; Mr Pfennig; Mr Prag; Mrs Viehoff; Mr Estgen; Mr Tindemans; Mr Thorn (Commission) 72</p>	<p>5. <i>Question Time (Doc. 1-330/82) 91</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Question No 1, by Mr Cousté: Measures to strengthen convergence:</i> Mr Ortoli (Commission); Mr Enright 91 • <i>Question No 2, by Mr Nyborg: Coastal protection:</i> Mr Richard (Commission); Mr Nyborg; Mr Richard; Mrs Ewing; Mr Richard; Mr Hume; Mr Richard; Mr Purvis; Mr Richard; Mr Griffiths; Mr Richard 91 • <i>Question No 3, by Mrs Dury: Consultation of the ETUC on the formulation of the FAST programme:</i> Mr Richard; Mr Dury; Mr Richard 92 • <i>Question No 4, by Mr Psemazoglou: Full utilization of the mineral reserves of Member States:</i> Mr Tugendhat (Commission); Mr Psemazoglou; Mr Tugendhat; Mrs Ewing; Mr Tugendhat 93 • <i>Question No 5, by Mr Lalor: Common organization of the market in potatoes:</i> Mr Dalsager (Commission); Mr Lalor; Mr Dalsager; Mr J. D. Taylor; Mr Dalsager; Mr Clinton; Mr Dalsager; Mr Newton Dunn; Mr Dalsager 94 • <i>Question No 7, by Mr Flanagan: 4 750 jobs to be lost in Northern Ireland:</i> Mr Giolitti (Commission); Mr J. D. Taylor; Mr Giolitti; Mrs Boot; Mr Giolitti; Mr Hume; Mr Giolitti; Mrs Boot; Mr Giolitti; Mr McCartin; Mr Giolitti; Mr Seligman; Mr Tugendhat 95 • <i>Question No 9, by Mr Purvis: Work permits and social security support for Polish nationals:</i> Mr Richard; Mr Purvis; Mr Richard 97 • <i>Questions No 10, by Mr Pranchère and No 17, by Mr Clinton: UK's contribution to the Community budget:</i> Mr Tugendhat; Mr Martin; Mr Tugendhat; Miss Quin; Mr Tugendhat; Mr Rogalla; Mr Tugendhat; Mr Welsh; Mr Tugendhat 97
---	--

- | | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question No 11, by Mr Simmonds: Tax incentives for rational use of energy:
Mr Tugendhat; Mr Simmonds; Mr Tugendhat; Mrs Ewing; Mr Tugendhat; Mr Price; Mr Tugendhat 98 • Question No 13, by Mr Radoux: Resolutions tabled at Parliament's July 1981 part-session on the improvement of inter-institutional relations and their operation:
Mr Andriessen (Commission); Mr Radoux 100 • Question No 14, by Mr Enright: Medical provision for European holidaymakers:
Mr Richard; Mr Enright; Mr Richard; Sir David Nicolson; Mr Richard; Mr Sherlock 100 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question No 15, by Miss Hooper: Customs duties on goods purchased by international travellers:
Mr Tugendhat; Miss Hooper; Mr Tugendhat 102 • Question No 16, by Mr McCartin: Land improvement under Regulation 1820/80:
Mr Dalsager; Mr McCartin; Mr Dalsager 103 • Question No 20, by Mr Dalziel: European Community aid to householders affected by severe winter weather in Scotland:
Mr Giolitti; Mr Dalziel; Mr Giolitti; Mr Beazley; Mr Giolitti; Mr Bournias . . . 103 |
|--|---|

IN THE CHAIR: MR DANKERT

Vice-President

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

1. Approval of the Minutes

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

Are there any comments?

I call Mr Moreland.

Mr Moreland. — Mr President, you announced yesterday that an oral question with debate which was proposed by myself and some others on coal imports will be taken on Friday with the Pintat report. You then went on to state that the deadline for tabling motions to wind up oral questions with debate would be 8 p.m. last night. My question has not actually, to the best of my knowledge, yet been circulated — certainly I have not seen it. Could we ask for an extension of the deadline because we may wish to submit a resolution to wind up the oral question with debate?

President. — Mr Moreland, I think there is a misunderstanding here. Your proposal has been *included* in the debate on the Pintat report. That means that there

will not be a specific resolution, and that one has to solve the problems by amending the Pintat resolution. That is the interpretation the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions has given so far.

(Parliament approved the minutes)¹

2. Fruit and vegetables

President. — The next item is the report, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on the proposals from the Commission of the European Communities on the Council for

- I a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 1035/72 on the common organization of the market in fruit and vegetables as regards producers' organizations
- II a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 1035/72 on the common organization of the market in fruit and vegetables (Doc. 1-674/81-COM(81) 403 final)
- III a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 1035/72 as regards preventive withdrawals of apples and pears (Doc. 1-231/82-COM(82) 194 final) (Doc. 1-279/82).

I call the rapporteur.

¹ Topical and urgent debate (Announcement of motions for resolutions tabled: see Minutes).

Mr Maffre-Baugé, rapporteur. — (FR) Mr President, as with regions, so with countries, continents and people: there are those that are rich and those that are poor.

Where agriculture is concerned, the Mediterranean producing areas count among the poor ones. Devotion to human interests, which purportedly was the doctrine on which the economic Community was founded, had it not been so shamefully disregarded, should have led to an attenuation of social and economic inequalities. The initial policy as conveyed by the spirit of the Rome Treaty has in fact been quickly blown off course and all too often today seems to fall short of expectations.

For a great many agricultural workers the desired objective has not been attained. Their situation has in many cases deteriorated and the various attempts to rectify it have proved to be of no avail. It is a fact that numerous regions in the United Kingdom, Italy, Germany, Greece, Ireland, or wherever, are experiencing the same sense of disenchantment. The disparities have grown worse and the number of anxious, dismayed and bitter farm workers continues to grow also. They do not know what to make of this common agricultural policy which they had been given to understand would be like a horn of plenty to them; they are wondering what good it is doing them. Because Community agriculture has been such a disappointment, disaffection is liable to spread from the economic or social field to the political field.

It is time, in other words, for Parliament to stop and rethink. If the CAP as a whole has been a disappointment, you can imagine what the feelings are about certain product lines in certain regions of Europe, like fruit and vegetables. Not only do you have the usual problems due to the peculiarity of these sectors, but on top of them you also have the imbalance between the North and the South. Community regulations have been botched, guarantees varying according to product line. Some producers get their price, whilst others can only hope for a theoretical support, fixed on the basis of target prices. Some of them do not benefit from any guarantees or market support at all.

In addition, the mechanisms are so complex that intervention frequently comes too late. It is astounding with what lack of thought regulations have been drawn up, so much so that one might be forgiven for imputing some political motive. One can lose oneself in the maze of regulations and intervention mechanisms: a cat couldn't find its kittens in such a maze . . .

I have tried on many occasions to fathom the policy in this area, but I might as well batter my head against a brick wall because there is nothing consistent or rational about these regulations. We started off with an ill-conceived legislation which we keep patching and papering over cracks as they appear. The building is a mess. Rather than starting it again from scratch we

have those who delude themselves that they are strengthening it. What dismal architects! But the worst of it is that the walls are falling in not on them but on the farm workers.

Let us consider the importance of the fruit and vegetable sector for producers and consumers. In the case of fruit we are talking of 1 100 000 hectares with a total production of 20 million tonnes a year, in the case of vegetables it is 900 000 hectares and 28 million tonnes a year. Two million people are involved, 8 million tonnes of produce are processed. But on it also depend the equilibrium of trade balances, employment in the producing Member States and the social and regional future of the Community's least-favoured areas. What is more, these products suffer from extremely variable harvests due to their susceptibility to the weather. It is difficult to guarantee the Community's self-sufficiency without certain reserves provided by surpluses which are essential if we are to avoid short-term production imbalances, which would be disastrous.

And with such diversified and highly fickle markets exposed to the full force of King's law, any indiscriminate imports tend to upset the precarious balances resulting from the rather indifferent set of intervention measures that we have at present. However, it is not this production sector that is draining the financial resources of the EAGGF. It accounts for no more than 4 to 6% of total market support expenditure. And, incidentally, 70% of this goes on processed products. One could go so far as to talk of a shambles that regularly has the producers up in arms.

What are the Commission's proposals? The Commission is thinking along two lines: strengthening producers' organizations and changing the way the markets are organized. We support the system of aid to groups of producers but we ask that no decision on extending standards to producers, as the Commission is proposing, be taken until after the people in the region concerned have been consulted. The Commission's proposals regarding the activation of the so-called 'grave crisis' procedure, that is to say the one to be applied in the event of a slump in market prices, constitutes an improvement over the regulations that we have at present but still do not go far enough. It is true that they offer the Commission the possibility of implementing a procedure allowing purchases to be made on the open market; one cannot but regret, however, that these are applicable to only a limited number of products. Moreover, they cannot take place until the crisis situation has already made itself felt at the level of the wholesale trade. It is in the area of protection against imports that the Commission's proposals are most limited. To take into account the Community product price in calculating the entry price is a positive move, but it only applies to three products. We are particularly concerned at the Commission's intention to abolish the imports timetable in exchange for an extension of the reference price system. We are very much against this and urge it to abandon any

Maffre-Baugé

such plans. The improvements envisaged by the Commission would entail an annual increase in the EAGGF of 10 million ECU. This is very little, not to say derisory, when you consider that this figure was put forward simply to take account of Spain and Portugal's entry into the Community and not with any thought of adjustment for a hitherto backward sector.

With this report, Mr President, I have sought to flesh out and adjust the Commission's proposals so as to make them more acceptable to our producers. We feel it is better to suggest than to criticize. This report tries to take a responsible attitude. These suggestions are a platform where each one of you can add his own contribution, tighten or loosen a few bolts. To propose is not to impose. Flint will naturally become sharper through being rubbed against other flints.

It is for this reason, Mr President, that I thought it expedient, in accordance with Rule 100(4) of the Rules of Procedure, to introduce into the explanatory statement the principal minority views which the Committee on Agriculture did not adopt. I am conscious of the fact that I am rapporteur for the Committee on Agriculture and not rapporteur simply for the regions or the country that I represent here. You will appreciate that I can but hope that all or part of the proposals put forward will be listened to with an attentive ear, although I do not of course expect them to be received uncritically. The Council of Ministers, meeting in London, looked at the question of Mediterranean production and was supposed to have put solutions forward by the end of March. Here we are now in June and nothing has been done.

I urge the Commission to give consideration to the proposals of the Committee on Agriculture, as they will help the Council in reaching its decision. These proposals concentrate on certain priorities: to guarantee producers a respectable income, to ensure the coherent and balanced development of the sector as a whole, to prevent marketing crises, to keep consumers supplied with products of good quality and at reasonable prices, to ensure the uniform application of production rules and constraints throughout the Member States, to respect the principle of Community preference and to achieve better control over imports, especially by the strict observance of timetables, and finally to promote the sale of our products.

Market management can be improved by reinforcing the withdrawal mechanism, that is to say by bringing it into play sooner, and by extending it to a greater number of products. But one thing is sure, namely that any measures taken to improve market management will be compromised unless Community preference is reinforced. Community preference must be more strictly observed, primarily by extending the reference price system to all fruit and vegetables and by maintaining and introducing import timetables. The Committee on Agriculture has also drawn attention to the problems that enlargement would undoubtedly pose both for the

Community producers and for the export trade of the countries of the Mediterranean and the ACP countries.

In conclusion, Mr President, I want to say that I have tried to show how far matters have fallen behind and the need for a degree of adjustment and I have accordingly put together certain proposals designed to improve the situation. I could not end this speech without reference to what seems to me to be essential: where people figure in all this. It would be inconceivable for us to debate economic matters without placing them in their proper context: a fair wage for the worker, in this case farm worker, protection of the rural environment and the chance for the individual to derive job satisfaction. Europe as we imagined it in the beginning was to devote itself to human interests. This cannot be achieved by words alone. Actions speak louder than words. So much is said about the North-South balance. It is high time appropriate measures were taken to achieve it. There is still time to save the fruit and vegetable sector, which provides so much employment. Today, this report goes beyond the usual strictly technical proposals. It is in the nature of an appeal and a witness. I am confident, Mr President, that it will not go unheard.

President. — I call the Socialist Group.

Mr Wettig. — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I have a few comments to make on behalf of a minority of the Committee on Agriculture.

The Commission has obviously been prompted by the criticism of the present organization of the market in fruit and vegetables and of insufficient support for Mediterranean products to put forward a package of proposals for a substantial improvement of the position of producers in the Mediterranean area. As I see it, the Commission has adopted the wrong course with its proposals. It has included precisely those elements which have been criticized for years and, as a result of their inflexibility, have resulted in other sectors in our having to contend with considerable structural surpluses, which place an undue burden on the Community's budget.

I am not opposed to a proper Mediterranean policy, an accusation that is repeatedly levelled at anyone who expresses such criticism. We are simply opposed to measures which it is known from the outset cannot produce the desired result and will leave the Community's agricultural policy in an *impasse*. The proposals which have been submitted to us and have been underlined by Mr Maffre-Baugé do not, in my view, take account of certain peculiarities of Mediterranean agriculture, one of which is the extremely small size of holdings in that area. This makes it impossible to start thinking about improving production.

Wettig

Another important point is that Mediterranean products are such that it is impossible, for example, to have fixed arrangements for intervention, since these products go bad so quickly that intervention would result in their landing on the rubbish heap. This is something which has attracted a great deal of criticism recently. The proposal the Commission makes here will eventually lead to an increase in intervention. It extends intervention to include two other products, and there is no denying that the tendency is undoubtedly towards all fruit and vegetables being subject to intervention in the next few years.

This is also explicitly proposed by the Maffre-Baugé report. It should be realized that the additional cost the Community will have to bear will be far more than the figure the Commission quotes in its report. Its figures in this respect are extremely unrealistic. Even next year we shall see that costs cannot be kept down to this level.

Criticism must also be levelled at the arrangements for producers' organizations, a subject which I cannot go into in great detail. Here again, an inflexible system has been chosen, one about which countries importing these products in particular must have considerable doubts, because this inflexible system for producers' organizations will certainly increase prices to the consumer. The Commission must unfortunately accept the criticism — and this also applies to other sectors — that it has not taken sufficient account of consumer interests in its policy. This is also true if the extension of the reference price system and particularly of its proposals on tomatoes. Again, this can only increase the burden on the consumer and is hardly likely to improve the Community's reputation.

At this juncture it must also be said that the proposed external economic arrangements — on which the Maffre-Baugé report also dwells — are unwise, since they are not commensurate with the external policies of the Community's Member States. Important countries in the Mediterranean area have aligned their production with the Community market, and it would be utterly unreasonable of the Community to remove them from this market with very strict external economic arrangements.

All in all, this proposal by the Community and particularly what the Maffre-Baugé report has to say about it will aggravate a tendency which we consider disastrous. We have therefore tabled quite a number of amendments to the report, and we hope they will change the report sufficiently for us to be able to approve it. Should this not be the case, we shall not be able to endorse it.

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

Mr Kaloyiannis. — Mr President, in intervening I would like to comment that the rapporteur has pro-

duced a report which, though it may be based on the interests of fruit and vegetable producers, does not neglect the position of the consumer. He has also not omitted to mention that an improvement of the Community's policy in relation to each of the three chapters of the report will serve the more general interests of the Community as well. It is indeed right that we should try to devote some attention to the needs of this production sector, in which several million agricultural workers are engaged, and though it would still be possible to add a great deal to what has been said, let us for the moment be content with the following: as a Greek, and therefore a native of a country very much involved in the fruit and vegetable growing sector, perhaps more so than any other in relation to our population as a whole, I have a particular sensitivity to, and understanding of the matter because have many times shared the agony of these producers when, sometimes because of weather conditions, at other times because of an unfavourable turn in the market, and sometimes because of the misguided Community or national policy, they have been reduced to real despair. The burying of citrus fruit is by no means a rare phenomenon in Greece, as elsewhere. For all these reasons I agree with the general lines of the report under discussion, and also because I have the impression that if the measures it proposes are finally adopted and applied correctly by the executive organs of the EEC, this will bring about an improvement in the sensitive area of fruit production, though I still hold certain views concerning the integration of these effective measures.

In the short time available to me, I think it essential to recall certain well known statistics that might perhaps serve to assist the planning of more particular measures. In 1980 the production of fruit within the Community increased by 1% compared to 1979. The production of apples and pears was slightly down, in contrast that of peaches and eating grapes increased by 3% and by 4% respectively, the production of vegetables remained at the same level as in 1979, in other words amounting to 28.5 million tonnes, Italy remained the main producer of soft fruit with 49%, and of vegetables with 42% of the total production within the Community, and the consumption of fruit in the Community during the year 1979-1980 increased by 0.7% to 19.1 million tonnes. The total internal consumption of vegetables increased by 1.9%, namely to 33.7 million tonnes. The market prices fluctuated considerably during the year, and in many cases they were based on temporary measures, such as equalizing subsidies of imports, and occasionally on preservational measures. The quantities withdrawn from the market were smaller in 1980-1981 (in the case of apples, peaches, cauliflowers and tomatoes) than in 1979-1980, but larger than in the case of other products such as pears. In trading, the imports of soft fruit to the Community excluding Greece were, in the case of most fruit and vegetable products, about the same in 1980 as in 1979, in other words about 4.5 million tonnes.

Kaloyiannis

In conclusion Mr President, with reference to another matter raised by the rapporteur, I would like to add that while Greece is not in principle opposed to Spain's joining the Community, in my humble opinion we would like to ensure that the final negotiations with Spain will include all the measures necessary to prevent a deterioration in the position of producers in this category in the Mediterranean States that are already members of the Community. I refer to this point because the rapporteur is clearly opposed to any enlargement of the European Community in the direction of Spain.

President. — I call the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

Mr Hord. — Mr President, my group is not enamoured with the Commission's proposals and it is very much against Mr Maffre-Baugé's report. We think that it is not only a long report but a bad report. We believe it to be something of a protectionist's charter. It is narrow, blinkered, self-centred, and I think its whole approach to the important sector of Mediterranean trade is totally unrealistic. In fact, Mr President, it poses very serious problems for Third World trade. It ignores the situation of Mediterranean countries with associated status *vis-à-vis* the Community. It ignores the vital trade links with many of the Lomé countries who are interested in promoting agricultural trade themselves.

I believe that Mr Maffre-Baugé's approach is wholly contrary to the liberalization of trade and therefore has to be condemned. It is so inwardlooking in fact, Mr President, that it goes almost to the point of saying we should not contemplate enlargement of the Community by taking in Spain and Portugal. I think it was only due to the fact that the Committee on Agriculture voted down an amendment to that effect that such a proposal is not in the report today.

I would submit, Mr President, that in future the common agricultural policy will tend to be less interventionist and not more interventionist, as Mr Maffre-Baugé is insisting. The taxpayers of Europe are fed up with giving blank cheques for European agriculture. It is time to reduce the financial support for agriculture and give it to those areas in very real need, urgent need. On that basis, Mr President, my group will not be supporting the report in its present shape.

President. — I call the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Vitale. — *(IT)* Mr President, we are glad that the Commission has at last expressed some ideas for the improvement of the market in fruits and vegetables. These products are fundamental for the Mediterranean countries, and up to now they have been of only marginal cost to the Community, whatever may be

said by Mr Hord, who goes so far as to consider an increase of expenditure in this sector as catastrophic.

I must say, however, that the Commission's text unfortunately contains ideas which belong to an out-dated way of thinking, that is, the policy of price supports on the one hand and the policy on structures on the other. In our amendment we stress instead the advisability of a connection — and this is the crux of my argument — between the two aspects. We ask that the mechanism of intervention be a selective one — this is the way to approach a serious policy on fruit and vegetable products — so that the types and qualities in demand on the market may be favoured and the unwanted ones discouraged. With this, the very withdrawal of the products would itself become the instrument, not of an aid policy such as was being criticized a moment ago, but rather of a true restructuring in this sector.

We therefore agree with the need felt by the Commission to strengthen the market mechanisms in this sector, but we do not approve of the contents of the Commission's document, because of the complete separation that exists between the factor of price supports and that of the reorientation of production. For this reason we will abstain from the final vote on the Commission's text, and — I regret to say, considering the excellent work done by Mr Maffre-Baugé — we will also abstain on the text approved by the Committee on Agriculture, both because we do not agree that private businessmen as well as producers' associations should take part in the withdrawal operations — Mr Maffre-Baugé did not agree on this point, but he was obliged to yield to a vote of the Committee on Agriculture — thus weakening the role of the producers' associations, and because we feel that the approach is too exclusive — here I agree with some of the preceding speakers — in regard to the products of other countries, the Mediterranean countries, and in particular the developing countries. We feel that in the fruit and vegetable sector, as perhaps in no other, it is necessary to take an overall view which is lacking in the text of the Committee on Agriculture, and this prevents us from giving it our support.

President. — I call the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Delatte. — *(FR)* Mr President, the volume of fruit and vegetable production in Europe is so great that it is imperative to have a regulation which will ensure both better use of our produce and a decent income for the growers.

I would remind you that the Committee on Agriculture in its report on the mandate of 30 May expressed the view that to develop regional policy in a way that would assist the Mediterranean regions would have only limited impact unless a complete set of regulations was adopted for the fruit and vegetable sector.

Delatte

Agriculture is in effect vital to these areas and regional measures by themselves cannot guarantee the sort of decent income that a good regulation can. To this extent the process of European integration contains a serious flaw and something must be done to ensure that the benefits derived from a better organization of the Community markets are more equally shared between the producing areas in the North and the South of Europe. That is not to say, of course, as some of the amendments propose, that we shall find ourselves tomorrow having to take from some to give to others. Our budget enables us to avoid that.

My group accepts the report presented by Mr Maffre-Baugé on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, with the reservations expressed in our amendments. I must say, however, that a policy of economic recovery based on increasing the purchasing power of households can, in my opinion, have only an insignificant impact as regards any increase in the consumption of fruit and vegetables and to suggest as much, as the report does, seems to me to be expecting the impossible. I would also point out to Mr Maffre-Baugé the drawbacks of a policy of boosting consumption by means of piecemeal decisions, and may I remind him that the French Government which he supports has just recently decided on a freeze on wages and prices, which invalidates this proposal so far as France is concerned. French workers will now no doubt be seeing a fall in their purchasing power and French producers are going to be penalized when it comes to exports by the introduction of new negative compensatory amounts. Furthermore, the rapporteur quite rightly stressed the need, to observe Community preference, which must be scrupulously respected, but it would be a serious mistake to scrap the system of timetables as the Commission is proposing and on this point we are at one with the rapporteur. Just as prompt intervention before sectoral crises have a chance to spread, it can be very effective in preserving the equilibrium of the markets, given that we are dealing here with extremely sensitive products, both from the point of view of the uncertain volume of production and the difficulty of keeping produce for any length of time. It is perhaps regrettable in this connection that the Commission has not adopted a minimum price system in relation to trade within the Community. I would add that the organization of the markets justifies special attention being given to processed products. The Commission has not offered any proposals on this point, or at any rate its proposals are rather imprecise, and here again I have to point out the principle of Community preference must be scrupulously observed for these products as well. Our trade with countries outside the Community can only benefit from a proper market organization that takes account of the vital complementarity of certain products.

Mr President, I have conveyed to you the views of the Liberal Group. Fruit and vegetable production represents 12% of European agricultural production as a

whole; a sound market organization is imperative. In voting for this report we believe we are making a positive contribution to filling an existing gap in the common agricultural policy.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Vernimmen.

Mr Vernimmen. — *(NL)* Mr President, Mr Maffre-Baugé's report is undoubtedly a serious attempt to attain a better organization of the market in fruit and vegetables. To me at least this report will be acceptable only if certain amendments tabled by Socialist colleagues are adopted. It is all too easy and all too simple to imagine that glass-house cultivation in the North wastes energy and to pursue a policy aimed at progressively dismantling this industry. This reasoning is false for various reasons.

The first of these reasons is social. In the Netherlands and Belgium alone 80 000 people are employed in this sector. Secondly, these crops are usually grown in very densely populated areas where the demand for quality products is constantly expanding and, as certain studies have shown, consumers are prepared to pay quite a reasonable price. Thirdly, British studies have revealed that the energy input, which at present is at a ratio of 20:1, can quickly be reduced to 3:1 through the application of new technologies, on which work is proceeding apace. In general, I can therefore say that the support they will receive for the reorientation and above all the rationalization of production will be a very important factor for all market-gardeners in the Community. In some countries this support is very well organized, while in others market-gardeners are very largely left to their own devices. There is also a need to consider how reasonable is the alternative of changing to other and, more specifically, smaller vegetable crops, and also the possibility of changing to flowers and, depending on market prospects, pot plants as a means of making the most efficient use possible of the area under glass.

Something which certainly must not be overlooked, but to which too little attention is paid, is that crops grown under glass are far less dependent on weather conditions than crops grown outdoors, and that supplies to the consumer in the Community must be ensured in the event of a poor harvest or poor weather.

For all these reasons it seems to me realistic to set aside part of production for cultivation under glass today and tomorrow. It satisfies a real need, and I believe that this must be made clear in connection with this report.

President. — I call Mrs Poirier.

Mrs Poirier. — (*FR*) Mr President, fruit and vegetable growers in our regions invest a great deal, run up heavy debts and work hard. But they are often forced to sell their produce at a loss or to destroy it. Faced with such a shambles, is it surprising that their discontent at times explodes into violence? The initial measures taken by the French Government — tighter import controls, particularly in regard to Spanish pears and strawberries, a planned product office — are a hopeful sign, but the fundamental problems remain. We shall be talking about it today, but the malaise is deep-seated. Thus in my country the total area under orchards has fallen by 18% since 1970, whilst the number of growers has fallen by 22%. In the first four months of the year our trade deficit in fruit and vegetables has almost doubled compared to 1981, rising from 875 to 1 556 million francs, basically as a result of higher imports. At Community level, fruit and vegetable prices fell by 17% between February 1981 and February 1982. So, what is to be done? The first thing that is required is a substantial improvement in Community regulations. Let us bear in mind that the EAGGF has set aside only 4 to 6% of its expenditure for fruit and vegetable growers even though, as Mr Delatte has pointed out, their production represents 11 to 12% of the total. This injustice must be rectified as a matter of urgency. The Commission must without delay take up the proposals contained in the Maffre-Baugé report to enable the Council to come to a final decision by the end of October 1982, in accordance with its undertaking. I note with satisfaction that the Committee on Agriculture is insisting on the need to tighten import controls, without which any improvements in market management would be thrown into jeopardy. But we should see to it that these essential protective measures keep pace with enlargement of the Community, which is the justification for the amendment we are tabling in this debate. Our action in the field with the growers has succeeded in putting back the date of enlargement. We are delighted by that but we shall continue the struggle with them. Enlargement of the common market means simply the enlargement of the war of the poor, which benefits no one but the big wholesalers and the consumer countries of the North. At any rate that is what they are doing already today in trying to make maximum capital out of crises on the Community markets without any of the benefit being passed on to the consumer. These periodic crises are damaging to the interests of the growers, whether they be French, Italian or Greek. To remedy this it is necessary to prevent the crisis spreading from one country to another. That is why, in another amendment, we are proposing to regularize trade within the Community by establishing the concept of a minimum price, thereby respecting the principle of market unity, together with import timetables based on seasonal complementarity. We say yes to freedom of movement but not for the benefit of big business and at the expense of the growers. In my country, the government is setting up product offices intended particularly to cover fruit and vegetables. They should constitute an effective means of revitalizing our production, rais-

ing the incomes of the growers and protecting them more effectively against imports, but we cannot allow their activities and their scope to be restricted arbitrarily by Brussels. That is why we are pressing for Community regulations relating to fruit and vegetables to be amended and improved along the lines of our proposals, so that our product offices are not prevented from performing their role.

President. — I call Mr Adamou.

Mr Adamou. — Mr President, though the report by the Committee for Agriculture has its positive aspects it still does not suffice to protect the interests of the producers, particularly now that the situation in relation to fruit and vegetables is to become more acute with the entry of Spain and Portugal.

If Greek fruit and vegetable products are to be viable within the framework of a common organization of the market for these products, they will first all have to be brought into the system of pricing and intervention, and secondly, the mechanism in question will have to be effective.

So far as Greece is concerned the mechanism of market organization must become the exclusive concern of the cooperatives, and should in no case be left to producer groups.

Nearly all agricultural workers are organized into such cooperatives and only when the administration of the production, packaging and marketing of fruit and vegetable products is in the hands of the cooperatives are their interests assured. In contrast, producer groups operate in favour of the large landowners and their reinforcement will lead to the disappearance of the smallholders.

Moreover, if all this administration is taken over by the cooperatives this will protect both the producers and the consumers from savage exploitation by middlemen.

President. — I call Mr Sutra.

Mr Sutra. — (*FR*) Mr President, as my group's speaking time this morning is extremely difficult to share out, I shall say tomorrow, when we come to the explanations of vote, why the French members of the Socialist Group support the report of my friend Emmanuel Maffre-Baugé, who did adopt our amendments in the Committee on Agriculture.

President. — I call the Commission.

Mr Dalsager, Member of the Commission. — (*DA*) Mr President, the Commission has noted with great

Dalsager

interest Mr Maffre-Baugé's report on two proposals for a regulation amending the basic Regulation for fruit and vegetables, and I should like to express my appreciation of the impressive work which has been accomplished.

Nevertheless, the Commission has to note that the report goes far beyond the proposals to amend the rules in that, practically speaking, it analyses the entire fruit and vegetables sector and, in that respect, to some extent covers the same ground as the own-initiative report of Mr Sutra de Germa. The Commission will therefore limit itself to dealing in the first instance with those amendments proposed by the Committee on Agriculture which are concerned with linking the rules on groupings of producers to those firms bound by contractual arrangements. An amendment such as this is not easy to understand. If the producers' organizations act as middlemen this addition is not necessary and, if on the contrary, sales are effected outside the producers' organization, there is no reason to take that production into account in the calculation of the launching aid paid to the producers' organizations.

With regard to the amendment requiring consultations with representatives from the industry before any extension of the regulations is imposed, we hesitate first and foremost on purely practical grounds to go along with this, because what shall we do if the industry lodges objections or comes out in complete opposition to any extension of the rules? Should we then simply not follow the views put forward by the industry and, if so, what was the point of consulting it? Or should we follow those views and thereby run the risk of never being able to put into effect an arrangement which we feel would promote the stabilization of the fruit and vegetable market?

Article 19b, which the Commission proposes should be added to Regulation No 1035/72, contains a number of provisions which may stabilize the market in certain sensitive products. The proposed amendments weaken if not nullify the effect aimed at in that, if they adopted, it will no longer be possible to allow a Member State engaging in public purchases because there is a monetary production surplus to apply measures for the temporary limitation of quantities made available from that production for sale.

If we drop Article 19c, as proposed in the report, we shall continue to allow products — and this applies exclusively to eating apples — to be stored over and above reasonable levels. For if they are not sold at the beginning of the following harvest season, they may be taken into intervention stores with the consequence that these products will burden the market for the new harvest and distort it. The Commission does not think it very desirable at all events.

On the other hand, we do not think it possible to extend the terms of Article 24(4), which provide that the prices of EEC products be taken into account in

the calculation of entry prices for imported products compared with the reference price, to cover all products falling within the scope of the reference price arrangements. Leaving aside the three products arising in the Commission's proposal — eating grapes, peaches and tomatoes — the duty on all these products is linked to GATT, and the suspension of the obligation which the Community has entered into, for example, by the introduction of a countervailing duty, would not be justified on the basis of a fall in prices quoted for EEC products, which could simply be due to temporarily overabundant EEC production and not to excessive import levels.

Finally, I would point out that the reason why the Commission has only proposed the addition of aubergines and apricots to the list of products covered by the intervention rules is that we are concerned more with typical Mediterranean products than, for example, with green beans and artichokes and that this change in the EEC rules which we are proposing as a whole is designed to take into account the fact — it should not be forgotten — that Spain will soon be joining. Others have also referred to the problems of the Mediterranean in this context. I can inform the House that the Commission has a study in progress on these very problems and that this will soon be available to provide further information on the overall situation of these products in the Mediterranean, also in conjunction with Spain's accession to the Community.

IN THE CHAIR: MR VANDEWIELE*Vice-President*

President. — I call the rapporteur.

Mr Maffre-Baugé, rapporteur. — (FR) Mr President, my first duty is to thank all those who took part in the debate, each one expressing his own point of view and each one equally convinced that his point of view is right. As for myself, Mr President, I had to submerge my own feelings as a native of the Mediterranean when I agreed to be rapporteur for the Committee of Agriculture. As I said earlier, I took my role as rapporteur for the committee seriously and I hope I can clear the air somewhat by repeating it. Dealing with the remarks made by my colleagues point by point, I would say to Mr Wettig, who raised the worrying question of the surcharge, that this involves no more than 4 to 6% of total expenditure. In point of fact, therefore, the fruit and vegetable sector is one of those that has received least from the EAGGF, even though it is also one of the sectors experiencing the greatest difficulties.

Maffre-Baugé

I believe that on this question, which appears to be the essential point raised by Mr Wettig, we have tried to adopt a reasonable attitude. We have chosen to steer clear of demagoguery in our report because, Mr Dalsager, we have followed in your footsteps.

All I will say, if you will allow me, is that we are endeavouring to go further. For if we Members of the European Parliament are expected to go along with the Commission on everything, well, I think we should know right away. If that is the case, there is no need for us to be elected by universal suffrage. We are here to express points of view, in an advisory capacity, which we in no way seek to impose, the power of decision in any case resting with the Council of Ministers. We merely wished to broaden these horizons.

I thank Mr Kaloyannis for his praise of the Committee on Agriculture's report. I have to say that many people had a hand in its preparation. He brought up the question of the negotiations with Spain, saying that it was in the interest of the Greeks to be very cautious in their approach to this. I do not wish to dwell on this point today, Mr President, because I am rapporteur and I have to keep to my task of rapporteur.

Mr Hord, whilst I may have come here dressed ready for jousting, you have come equipped with a breastplate. And what a breastplate! A breastplate with which you are capable of demolishing everything that might be in any way constructive. Whereas I came armed with a wooden sword, you fought me with God knows what kind of missile. Believe me, Mr Hord, although I have a profound respect . . .

President. — Mr Maffre-Baugé, I would point out that it is only because we have plenty of time now that the president is letting you speak in this way. This cannot create a precedent for the future as the rapporteur may not answer each speaker. But since you are addressing a colleague, I fear I may be asked for permission to reply. Please be brief, allow yourself two minutes, but do not open debate. Otherwise the president will be sharply criticized.

Mr Maffre-Baugé, rapporteur. — (FR) . . . Thank you, Mr President, for bringing this point to my attention, I shall bear it in mind. I shall not quote anyone else. All I want to say is that, through this report — and I shall be as brief as possible — we have sought to make provision for the future for those producers who are going to find themselves in extreme difficulties in the coming years — you are not unaware of this and the Commission knows it very well. Every day, as someone has pointed out, some of our producers go to the wall. It is on their behalf and in the interest of a North-South balance, Mr President — and here I know what I am talking about because this is the theme of the report — that we have to give a demonstration, show proof of determination. It is not enough

always to say that we agree to the restoration of the balance between the North and the South, and then, as soon as the South demands certain advantages, to refuse it them. Mr President, it is on that basis that we shall judge tomorrow's vote.

President. — The debate is closed.

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

3. Agricultural structures

President. — The next item is the report by Mr Dalsass, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 1-1089/81-COM(81) Final) for a directive amending Directive 72/159/EEC, 72/160/EEC and 72/161/EEC in relation to agricultural structures (Doc. 1-184/82).

The following oral questions will be included in this debate:

— oral question with debate by Mrs Barbarella and others to the Commission (Doc. 1-256/82):

Subject: Advisory committees on agriculture

With reference to the renewal of the advisory committees on agriculture will the Commission state:

1. When it intends to take a decision on the composition of these committees as this is long overdue?
2. Whether it does not believe it to be in its best interests to ensure that the relevant professional organizations are properly respected?
3. Whether it does not feel that the Italian Cooperative Movement should have a suitable part to play in these committees, particularly a major organization such as the League of Cooperatives, which has so far been inexplicably excluded?

— oral question with debate by Mr Papaefstratiou to the Commission (Doc. 1-337/82):

Subject: Improvements in agricultural structures in Greece

What special structural measures from among those proposed by Greece (and compared with those adopted by the other Member States) has the Commission submitted to the Council of Ministers since Greek accession to date, and what measures does it intend to propose to cope successfully and in good time with the problems that will otherwise affect Greek agriculture after the accession of Spain and Portugal?

President. — I call the rapporteur.

Mr Dalsass, rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, what we are concerned with here is the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a directive amending Directives 72/159, 72/160 and 72/161 in relation to agricultural structures.

When the Community was contemplating the introduction of a common agricultural policy, its goal was to increase the productivity of agriculture in all the Member States by encouraging technical progress, rationalizing agricultural production and ensuring the optimal use of the means of production and of labour in particular.

In other words, the aim was to produce more and more cheaply with a smaller input of capital and labour. This was designed not least to give the farming population a reasonable living by increasing the per capita incomes of those engaged in agriculture. This was intended to ensure that an appropriate number of jobs would be retained in agriculture and that the substantial difference between agricultural and non-agricultural incomes would gradually be reduced.

A further goal of the common agricultural policy was to stabilize markets and to ensure the supply of agricultural products to the people at reasonable prices. It was clear from the outset that such ambitious goals would be achieved only if the organization of the market was near-perfect. It is not enough to ensure free trade and the free movement of farm products within the Community. It is not enough to remove certain barriers to trade within the Community or even to respect the Community preference. Nor is it enough to agree on a fine package of prices, although I should like to make it quite clear that prices are a very important factor for the agricultural producer.

But it is not enough to adopt a fine package of prices. It has always been necessary to think of the places of production, the agricultural holdings and their quantitative and qualitative improvement. A better arrangement must be provided for them, one that takes account of their size and makes for better rationalization so that they can earn higher incomes at less expense. To permit this to be done uniformly in all the Member States, without some being given preference and others placed at a disadvantage, Directives 159, 160 and 161 on agricultural structures were adopted in 1972. They were followed in 1975 by the structural directives on hill farming.

It was right and necessary, as I said, that these structural directives should be adopted: they could ensure that agriculture in one country was not encouraged to the detriment of agriculture in another and farmers in one country were not better off than farmers in another.

If there was to be a fair balance, such directives had to be adopted and enforced.

They were then incorporated by the various Member States into their legislation, and it can indeed be said that they have borne fruit after being in force for ten years. In some countries they were applied soon after their adoption in others — my own, for example — it was six or seven years before they were incorporated into national legislation. Nevertheless, I must say that they have borne fruit.

The original directives expired in mid-April. To avoid a vacuum, the proposal now before the house seeks to extend the period of application from April 1982 provisionally until the end of 1983.

My report contains a number of statements which should be taken into account when the directives are reformulated. In particular, when the common agricultural policy is reformed, or rather adjusted, the need for directives and measures concerning agricultural structures should be emphasized, and this not only for the past but also for the future. The formulation or reformulation, the rewording of the structural directives for the future, using the available monetary resources, should above all make it easier for young people to take up farming — and I stress this in my report and I should like to put it to the Commission as a proposal. In other words, young farmers should be given the opportunity of staying in agriculture or finding a job in agriculture. We must try to get more young people into agriculture in the future because, if the average age of the farming population should become too high, we shall run the risk of seeing farms abandoned here and there — with, of course, all the negative consequences that can have.

To make it easier for young people to take up farming, we must certainly try to ensure they receive proper vocational training. This is another point my report emphasizes. In future, we must also pay particular attention to family farms, the nucleus of our agricultural policy, and take special account of them in measures to assist farmers.

Priority must also be given in future to the weaker regions, the underdeveloped areas and the mountainous areas in the use of monetary resources so as to reduce the gap between those who are better off. This has unfortunately not been achieved in the last ten years, and as a result the weak have often become a great deal weaker and the strong even stronger. In future, therefore, we must formulate the structural measures in such a way that a better, a fairer balance among the various regions and various countries is struck.

Greater care must be taken to ensure that the low incomes of hill farmers, who are exposed to natural and structural disadvantages, are raised by means of higher compensatory payments or grants. I advocate

Dalsass

this for hill farmers, although I am in fact inclined to be against making it a rule for lower incomes in agriculture to be improved with direct payments, because as a rule it must be totally rejected.

Agriculture is an economic activity like any other, and it should be assisted according to its performance. But in areas in which we are all interested in seeing farming continue, such as mountainous areas, where the environment can be damaged by erosion and avalanches, for example, if farming ceases, in areas, therefore, where the farmer preserves the beauty and recreational function of the countryside specifically for the non-agricultural population, we must make direct payments to farmers to assure them of a reasonable income.

These are a number of the suggestions I have made in my report. Many more could, of course, be made, but it is now for the Commission to draw up a practical proposal and to submit it to Parliament so that we may then consider it carefully.

I cannot avoid criticizing the Commission for the delay that has occurred. It could have acted earlier and more quickly. We ought really to be considering the amended structural directives today and not to have to wait another eighteen months.

After all, we had an extensive debate on the rewording and reformulation of the structural directives two years ago. Unfortunately, the Commission has acted too slowly. I cannot avoid criticizing it for this. I call on the Commission, or the appropriate Commissioner, Mr Dalsager, to submit the amended structural directives to Parliament no later than the end of this year or the beginning of 1983. That would enable the Committee on Agriculture and Parliament to consider the new proposals without any pressure and then to deliver an opinion. The new directives could then enter into force promptly on 1 January 1984. What I am saying is: act quickly so that Parliament is not again forced to rush its consideration of the matter.

I should also like to see rather more understanding in future for structural improvements, on which very little has been spent in recent years in relation to the agricultural expenditure. In other words, rather more resources should be made available for this purpose. This could help us to remove the inequalities among the various countries and regions and at last achieve the goals we have set ourselves in the Community Treaties.

(Applause)

President. — I call the Socialist Group.

Mr Eyraud. — *(FR)* Mr President, Europe is an unfinished structure and this is due to a faltering polit-

ical will. It can and must find new inspiration, but it is certainly not by whatever problems arise being put off from one year to the next that the structure will come to be completed.

It is an inescapable fact that a policy of free trade favours certain regions and certain producers. The majority of Socialists would like to correct these differences by means of an adjustment in prices. As this method does not yet have majority support we have to concentrate our attention on the structures. To that extent we believe, like the rapporteur, that the Commission must show a degree of imagination and come up with some measures before next spring, in time for them to replace or supplement those already in existence.

Its first objective should be to provide an answer to the following question: what kind of agriculture are we looking to have at the end of the twentieth century? Do we want the sort of family-run farms that we see in the vast majority of the Community countries, enabling particularly the young people, who are the farmers of tomorrow, to make a decent living from the land? To answer this it is necessary first to define the status of the farmer, not condemn out of hand those that simultaneously engage in activities not related to farming if that will enable the agricultural holding to adapt to its environment and if that is the only effective means of combating the desertification which threatens so many regions of the Community.

Second objective: any realistic structural policy must be accompanied by a regional economic development programme. In order to ensure a sufficient number of farmers it is necessary to offer them a decent income, which can be secured through a policy of guiding production and often through a policy of rational intensification based on three criteria: number of working persons per hectare, income per hectare and income per family holding.

The third idea that needs exploring concerns measures to encourage the release of agricultural holdings, at the same time ensuring their continuing survival. Accordingly the payment of farmers' pensions should be dependent on their ceasing to farm. This ought moreover to apply not just to farmers but to all sectors of activity, which would undoubtedly help to ease the employment situation.

There is a fourth possibility the Commission might consider, namely laying down a Community outline plan for structural changes which would coordinate parallel regional and provincial plans. I am thinking in particular of development areas which would need to be designated in an effort to do something about the increasing precariousness of numerous regions and agricultural holdings, regions where desertification has reached a point of no return, regions dependent on a single product, where farming has become over-specialized. It is with the aid of the law governing real

Eyraud

estate offices that France believes it can in the very near future give itself the necessary means to develop farming. These will offer more widespread opportunities for rental to young people without the financial resources to buy their own farms, they will permit control of agricultural structures and the determination, region by region, of the minimum viable acreage. But if one really wants the freed land to go to budding farmers, one needs to ban throughout the Community the breaking up of small farms, the establishment or expansion on what are in principle separate holdings by two members of a couple — each being able to farm without authorization so long as he or she does not go over the threshold beyond which controls apply — accumulation of holdings by inheritance, and the possibility for people holding down other jobs and having a minimum knowledge of farming to expand or establish themselves up to the limits laid down by common law. At the same time one would need as a matter of course to insist on a prior declaration in relation to every instance of establishment of expansion so that the structures commissions and offices can perform their task of verification as effectively as possible.

In short, every possible measure relating to restructuring, relief from real estate charges, adjustment of charges at premium rates to investment financing and the liquidity of the agricultural holding, must be looked into and introduced through development plans drawn up on a regional basis, for European agriculture differs widely from the Shetlands to Greece.

To conclude, I should like to say how eager I am to see a revision of the texts setting out the criteria for defining less-favoured regions and mountain regions, simply to prevent the sort of gross injustices suffered by the department where I come from, injustices which have been denounced for years by professional organizations and by the electorate and which nevertheless still persist.

And so the Socialist Group will vote for the Dalsass report, although I hope, Mr Commissioner, that my suggestions and observations will be taken into consideration.

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

Mr Papafstratiou. — (GR) Mr President, fellow Members, now that we have reached a decision concerning the determination of agricultural prices, which we know about and which, because of our notorious inability to arrive at a common agreement over a long period of time, led to the overthrow of the existing system of unanimity — a fact which is of course very significant and whose consequences for the relations between the Member States we do not yet know — we must indeed examine, and are quite rightly discussing in the Assembly today, the more general subject of

agricultural organization, because apart from defining the prices of agricultural products there are very serious material problems in various parts of the Community, particularly in the Mediterranean countries, and unless these are faced quickly and effectively I fear that in the future we will encounter many more matters and problems in connection with the inclusion of Spain and Portugal in the EEC, even though this is a matter concerning whose political expence we are all in agreement.

Having thanked and congratulated our colleague Mr Dalsass for the comprehensiveness of his report, I hope I will be allowed to propose certain specific measures.

Firstly, special measures should be enacted for the economic relief of farmers in the EEC countries who unfortunately suffer the burden of above-average inflation.

Secondly, and I ask the Commissioner to take special note of this, the principle of Community preference should be applied rigorously so that the Community's agricultural products should be absorbed by the markets within our Community, as would indeed be possible.

Thirdly, Mediterranean products receive some support in order to reduce the differences in income that undoubtedly exist between the producers in the South and those in the North.

Please allow me, further, to propose the adoption of the following measures designed to help Greek agriculture in particular, since because the lots are small and of poor quality and the production costs are high, it is clearly at a disadvantage compared with other countries in the Community from the standpoint of incomes.

First of all, it will be necessary to equalize the prices determined for Greek products with the common agricultural prices as soon as possible, by curtailing the period of transition.

Secondly, we ask that the rate of approach of the level of economic support towards that granted to the other countries in the Community should be accelerated, for example in relation to the subsidies granted for the production of olive oil, for the penetration of citrus fruit, for hard grain, etc.

Thirdly, the EEC should subsidize the interest rates on short-term loans to Greek farmers, and indeed to farmers in other countries whose incomes are very low.

Fourthly, it is also necessary to subsidize the means of production, such as fertilizers, plant medications, animal feedstuffs, and olive-gathering nets.

Papaefstratiou

Fifthly, proper concern must be shown for those farmers who are unfortunate enough to be cultivating under very difficult conditions, in mountainous or otherwise problematic areas.

Sixthly, we should contemplate a programme of finance and technical assistance by the Community for land-improvement works in Greece, for the development and modernization of fishing, for developing the lagoons and the large bays in the country, and for supporting the foundation and organization of agricultural manufacturing complexes.

Mr President, we all desire to maintain cohesion within our Community, but we must bear in mind this depends largely on our willingness to make generous and just decisions in favour of the poorer farmers in the Community, who very often work under inhuman and extremely harsh conditions and who look to all the producers in the Community to secure for them incomes that provide them with some degree of dignity. Fellow Members, let us not forget that they are the real backbone of our great European Community and that this is the light in which we should see them.

(Applause)

President. — I call the European Democratic Group.

Mr Provan. — Firstly, let me say, Mr President, that I welcome this report that Mr Dalsass has put before us this morning. I think the whole tone of the report, as I said in committee, makes it a very satisfactory way of going about reporting on the Commission's proposal to extend these regulations.

I think there is a slight difference, however, between Mr Dalsass' reason for extending the proposal and, perhaps, the reason I would like to see it extended. If I understand him correctly, he feels that the programme has not had sufficient time in which to bear fruit. I believe, perhaps slightly differently, that the reason that the scheme has not been totally successful so far is that the amount of money available in the budget for carrying out these structural changes has not been sufficient. I would have thought that if the scheme had been more attractive, we would have seen a quicker take-up of the suggestions.

However, we do welcome the extensions and hope that they will be seen to be successful as time goes on.

But one would, I think, welcome the report mainly because of the emphasis that I see in it on trying to suggest to the Commission that in the longer term we want to see structural money from the EAGGF going to the less-favoured areas. I think that is the really important point that is stressed in Mr Dalsass' report. There is no doubt in my mind that this new doctrine of putting money into the less-favoured areas is neces-

sary because it is in those areas that are less productive that we need really to give greater added-value to the products that come out of those areas. If we can increase the amount of money that those areas get for their production, that is the best thing we can do. We need a pump-priming exercise to do that.

All structural money should, therefore, I believe, go to these areas and we should not be promoting the flow of finance into the areas of the Community which are agriculturally better off.

For long enough we have seen our grants being given, for instance, for giving up dairying, and five years later some of these people have been re-applying to go back to dairying and getting money again from EAGGF funds so set up new dairies with new equipment. Now that is totally wrong: I would have thought that if the Community is going to mean anything where structural policy is concerned it should be concentrating on the less-favoured areas and at the same time it should be saying to national governments that if there are capital requirements in the Member States it should be up to the Member States themselves to finance the better-off areas under Community criteria. With that, Mr President, we welcome the report.

President. — I call the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Kyrkos. — Mr President, we believe that the time allowed for applying the measures designed to improve the organization of agriculture should be extended beyond two years in the case of some regions and for the Mediterranean countries in the Community.

For example, Greece, the most recent member of the Community, has derived hardly any benefit, even though as is known she has extremely acute organizational problems, a low proportion of arable land, a low rate of industrial transformation, weak forms of cooperative organizations, high production costs, etc.

In contrast, the highly-developed countries in the EEC, those with firm infrastructures, administrative mechanisms adequate for the task of planning programmes, and advanced agriculture, have derived great benefit. These are mainly the countries whose political representatives, with their conservative tendencies, object so strongly even in this House when, in the name of the common interests of the peoples in the Community, we of the southern part of Europe ask for increased concern and improved support for a reorganization of agriculture to the benefit of our farmers and not aimed at their ruin. And in this connection I support, without repeating them, the proposals put by my colleague Mr Papaefstratiou.

I would now like to ask those colleagues who have demanded with some fury that we should stop issuing

Kyrkos

blank cheques to the benefit of the producers, whether they would prefer us to flood the squares of their cities with our unsold agricultural products, fruit, vegetables and others, so that they may become aware that the problem is not just ours but theirs as well?

We therefore ask that the Community should face up to the need to offer support, by means of immediate additional measures extended for the requisite period of time and certainly for much longer than two years, to countries with very acute organizational problems, such as Greece, Ireland, southern Italy, and possibly others like Spain and Portugal, and that powerful incentives should at once be created for the development of productive associations as proposed by Mr Dalsass, which in Greece consist mainly of cooperative organizations.

President. — I call the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

Mrs Ewing. — Mr President, my group supports Mr Dalsass. I am sure it will not be any surprise to any Member of this House that I, of course, do represent an extremely peripheral, less-favoured and mountainous area. I wish when people were throwing out the list of these areas — perhaps I could appeal to my Greek colleagues here, who mention Ireland — that they please add the Highlands of Scotland. Whatever criterion you adopt we must be able, I think, to meet it, and even stand comparison with arid parts on the periphery of Greece. So my area certainly owes Mr Dalsass a vote of thanks for his efforts here and naturally, along with my group, I support the period being extended as suggested.

There are one or two things I would like to say quite quickly — we support the Committee on Agriculture's view that there should be increased monitoring of national-aid measures. These get a lot of publicity in the press when there is something that one State believes another State is doing unfairly and I would suggest that these, above all, bring the Community into disrepute in the mind of the man in the street. I do feel we should all take these things very seriously and try to eliminate national-aid measures where they are clearly unfair.

I would like to support some of the general propositions here, for instance assisting young farmers — now I throw out the only experience I have at first hand. In my area it is virtually impossible for a young farmer to acquire a farm in any sense of ownership and very difficult to acquire a farm even as a tenant. That is the situation that we have come to; there is a land hunger, although there is plenty of land lying fallow. That cannot be in the interest of anyone.

Someone mentioned the fact that farmers are getting older. They cannot even by tax structures, in my area,

easily pass on the farm to members of their family unless they arrange to do so many, many years in advance of the time they would really want to do it. So I would suggest that we have to look at the problem of young men acquiring farms one way or another. Someone also mentioned soft-interest arrangements. Well, that obviously is at the crux of it but there is more to it in some cases. There is the problem of the land and the way it is used as a tax structure in some States. I suggest that there must be some land-bank arrangement for looking specifically at the need to get young men to farm the land because they have the energy, they have the new ideas, and I feel it is to the advantage of us all.

Mention has been made of lower incomes. People like myself have often been on our feet talking about the amazing drop in real terms of farmers' incomes in areas like mine, particularly in the more remote parts, and anything that can be done to treat such areas as areas of priority I think we should all support. Whatever variety we have in our farming in our Member States, I think we are all united in agreeing that the rush to the cities cannot be a good thing; that the overconcentration of population, the overurbanization of our Community, cannot be a good thing. That creates social problems in itself. Rural communities tend to be remarkably free of social problems, rural communities tend to be stable and we should be encouraging people to stay on the land, however difficult it may be to farm certain types of area. Instead of punishing them by the costs involved of distance and peripheries, tax systems, we should be saying, well done, if you wish to farm in a mountain area, or an island, or a faraway place, do that, we will try and find policies that will help you. And if that means it will cost more of the cake I think you will have to look at it, because who wants a Community with peripheries turned into deserts with no people and I assure you that is the situation I am in with already only eight people per square kilometre, and many dead villages, and more and more coming along all the time.

Now, someone mentioned fishing and I must say I speak often enough about that, so I do not think I will bring it in, save to say that to some extent it is indigenous and in some areas fishing is the complement to agriculture. We still lack a common fisheries policy and there is the incredible fact that this Parliament passed in the month of April a resolution condemning the Council for not having discussed this; yet since December the Council still have not met, although I believe they may actually be meeting today or tomorrow. Let us hope that it is not one of the other meetings they cancel.

I think that this report, in giving priority to areas that have been mentioned and listed, must be deserving of unanimous support here.

Lastly, I wonder if I could ask the Parliament to cast its mind back to my unfortunate resolution which had

Ewing

the support of the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Budgets for an agricultural development programme for the Highlands and Islands of Scotland. It was one of those few amendments that lost out because of our coffee break when the machinery broke down. Now I had all the support that was needed of the House but I just failed, because of this rather curious freak situation, to get the support. However, I am happy to say that following a resolution, the Committee on Agriculture is now appointing a rapporteur on this, who is in the House here, who just spoke, and I am hoping that he will come along with a proposal to support this area.

My area should be regarded as precious because places with few people are so valuable in a Community which is so densely populated. The whole Community should be caring about the survival and the economy of the really remote parts. At the same time, while remoteness is attractive to the tourist, it is not attractive if there are no people there and if land lies fallow which could quite well be in use. This report talks of supporting cooperatives. That is a very good proposal because in remote areas self-help can improve the situation. Farmers get together, buy in bulk, and reduce their costs. This is being done. I am not asking you to help farmers who do not help themselves. These cooperatives are taking off all over my area, as I am sure they are in other parts of the Community, and they are deserving of your help.

A final word. I know it may be a matter of translation here, but some of the speakers have referred to 'peasants'. Well, we do not have any peasants in Scotland. The peasant, as you call him, is liable to have a son who is a professor at Edinburgh University, as my son is, and really and truly every time I here the word it makes me very upset. I suppose it is only a matter of translation and it may be that the word in another language does not have the same connotation. So for these non-peasants, I ask for the support of Mr Dalsass.

President. — I call Mr Bocklet.

Mr Bocklet. — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, at first glance the extension of the three socio-structural Directives Nos 159, 160 and 161 adopted in 1972, which is the subject of the Dalsass report, is no more than a formal procedure. However, the extension of the implementing deadline until 31 December 1982 is designed to give the Commission the opportunity to take account of past experience before submitting suitable proposals for the amendment of these directives.

The Committee on Agriculture therefore has some clear ideas on the future form of the policy on agricultural structures. All future deliberations must be based on the realization that in practice these directives have

not had the effect hoped for, as the European Court of Auditors put it, or have even had the opposite effect.

Regional disparities have grown further, and selective support on the basis of the support threshold has had extremely undesirable structural results. We therefore call for agricultural structural fund resources to be concentrated on regional programmes, on measures not related to specific farms, in future with the aim of improving the infrastructural conditions of competition in the economically weakest regions of the Community, thus making a more effective contribution to the removal of regional imbalances in the Community than in the past.

Our most important demand, however, is for the replacement of the support threshold with more differentiated and more suitable assessment criteria. As a result of the bias towards larger agricultural holdings in the structurally more favourable regions, the concept of the programme for the promotion of individual farms has turned against agriculture run by small farmers and resulted in disadvantaged regions falling even further behind.

This concept today represents a considerable obstacle to the efforts being made to safeguard jobs because it forces the individual to choose between increasing production and getting out of farming, and this largely in structurally weak areas where there are not enough alternative, non-agricultural opportunities for earning a living. Selective support also distorts competition among farms, places the weaker at a disadvantage and conflicts with the demand for equality of opportunity. Nor is the fixing of an average non-agricultural income as a condition to be met before support is granted hardly a suitable economic criterion for the assessment of an investment. Furthermore, the support threshold has in some cases resulted in excessive investments, with the farms receiving support consequently going heavily into debt. The support threshold also forces agriculture to increase productivity further, which, with farmland and the labour input remaining unchanged, further aggravates the present situation of surplus production.

For all these reasons, the support threshold must be abolished as soon as possible. The Commission now has an opportunity to do this.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr McCartin.

Mr McCartin. — Mr President, I want to thank Mr Dalsass and the Committee on Agriculture for this report and to welcome the emphasis it places on the problems of disadvantaged areas and regions in the Community. This directive is not just about agricul-

McCartin

ture: it is about regional problems: it is about the very survival of people in areas where the numbers we are able to maintain on the land can in the end determine whether those areas will survive as habitable regions, whether there are schools and churches and the infrastructures that are needed. So this is not solely a question of agriculture: it is a problem of the survival of cultures and regions and communities.

At price-fixing time in this Parliament, all the attention of journalists, agriculturalists and politicians is concentrated on that day, but to a majority of farmers and their families in the Mediterranean regions and in the west of Ireland, where 65% of the people in my own constituency are in agriculture, the structural assistance that is provided by governments and by this Community is of greater interest and importance, because their agricultural production is so low that the result of a 5%, 8% or 10% price-increase means very little in monetary terms.

I am disappointed first of all because the region that I represent joined this Community at a time when Directives 159 and 160 were already in existence and we had to seek to accommodate ourselves to them. Those two directives in particular have never worked in my part of the Community: for different reasons, they have not been successful. It is a matter of great frustration to ordinary farmers in a region of this Community that they can recognize the deficiencies of a directive for six years past now and find that over that period of six years nothing has been done to adjust that instrument to their particular requirements. Most people think that a review is under way, and it is regrettable that at this stage that review has not been completed. I would ask the Commission to speed it up. I would ask them to make it more applicable to the special conditions obtaining in the region that I represent. Directive 160 has never been used, principally because it has got confused with social-welfare benefits and entitlements in Ireland and the Irish Government has insisted on deducting the amount of money received under Directive 160 or including it in a person's income for the purposes of social-welfare computations. In my view, the Commission should not have allowed that to happen: if that directive is there and it is made available to Irish farmers, then national legislation should not be allowed to cancel its effects.

Furthermore, I would say that the vast majority of farmers in the part of the Community that I represent can never become what are known as 'classified development' farmers. Whatever hopes existed in 1975, 1976 and 1977 that more of them might fit into that category, today it is increasingly obvious that very few, if any, of them will be able to do so, and therefore they are denied all assistance in a region where this directive is specifically intended to help restructure holdings. It is of absolutely no use.

President. — I call the Commission.

Mr Dalsager, Member of the Commission. — (DA) Mr President, I should like to say first of all that we note with satisfaction the resolution of the Committee on Agriculture recommending approval of the Commission's proposal to extend the agricultural structure Directives until 31 December 1983. I think this is very important because by this means continuity can be maintained in the Community's agricultural structure policy. I can promise you that the proposals put forward for the improvement of agricultural structures will be examined very carefully. I can inform you now that in recent years we have supplemented the basic arrangements by specific or integrated programmes for the regions which suffer from special structural deficiencies and that we shall continue this development in the future too. A remark might perhaps be made for the benefit of the last speaker, who represents one of these regions in the Community, since we have made a special effort to accommodate the farmers in these areas with especially difficult situations.

In answer to the two Greek speakers, who referred to the special difficulties of Greek agriculture, I should like to take this opportunity to announce that the Council of Ministers yesterday adopted the special support programme for the development of Greek agriculture which takes into account forests, drainage problems and a number of other agricultural problems which Greece's agriculture has put before the Commission. The Commission has put forward a proposal which will cost a total of 200 million units of account over five years for the support and development of agriculture in the regions of Greece experiencing special difficulty. Thus, even if certain of our structural directives, as is known, are not working in certain areas of the Community, the Community has nevertheless been able to take other initiatives in these regions, so that it has been possible to give support to agriculture in these less-favoured areas in other ways.

I would also inform you that, in 1981, the Council also adopted amendments to Directive 72/159 on the modernization of agricultural holdings with the aim of adjusting the conditions for approval of a holding's development plan. We are of course aware that there are certain problems in this area. I cannot at present really see any criterion which can replace the comparable income which we refer to, since it must be possible for any alternative criterion to be differentiated regionally, in view of the great discrepancies in the Community in this area.

Might I also say to Mr Dalsass, who has asked for these proposals to be presented by the Commission at a very early date, that the Commission has an obligation to put the proposals before the Council by the end of the year, and that means that they will be sent to Parliament by the beginning of 1983 at the latest.

I should like to add to what I have said my thanks for the many ideas which have been presented in the course of this debate. I can assure the rapporteur, the

Dalsager

chairman of the Committee and the various speakers that the comments made regarding the development of agricultural structure policy, which I also consider to be one of the Community's most important policies, will be taken up in the discussions we shall be holding in the Commission on the proposals, which will be put forward in good time, so that they can be subjected to the thorough treatment they deserve.

President. — I call the rapporteur.

Mr Dalsass, rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, I should like to thank Commissioner Dalsager for his assurance that the Commission's proposals will be submitted to the Council this year, as this will enable the Committee on Agriculture and Parliament to consider them in early 1983. This is what everyone wants. I also thank him for emphasizing the significance, the importance of these structural measures. The approval of special programmes for certain underdeveloped regions, certain disadvantaged areas such as Southern Italy, Southern France, Ireland and, as we heard yesterday, Greece fits in with the concept we endorse and shall continue to endorse, that greater attention must be paid to the weak areas so that they too may enjoy the benefits of a common agricultural policy.

I should also like to thank all the speakers for the suggestions they have made to me and to the Commission for the establishment of the new structural directives. I also feel that everything must be done to enable the farmer to make the best of his farm and so to earn a living from his work. This would also prevent, as has been said here, the continuing depopulation of certain areas, which would be unacceptable.

But I should perhaps give one piece of advice in this respect. We are, after all, talking about structural measures, structural directives. These structural measures should not include everything that has, let us say, been mentioned here, for example, the fight against inflation, the need to take greater account of Community preference or special measures for fisheries. They should stick to structures. If other measures are needed — and I count myself among those who maintain that these measures are not sufficient for a common agricultural policy and that many other measures are required to make that policy complete — they should be taken in the appropriate areas, but not form part of these structural measures.

With this recommendation or request I conclude this brief statement. I can only hope that, as promised, the structural measures will be submitted to the House soon for our consideration.

President. — The debate is closed.

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

(The sitting, suspended at 10.55 a.m., was resumed at 11 a.m.)

IN THE CHAIR: MR DANKERT

President

4. *The Belgian presidency and related matters*

President. — The next item is the joint debate on:

The statement by the Council on the activity of the Belgian presidency;

The statement by the Commission on the changes in the European Monetary System;

A report by Mr Israël, drawn up on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee, on the situation in Afghanistan (Doc. 1-296/82);

The report by Mr Haagerup, drawn up on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee, on the visit by a European Parliament delegation to Pakistan (Doc. 1-201/82);

The statement by the Commission President on the outcome of the Versailles Summit Conference.

I call the Council.

Mr Tindemans, President-in-Office of the Council. — (NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, two weeks before the Belgian Presidency comes to an end, I should like to follow the tradition of this Parliament and to outline what can already be said about the last six months. What I have to say will not be an inventory or a series of non-committal statements, since you yourselves keep a very close watch on European affairs. Furthermore, there will be quite a few Council meetings before the Presidency passes to Denmark. These meetings will discuss the accession of new Member States, the Genscher-Colombo proposals, the reform of the consultation procedure and the budgetary procedure. Thanks to the close cooperation among the Presidents of the European Parliament, the Commission and the Council, a solution has been put forward to the last of these problems. Meetings will also have to be held to discuss matters to do with fisheries, the environment, development and research. It is therefore possible that quite a number of decisions will be taken. But it is right that at this part-session of the European Parliament stock should be taken of what has been done.

Tindemans

These have been eventful months. Before a start could be made on a real programme or the Community's continuing problems could be tackled, we were overtaken by tragic international events: Poland, the Falkland Islands, Lebanon.

The crisis over the mandate, which had been on the agenda since 1980, threatened to grow into a Community crisis. This resulted in endless negotiations in various capitals.

This all happened against a background of economic uncertainty, at a time of recession which threatens to turn into depression, both in the European Community and in the world as a whole.

The question of the mandate degenerated into the constant dissatisfaction of one Member State over its contribution to the Community budget. This dissatisfaction persists because agreement has still not been reached on a multiannual concession to the United Kingdom. The dissatisfaction of one Member State is infectious, as other Member States also beginning to question their own contributions. A disease of this kind threatens to set the whole system of the Community's own resources on a downward path.

The crisis occurred when this multiannual concession was unfortunately linked to the annual round of talks on farm prices. The Treaty requires a decision to be taken on farm prices by 1 April, and it is a decision that cannot be postponed indefinitely without causing irreparable damage to the common agricultural policy.

Once the crisis had broken, the Community was very quick to find the means to get itself out of trouble. Most Member States realized that the Treaty offered the only way out.

The Council thus in fact agreed to your recommendations of 13 May 1982 almost to the letter.

This was not all. During the night of 24/25 May a solution was found to the problem of the British contribution to the budget, or at least to the 1982 budget.

A crisis, Mr President, can also serve as a catalyst, and this has been true of political cooperation. Particularly close attention has been paid to the dialogue between the Ten and the European Parliament, both in the Political Affairs Committee and during urgent debates on topical problems. The Council asked me to go to Turkey to convey the Ten's feelings on developments in that country and to receive answers expected to a number of questions. As President, I have also been in contact with such candidate Member States as Portugal and Spain and also with Norway. The Presidency also gathered information during visits to Washington and Tokyo.

In view of the situation in the Middle East, invitations from Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Egypt and Israel were

accepted. Other visits were on the agenda, but there was simply not enough time for them to be undertaken. The plan is to forward a report to the Ten on the situation in the Middle East so that there may be a debate leading ultimately to the more accurate definition of the European position. Events in Lebanon have delayed this plan to some extent. The Ten's appraisal of the situation and their condemnation of the attack on Lebanon followed immediately upon these events. Again, where oppression in Poland and the occupation of the Falkland Islands were concerned, there was no delay in condemning the violation of the Helsinki Final Act and of international law. Aid to the Polish people was quickly set in motion. Early expression was also given to practical solidarity with the United Kingdom.

Meeting in Bonn on 9 June, the Ten strongly condemned the invasion of Lebanon by the Israeli armed forces as a violation of international law, involving the danger of escalation into a general conflict. The political leaders and the ambassadors of the Ten had previously considered the situation at the United Nations. The Community intends to use all the resources at its disposal to help to alleviate the suffering of the victims.

We are living in dangerous times, Mr President. There are major challenges to our safety, and we are rightly concerned about world peace. The failures that have recently emerged are untenable in the longer term and therefore unacceptable. They also reveal the urgent need for an in-depth and cohesive view of the Community's external relations.

The Community has been through a few difficult phases. But there is a continuing need for further progress towards integration.

The Community is not unaware of certain obstacles to enlargement, but there has been some progress on the accession negotiations with Portugal and Spain. I therefore hope these negotiations will continue and be brought to a successful conclusion.

The Community has also strengthened its ties with the Third World. In Libreville, new financial resources were injected into the Lomé Convention's STABEX system. This very week the Council of Development Ministers will be giving its initial reaction to the original and sorely needed proposals from Commissioner Pisani concerning the food strategy which, if properly implemented, could change the food balance of developing countries.

Genuine and improved cooperation under the Lomé Convention will give the Community the legitimacy it needs to join in the North-South dialogue with authority. During the Versailles summit meeting the Community succeeded in persuading the United States to adopt a more open approach towards international, global negotiations in this respect.

Tindemans

To the considerable satisfaction of the ACP countries it was also possible to settle a dispute over the price of sugar that had gone on far too long.

The European Council discussed economic and social problems at length at its meeting in late March. Special attention was paid to monetary problems and the disturbing increase in unemployment.

The anti-crisis policy was the central issue of the debate, which proceeded from the supposition that there is no one straightforward and simple way of solving today's social and economic problems. The Council did agree that the Community should be tough and courageous in its efforts to achieve industrial and technological restructuring, that support must be given to an improved investment policy, that it was essential for these adjustments to be accompanied by social measures and that there was a need in this context for greater monetary stability and greater cohesion in the economic policy pursued. This can only be done, however, in close consultation with our major industrial partners and an improved dialogue with the Third World if a wave of protectionism and a return to autarchy are to be avoided.

Various matters of concern to the European Council led to the adoption of practical measures by the Council of Social Ministers in May. I hope that the same approach will be adopted at the forthcoming meeting of the Jumbo Council.

I had hoped this meeting of the Jumbo Council would take place in June, but the Commission's preparations have not been completed, and the meeting is now planned for the end of the year. A few weeks after the Standing Employment Committee had discussed problems connected with the fight against unemployment, the Council of Social Ministers adopted a resolution designed to enable the Commission to take practical initiatives in this area. These initiatives will form the basis of Community action to combat unemployment.

The Community can and must tackle this social and economic scourge, and it will soon be in a position to do so.

The Council of Social Ministers also approved a resolution designed to help strengthen the present movement to achieve equality for men and women at work in the Community.

The Council has similarly adopted the directive on the protection of workers against the effects of lead. This directive is creditable in itself, but it will also enable analogous decisions to be taken to protect workers against other dangerous substances. The Education Ministers have examined the same problem by considering how schools can help to increase employment opportunities and how the transition from school to working life can be improved.

In the textile sector, the Council has been able to adopt a position on its participation in the Multi-fibre Arrangement. This will form the basis of our trade relations with the low-price countries over the next five years. Account has been taken both of our own important textile sector and of the interests of the developing countries.

The Commission was given a mandate to conclude numerous bilateral agreements designed to give shape to the outline agreement. This whole business must be completed in the next few months.

I find it difficult to discuss fisheries, since the Ministers concerned are meeting in Luxembourg at this very moment.

A satisfactory meeting in the autumn of 1981 raised the hope that a solution might still be found. It is now expected that agreement can be reached on the elements that will eventually lead to the adoption of Community policy in this sector. There is not only an urgent need for this policy, it is also imperative that it be adopted. It is generally agreed that this is the case, and this, I am convinced, will enable considerable progress to be made.

The Community has also made some progress with regard to transport policy. The report drawn up by Mr Carossino strongly criticizes the Council's activities in this area, in which there has been no integration despite the provisions of the Treaty.

At its last meeting, the Council of Transport Ministers took a large number of decisions concerning the railways, combined transport and inland waterways.

Considerable progress was made with regard to infrastructure, the weights and dimensions of vehicles and interregional transport. The members of this Council felt it had been an excellent meeting. A meeting of this kind allows one to hope that there will be a great revival in the transport sector.

I would also remind you of the signing, on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the Treaty of Rome and of the meeting of the European Council in Brussels, of the convention establishing a European Foundation. Its real aim is to strengthen the feeling of belonging together in Europe, to enable each to learn to understand the other's problems and to appreciate his characteristics and to make Europe better known in the world.

This attempt to explain to you everything that has happened in Europe in the past five months and two weeks is, of course, doomed to failure. But I will not conceal from you a degree of disappointment at the absence of real, global progress in Community policy to combat the economic crisis.

I certainly do not, of course, underestimate various Community investment instruments. Nor do I wish to

Tindemans

belittle the importance of some sectoral decisions such as those concerning the new steel policy and the policy on textile imports. But I feel these results are insufficient. It was, after all, the great hope of so many Europeans that we would never again have a situation like that in the 1930s and that, if there should nevertheless be another economic crisis, we would tackle it forcefully at European level.

I would add that there is only one answer to the question of how we are to inspire the citizens of Europe for the next European elections, and that is with an effective, European anti-crisis policy.

Anyone who takes stock of recent developments in the Community will conclude that certain problems, some of them very difficult, can indeed be solved, that there can be an intelligent reaction in a spirit of solidarity to some foreign developments and that dangerous internal obstacles can be removed.

On the other hand, it is hard to deny that many questions concerning what is in some cases a precarious situation and the development of the Community remain unanswered.

It is clear that, in the absence of a strong Community approach, the Member States will be increasingly inclined to take action individually at national level. The more national measures taken, the more difficult will it become to establish Community rules of conduct. This leads me to comment on the situation on the Community.

*

* *

Mr President, recent months have shown that some progress can always be made. The essential problem, however, is whether the results obtained correspond to the needs of the hour and on this point I cannot conceal my anxiety.

It is true that the Community's past record has been extremely good. However, I am concerned about projects that have been started but never finished and in very many areas the Community has adopted rather a dilettante approach. With the developing countries the Community has entered into a novel kind of relationship in signing the Convention of Lomé. This arrangement is of only limited scope and covers essentially economic and financial cooperation. One cannot at this stage talk of a global perception of the problems of the Third World even if at the Versailles Summit a step forward has been taken with the opening of global negotiations under the auspices of the United Nations. We have put together a common agricultural policy guaranteeing freedom of movement and based on Community preference and financial solidarity. We have not however succeeded in adapting its operation to the new situation, characterized by economic crisis,

which would presuppose a tighter control over the costs which it engenders. We have created a common market but we have still to establish a genuinely unified internal market. In those areas where the Treaties have not spelt out commitments in such precise terms the Community has time and again produced long-term plans and set the course to steer by.

What is the position at the present time with the plan for economic and monetary union? True, we do have the European Monetary System, which has so far weathered every storm. But of a dynamic development there is now hardly any chance. The same could be said with regard to energy problems, where, despite certain achievements, the major joint action programmes still remain on the drawing-board. A great deal is talked about a genuine industrial policy, but for all the talk little has come out of it, even if — and I have in mind the recent decisions in the iron and steel sector — the Community does now and again, in spite of everything, succeed in coming up with a package of measures which matches the gravity of the situation. For many years the development of the Community has relied essentially on voluntary action. This approach, at the outset, set its sights on some ambitious achievements. It has now come down to a policy of one step at a time.

I wonder if we should not adopt a more enterprising course. For a real recovery to take place there has to be a political will backed by a broad measure of public support. I would not wish to condemn Europe's technocrats and diplomats, but the fact remains that they are not capable of providing solutions to the problems of today. For that, Europe has to be helped to find its way again. The fundamental problem is how to give the European venture a new significance. Should we not pause and consider why the man in the street has lost interest in the Communities? The European Communities for all that affect his everyday life without, for the most part, his even being aware of it. Only as we find answers to the questions that our fellow citizens are asking themselves will we be able to recapture the spirit needed to make further progress.

In my view the problem is a threefold one.

In the first place, the Communities must deal with the problems which concern each one of us. You may be sure that the farm worker is fully aware of the importance to him of the decisions of the Council of Agriculture Ministers on prices. Perhaps the steelworker also is aware that, last week, the Iron and Steel Council extended for a period of one year the state of manifest crisis which has helped to prevent a slump in prices. The bulk of the decisions affecting our everyday lives pass unnoticed. Nearly all one hears about Europe has to do with crises and rivalry between the Member States.

This brings me to the second point, that is to say the growing misgivings about the European Communities.

Tindemans

I am struck by the disenchantment, but also by the deep scepticism which many people have about everything to do with Europe. It was pointed out that at Versailles the Community was treated as a poor relation, whereas in contrast, at the last Western Summit, the influence of the Ten made itself felt perhaps unusually strongly in key areas like the present economic crisis, monetary policy, trade and the North-South dialogue. Europeans will never believe in Europe unless it is able to assert itself and play a decisive role. The problem is one of will and not solely or primarily of the way our institutions operate. I firmly believe in the need to apply the rules laid down in the Treaties. I am equally firmly convinced of the need for a better dialogue between the institutions. However, this will not be enough unless we also have the will to work together towards common objectives.

After all, Europe cannot stay confined within its own limited domain. At a time like this Europe cannot remain a Europe of the 1%. It must be able to come to grips with all those problems which can be resolved more effectively at European level than at national level, given that we are dealing with matters of major importance for all our fellow countrymen.

(Applause)

It is necessary therefore to get public opinion back on our side. I, for my part, am persuaded that the forthcoming direct elections will, in this respect, constitute both a formidable challenge and also a unique opportunity. It would be extremely serious for the future of the European venture if the next elections should result in the disenchantment of the people. Whereas, in point of fact, the intended aim was to generate a renewed enthusiasm that would succeed in overcoming the resistance traditionally met with at national level.

Secondly, careful consideration must be given to the objectives we wish to work for together. I have no faith in the formula of a Europe à la carte. Such substitutions do no more than give an illusion of progress because they do not ensure the necessary cohesion and will never be seen as a tangible political reality capable of satisfying the aspirations of the people. We cannot continue wanting and at one and the same time seeking to dismantle the common agricultural policy; expressing our attachment to the idea of own resources while allowing exceptions to multiply to the point where they become the rule. Neither can we continue to affirm the need for monetary, industrial and energy solidarity without translating this into action. We cannot continue to discuss the problems of unemployment without putting our conclusions into practice. We need, in fact, to recreate the legal community as it was envisaged by the pioneers of Europe.

The institutional framework and ground rules are vital to the smooth functioning of the Community. This is not to deny that a pragmatic approach is often neces-

sary. Compromises have to be struck to enable the most difficult obstacles to be overcome and more often than not diplomacy has to be given preference over confrontation. A legal community nevertheless remains an essential element and observance of the rules is still a necessary condition for guaranteeing smooth functioning. Let us not forget that these principles are at the very basis of our democratic society.

Mr President, I hope that this presidency will prove to have succeeded in improving relations between Parliament and Council in the highly complex area of the budget. I cannot understand why we should always have this conflict when it comes to the exercise of budgetary powers. As you probably know, the dialogue which has been established on this subject between the President of Parliament, the President of the Commission and myself has resulted in a draft agreement being drawn up. Apart from the adjustments it provides for in the classification of expenditure, I think it should be possible to ensure that the budgetary procedure will proceed more smoothly and tie in better with the legislative process. It also gives Parliament greater powers to take political initiatives. I, for my part, shall do all I can to persuade my colleagues to accept it at the next meeting of the Council. I hope that Parliament will seize this opportunity to push our Community forward.

I honestly think the draft agreement is a balanced one. It will not work in favour of any one institution at the expense of the others, but it will benefit the Communities, which at present expend their energies in internal wrangles when they should be devoting them to dealing with the crisis and furthering the process of integration.

Besides, the best remedy lies precisely in accelerating and improving the process of European integration. I appreciate the fact that this is a difficult task and the economic crisis will only aggravate the problems unless we are prepared to embark resolutely on a process of enlargement, consolidation and completion. After all, the Member States must know what they want.

I should like, last of all, to express my satisfaction with the numerous contacts I have had with Parliament as President of the Council. They have always been particularly agreeable, instructive and fruitful. I say this also on behalf of my colleagues, ministers and Council Presidents who have been impressed by the dialogue they have been able to hold with you in the various parliamentary committees. I welcome this kind of constructive cooperation, despite one or two problems of an institutional nature. My confidence in this Assembly remains unshaken. My experience as a member of this Parliament and now as President of the Council strengthens my conviction that this Parliament is vital for anyone who believes in the unification of Europe and works actively in its service.

Tindemans

The difficulties of the present situation, some people's lack of judgment and the discouragement of others are not enough to quell the spirit of those who have made European integration their political ideal.

Jean Monnet said it all: 'There is no other solution for our countries and for our future'. Let those who understand and accept this point of view persevere and not allow themselves to be diverted from this goal, nor dissuaded from pursuing it by negative and outdated attitudes. Parliament must and can point the way to a Europe which, confident in its own identity, seeks to live in peace and understanding with its partners.

(Applause)

President. — Mr President-in-Office of the Council, it is not my role to intervene in the debate. However, since the Belgian presidency is now drawing to a close, I should like to say just a few words.

As you have already pointed out, the last few months have seen intensive consultations between the Presidents of the three institutions aimed at reaching agreement on the budget conflict which broke out last year and at devising guidelines and Community rules to avoid such conflicts in the future. I think that the Belgian presidency and you in particular, Mr President, deserve a special thanks for your efforts to find new procedures — and these we have found — to give genuine content to the dialogue between the Council and Parliament. I hope your reward will be that, before the end of the Belgian presidency, we shall have reached an agreement between the 'two arms' of the budget authority.

(Applause)

I call the Commission.

Mr Ortoli, Vice-President of the Commission. — *(FR)* Mr President, before proceeding to tell you about the adjustment in exchange rates which took place last Saturday, I wanted to pass on Mr Thorn's apologies for his absence here this morning. He has been detained in Luxembourg by an important Council meeting on fisheries policy, but he will be here this afternoon to discuss the broader aspects of Community integration that have come up in your various debates.

Mr President, on 12 June 1982 the monetary authorities of the countries of the Community decided by mutual agreement to go ahead with a realignment of parities within the European Monetary System. The success of the operation, which took place without long meetings and under satisfactory technical conditions, can be put down to certain supporting policies announced by the governments concerned which are designed to bring about closer convergence.

Four currencies have had their bilateral central rates changed. The mark and the guilder have been revalued by 4.25% in relation to the Belgian franc, the Luxembourg franc, the Danish krone and the Irish punt, whereas the French franc and the Italian lira have been devalued respectively by 5.75% and 2.75% in relation to the same currencies. The previous bilateral central rates between the Belgian and Luxembourg franc and the Irish punt have not been affected by the realignment of 12 June.

The greatest bilateral movement has occurred between the French franc and the German mark, the rate of exchange between these two currencies having been altered by around 10%. The decision to realign was based primarily on the fact that divergent trends had been detected in regard to prices and competitiveness, principally between France and Germany, and also on the contrasting trends as regards the balance of payments on current account in the two countries, this phenomenon being particularly marked where their bilateral trade is concerned.

The difficulties arising from these factors have been amplified by the fact that the French economy is out of step with the economies of its partners and also by international monetary instability. The guilder has followed the mark in being revalued. This decision is explained by the similarity in the trends observed in the Netherlands and in Germany in relation to prices and balance of payments, and also by the particularly close trade relations the two countries have with each other. The realignment of the lira, on the other hand, was decided upon in order to limit the rise in value of this currency against the French franc. The changes in the bilateral central rates are necessarily accompanied by a change in the central rates expressed in ECU for all the currencies in the basket. Furthermore, the new ECU parities in the various European currencies will necessitate adjustment of monetary compensatory amounts in order to preserve the unity of the agricultural market. In anticipation of this, all advance-fixing has been suspended for those countries whose parity changes are fairly significant, namely France, Germany, the Netherlands and Italy.

In order to ensure the success of the realignment it is absolutely vital to have supporting policies, and in this connection the following points are worth underlining: In France, the government's supporting policy covers essentially three areas: strict control of growth, the money supply and credit containment, a temporary freeze on prices and incomes with certain exceptions with regard to the SMIC, on the one hand, and energy on the other, especially since certain farm prices are also excluded from the freeze; keeping down the budget deficit in 1982 and 1983 to 3% of the GDP, or about 120 000 million francs in 1983, with the welfare budget being brought into balance and unemployment insurance back into balance, while maintaining public investment at existing levels.

Ortoli

Where Italy is concerned, ministers were satisfied that the adjustment of the Italian lira fits in well with the programme for restoring public finances and for reviving the economy as a whole which the Italian government is proposing to implement and which will be looked at in great detail over the next few days. We are, in other words, actively engaged in mapping out such a programme and you will understand that I obviously cannot comment on that which has yet to be decided.

In Germany and the Netherlands realignment could, hopefully, contribute to a further cut in interest rates, thereby underpinning the renewed economic growth which they are experiencing at present. Such a development would certainly stimulate domestic demand, which would have a favourable effect on the balance of payments situation of Germany's European partners.

The realignment of 12 June enables us boldly to reaffirm certain facts or objectives relative to European economic and monetary policy. Above all, economic and monetary solidarity between the countries of the Community has been firmly re-established. Adjustments have been made by common accord and in a spirit of cooperation so as to avoid having to alter the central rate beyond what is required by the underlying factors and to shield the Member States from the vicious circle of devaluation and inflation.

Secondly, the governments of the Member States have proved their loyalty to the European Monetary System and their will to regard it as an anchor, a point of reference, in the definition and conduct of their economic policies.

Finally, and this is the major lesson, the realignment of 12 June has demonstrated that the governments are convinced of the need to work towards closer convergence between the economic policies and performance of the Member States, essential for the smooth operation of the monetary system, and without which one of its *raison d'être* and a condition of its success could possibly be lost.

That is the main conclusion I should like to draw. As we have pointed out time and again — and when I say 'we', I mean Parliament and the Commission — the European Monetary System is not simply an exchange agreement, any imperfections in which can be easily corrected by successive realignments, having as its aim the establishment of an area of economic and monetary stability. Guaranteeing the development of a single market, it presupposes convergence of economic performance, on the basis of jointly-agreed policies. The Commission and Parliament have been pressing this point unremittingly and have called on the Member States to recognize this need for convergence and to implement the measures necessary to achieve it. Similarly, we have been calling all along for some kind of formal cooperation in the monetary area with our

major partners, the United States and Japan. The conditions of the recent realignment and the drafting at Versailles of an outline proposal for some form of international monetary cooperation are proof of the correctness of our analysis and show that it is now coming to be accepted. All this tends to confirm our resolve to pursue the course we have adopted with a view to strengthening the European Monetary System, and thereby the economy of the Community.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Israël.

Mr Israël, rapporteur. — *(FR)* Mr President, I should like first of all to thank Mr Van Miert and Mr Glinne, Chairman of the Socialist Group, who, in taking the initiative of tabling a motion for a resolution on Afghanistan, have helped to awaken this House to an extremely serious matter that is preying on all our minds. The armed invasion by the Soviet Union of Afghanistan is indeed a very serious matter. This is the first time since the Second World War that the USSR has stepped beyond its frontiers — or, to be more precise, beyond the frontiers of the Warsaw Pact. This is not a case of indirect intervention but of naked aggression, the Soviet flag flying at the head of the column so to speak. The question is, is this intervention, is this occupation going to last? There are good reasons for thinking that it will last for a long time, because at present it is not costing the Soviet Union very much. It is what I might call a cheap occupation. It is an occupation which has no foundation in law and which creates no real stir within the international community, only very transiently. In short, the West is growing used to this war, is getting accustomed to this occupation. And yet, not only is there a guerrilla-type war going on there, but we are also receiving detailed and consistent reports of chemical weapons being used in Afghanistan. This is the first time that the international community has unanimously condemned this occupation. The UN and the whole of the Third World have passed a resolution condemning this occupation. The same goes for the Islamic Conference, the countries belonging to ASEAN and indeed the European Community. In other words, for the first time the Soviet Union finds itself universally condemned. The resolution before you, which I am presenting on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee, is based essentially on one event. We had no wish to put before you a purely conscience-salving resolution. We wanted our resolution to have some political force and the first step we are proposing to the House is the recognition of Afghan resistance as a popular movement for national liberation, as a legitimate movement for national liberation. The difficulties that your rapporteur had to face up to are numerous. Afghan resistance may have the appearance of being fragmented and uncoordinated, and yet your rapporteur was able to meet in Europe, and unfortunately only in Europe, a

Israël

number of Afghan resistance fighters grouped around two major movements. The first is the Islamic Alliance of Afghan Fighters, which has an Islamic and fundamentalist outlook on things.

Incidentally, it is worth bearing in mind that when Afghans tell you they are fundamentalists and Islamic, it does not mean they are reactionaries. It is just their way of expressing their nationalism and their nationality.

The second movement it was my privilege to encounter is the Unified National Front, which is a completely secular modernist movement and is altogether quite acceptable.

What has come out of these contacts with the leaders of the Afghan resistance? The first thing to come out is that the people I spoke with are resolved never to resort to international terrorism as a way of publicizing their struggle for liberation. This is an extremely important fact. Secondly, they are determined that human rights, and in particular the rights of prisoners of war, should be regarded as absolutely sacred. You will no doubt have noted, with interest and satisfaction, that three Soviet prisoners of war who found their way into the hands of Afghan resistance fighters have been handed over the International Red Cross and these three prisoners have been interned on neutral territory in Switzerland. This marks a significant change for the good by comparison with the Second World War. I had to emphasize this point to back up my opinion that Afghan resistance has at the moment a real credibility, a fact that needs to be recognized.

The other measure proposed in this motion for a resolution, Mr President, is the scaling down of our diplomatic relations with the Kabul regime to a minimum level. It is not right that in the European Community today we should have ambassadors officially representing the Kabul regime when everyone knows that these people do not represent anything, or at any rate they do not represent the people in Afghanistan.

The political consequences of this occupation of Afghanistan have been somewhat underestimated by the West. We are at present in an extremely serious situation. How can we conduct with confidence our relations, our negotiations on European security, knowing that the USSR is pursuing a policy of armed aggression in Asia. These negotiations must go on, that goes without saying. World peace is at stake. But everything has been made more difficult and the West has become much more wary since the occupation of Afghanistan. At any rate, and this point is made in the Political Affairs Committee's resolution, there can be no Helsinki-type accord that would sanction the occupation of Afghanistan in exchange for I know not what other advantage. There are certain retaliatory measures that the West could take, such as cutting back on new technology supplied to the USSR so long as Afghanistan remains under occupation. We natur-

ally must try — and this is exactly what the resolution is proposing — to bring about some sort of agreement on the basis of a commitment to non-interference in Afghanistan. Soviet withdrawal, freedom for the Afghan people to express their will, these two conditions we must insist on. But, in any event, the European Community must continue and step up its aid to Afghan refugees. Much depends on Pakistan, which has shown such courage in taking in close on three million Afghan refugees. The State of Pakistan has a policy which we have to try to understand, but never losing sight of the fact that in the eyes of the European Community human rights are a vital concern. Pakistan has taken the initiative of convening in Geneva, this very day, or this week at least, a tripartite conference which brings together representatives of the regime in Kabul, Iran and Pakistan. I have no idea what will come out of this conference, which has been organized on the initiative of the United Nations. All I know is that it seems to be giving priority to the solution of the refugee problem. Now, I do not see how this problem can be resolved, that is to say how the refugees can return to their country, unless the Soviet troops withdraw from Afghanistan.

To conclude, Mr President, I want to say that the resolution which the Political Affairs Committee is laying before Parliament is not content simply to deplore the situation in Afghanistan and to make an emotional protest. It proposes a concrete political act, the recognition of Afghan resistance, an act of justice, the reduction in the level of diplomatic relations with Kabul, and emphasizes the effect of this situation on East-West relations. None can remain indifferent to the fate of a mountain people fighting with their bare hands against a blind and inhuman war machine served by imperialists.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Haagerup.

Mr Haagerup, rapporteur. — *(DA)* Mr President, I will not subject Parliament to a long historical exposé of this affair. It is deplorable from any point of view. The government of Pakistan has refused to meet a delegation from Parliament which was to collect information on the Afghan refugees in Pakistan, for the unacceptable reason that one of the members of the delegation — its chairman, moreover — is our Member, Mr Israël, who has just spoken. Since this rejection, there has been an exchange of views between the Community authorities and the government of Pakistan, and I should like to express my appreciation of the prompt action of the Belgian presidency in this matter.

Regardless of the fact that we unreservedly deplore the action of the Pakistani government, we should of course very much like to see a conclusion to this

Haagerup

regrettable affair, and we have noted that the Pakistani government will not admit to having acted in a racialist manner, but regards Mr Israël's presence in Pakistan as a security risk and considers his visit to the country to be undesirable or inopportune. But, in principle, they had no objection to a visit by a delegation from Parliament.

I would simply add that it is of course Parliament itself which should decide on the composition of its delegation and that on the basis of this position of principle and of rejection of any form of discrimination, I ask Parliament unanimously to adopt this short resolution in the hope of and in pursuit of a satisfactory conclusion to this affair. This can only happen, Mr President, if Mr Israël is appointed or accepted as a matter of course and is free, as a member and the chairman of the delegation, to make the journey to Pakistan as planned in order to accomplish his and the delegation's mission there. It is no more and no less than the principle for which Parliament stands and for which I, as acting chairman of the Political Affairs Committee and as rapporteur on this affair, ask Parliament's full support.

IN THE CHAIR: LADY ELLES

Vice-President

President. — I call the Socialist Group.

Mr Glinne. — (*FR*) Madam President, Mr President of the Council, Mr Commissioner, it is with obvious satisfaction that I am able to say that the record of the Belgian presidency has been a positive one.

Positive to the extent that a solution has finally been found to the problem of the British budget contribution and the fixing of farm prices. Positive also in that at the Versailles Summit, at which the Community was represented by the President of the Council, agreement was reached on tighter coordination of economic policies and policies to combat unemployment. Another positive aspect is the understanding reached between the Presidents of the three institutions of the EEC as regards classification of expenditure and other budget-related problems.

It is unfortunate, however, that no satisfactory solution has been found to the crucial problem of interest rates. It really is vital to have a cut in interest rates if we are to revive the economy through new job-creating investment. In this connection, the Socialist Group has occasion once again to express its dismay at the lack, above all, of positive and immediate measures to combat unemployment. What has happened to that

wonderful European social area advocated months ago by President Mitterrand?

Mr President of the Council, we were both of us in Paris at the end of last week, Friday to be exact, and we heard — and I do not believe I am doing any harm by saying this publicly, since so many people know about it already — we heard the Prime Minister Mr Mauroy arguing vigorously in favour of Community measures which would ensure that nowhere in the Community would we still have unemployed young people under the age of 18. This would be a partial and temporary solution. Why can we not do that much, at least until we are in a position to introduce other, more potent measures?

The real question we have to ask ourselves, as we see it, is whether over the past two years we have not placed too much emphasis on the fight against inflation at the expense of the crucial problem of underemployment in the Community. It is, after all, on its social and employment policies that workers and the ten million rather sceptical unemployed people are going to judge the Community. That is why we must stress the point that for the Community to achieve its necessary recovery it must first tackle this essential problem.

Let me finally say a word or two on my own behalf. In the discussions on the achievements of individual presidencies, it occasionally happens that disputes of a national character intervene somewhere in the background. Now, I have no wish at all for a Belgo-Belgian dispute on this occasion. As a European, it was a profound sense of satisfaction that I felt on learning of the position of the Belgian presidency, namely that, in the present circumstances, the Community is needed more, not less. It is very important that the Belgian presidency should have made the point that, given that there are insufficient resources to go round, there is at this moment a great temptation for each Member State to adopt the attitude of 'everyone for himself', which would be a serious mistake.

You spoke a few moments ago about 'the European of the 1%' and how derisory it was; we believe that this figure of 1% can be exceeded by combining this renewed political will with the introduction of new common policies, because in our view, to exceed the 1% figure depends entirely on a simultaneous decision on new common policies.

As I say, therefore, Mr President, for my own part — more so even than as chairman of my group — I am delighted that the Belgian presidency should have understood that and also clearly demonstrated it in large measure.

(*Applause*)

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

Mr Barbi. — (*IT*) Madam President, the Group of the European People's Party as well expresses a favourable judgment on the presidency of Mr Tindemans. It is favourable especially because of the shrewd and decided use of the majority vote: first in the case of the events in Poland, when Greece found itself in the minority, and then in the case of the economic sanctions against Argentina, when Italy and Ireland were in the minority; on the issue of agricultural prices, when the United Kingdom was in the minority, and finally concerning the measures for the steel industry, when Italy was in the minority. I, as an Italian and especially as a citizen of Naples, can feel a certain anxiety at this, but as a member of the European Parliament I feel considerable satisfaction. The Group of the European People's Party has no doubt that the principal obstacle to the normal development of the Community is precisely the paralysis resulting from the use of the unanimous vote, that is, the abuse of the so-called 'Luxembourg compromise'.

The concrete demonstration that it is possible to avoid such abuse, and therefore that the Community can proceed normally in the application of the policies already decided upon, is extremely important, even decisive. Only in this way was a correct and reasonable interpretation of the so-called 'compromise' supplied: that is, that a unanimous vote can be demanded by one of the Member States only when its vital interests are affected, but certainly not when it is a question of decisions which concern the implementation of Community policies already agreed upon in principle and in effect for several years. Moreover, we concur with the President-in-Office of the Council in considering the 'Luxembourg compromise' only as a political agreement of circumstantial utility, without any sort of legal basis: it does not constitute an amendment to the Treaty!

President Tindemans himself told us that in addition to this small progress — and I hold that the return to the majority vote is, despite its importance, only a small step forward — it is necessary to seek a more ambitious route. We fully agree with him. When we reflect upon the disappointment and dissatisfaction with which he stressed the lack of overall progress by the Community, its weaknesses, its lacks, its inability to deal with the serious problems posed by the economic crisis and principally by unemployment and inflation, we are necessarily brought to consider the need to correct and improve the institutions which govern the decisions and operative action of the Community.

It is certainly very important that an open dialogue should be instituted between the Council and Parliament within the framework of the Treaty of Rome, and that through the amplification of the system of conciliation Parliament should be increasingly associated with the Council's legislative function, with a concomitant extension of its effective powers. But how can we not be aware that today the treaty in force contains actual obstacles to Community activity?

These obstacles must be removed if the Community is to become the effective instrument of common progress for our peoples. We are faced with distortions of an essentially anti-democratic nature: among these we note especially the concentration of legislative power in the hands of the Council, which is not answerable to any political body representing the democratic power of the citizens. This distortion must be corrected if we are not to move towards a dangerous degeneration.

President Tindemans has said that in the present situation a Community anti-crisis policy is needed, and that the work of the Community, and therefore of this Parliament, will be judged on this basis at the coming European elections. He is perfectly right. But why is this Community anti-crisis policy not applied? Not because the Commission lacks the will or the ability to formulate it; not because this Parliament is not able to evaluate and support it. It is not applied because the power to decide upon it is solely and entirely in the hands of the Council, which functions as an intergovernmental body within which it is impossible to launch a Community economic policy: national interests, conceived of from an egotistic and short-sighted viewpoint, are continually in conflict.

The ministers who sit on the Council represent fragmentary positions conceived by national bureaucracies and linked to outdated and unproductive ways of thinking which nevertheless still predominate. On this basis it is erroneously believed that today's dramatic problems can be solved by purely national means and that everything supranational and Communitarian is to be regarded with suspicion. Despite the positive and fruitful results obtained during these twenty-five years, there are still those today who thought to bring about an economic recovery in their countries through the reconquest of the internal market, that is, through a return to the dreams of economic self-sufficiency which remind us Italians of the time of Mussolini. There are others who thought they could improve the workers' standard of living by applying provisions for wages, social security, and the reduction of working time without reference to the wider European context. The bitter disappointment which soon followed should serve to teach all of us that the right approach to an anti-crisis policy cannot be that of nationalistic self-containment but, on the contrary, that of enlightened, balanced, and concerted Community action.

Why are we not able to see this immediately, clearly, without making new and unsuccessful experiments in nationalistic self-sufficiency? Why are we not able to join together in the elaboration and firm implementation of such a Community anti-crisis policy? I think it is above all because we do not have a Community organ suitable for democratic decision in this area. A deliberating body which is not politically responsible is instinctively distrusted by everyone. For this reason, within this body itself — the Council — the members tend more towards the defence of their own particular

Barbi

interests than towards the discussion and deliberation of general interests. Nevertheless, particular interests are substantially dependent on the general ones: whether we will or no, the two groups form an integrated whole.

The need for European unity has also been evident in relation to the recent monetary events. In spite of the far-seeing and courageous decisions made in Bremen, the Council, ignoring the political pressures exerted by this Parliament, did practically nothing to bring about the vital convergence of our economies, nor was it able — or willing — to carry out the last steps planned for the implementation and revitalization of the European Monetary System. President Tindemans is right: what is left of the plan for economic and monetary unification?

As a result, the absence of a common European policy towards the dollar has made it necessary to make no fewer than six readjustments of the parities within the EMS over the last three years. How can this system be successfully developed if there is no unified leadership for Community economic policy, if there is no Community control or Parliamentary supervision? Even the question of economic collaboration between the free countries of Western Europe and those of the Soviet bloc cannot be favourably resolved if there is no unified leadership for European economic policy.

How can one fail to see that in the present dispersion of our interests in nationalism and particularism the Soviet Union is able to play our various countries off one against the other, and then all the countries together against the United States? How can one fail to see that a Europe with united leadership would have a far different contractual capability and an increased freedom of action in relation to both our North American ally and our Eastern economic partners? Furthermore, the worsening of the international situation, the continual rumblings from the Middle Eastern powder keg and even the regrettable Falkland Island affair make a closer European understanding urgently necessary, especially in the area of foreign policy. European solidarity with the United Kingdom would have been of quite another sort if the preceding phases of the South Atlantic affair, which has been going on for at least seventeen years, had been under Community guidance and management.

Immediately after the last war it seemed natural to the founding fathers of the European Community that the forces of the free and democratic nations should be joined in a supra-national policy in response to the threat of Soviet expansionism. Later the relaxing of tensions which followed the death of Stalin seemed to make this process of unification unnecessary, or at least possible to postpone. Now, the present threats of war and the enormous economic difficulties besetting us should make us realize that this decisive step towards unity — decisive for the security, the free-

dom, and the well-being of each of us and of all our peoples — is indispensable and extremely urgent.

Technocratic and diplomatic Europe — President Tindemans has said — is unable to provide an adequate response to the current problems. We fully agree: we need political Europe, a Europe capable of making decisions, of asserting itself. In it, and in it alone, will Europeans believe!

(Applause)

President. — I call the European Democratic Group.

Mr Fergusson. — Madam President, in the course of today's debate my colleagues will be dealing with the details of the Belgian presidency, the extent to which the machinery of the Community has been overhauled and adapted — or not — to meet the problems ahead or the problems already overwhelming us. They will present our views on the mandate, on the matter of decision making, on the Versailles Summit, and on the supreme need at this time of unemployment for the Community at last to get its economic game together.

For myself, and because of last night's news, I wish to concentrate on the events in the South Atlantic. These events, all of them of historical importance, have marked the tenure in office of a president who has unflinchingly and with our deep admiration and gratitude endeavoured to pull the Community out of the mud in which it has long been stuck while pursuing, for example towards the Lomé States, policies nonetheless of very great substance. The events in the South Atlantic have undoubtedly preoccupied UK minds almost exclusively for ten weeks and contributed to the frictions between the Community partners in May. And, as Members will understand, to the edginess of my country in the Community's dealings. We do hope that this month, when the Foreign Ministers meet again to discuss political progress, the dissatisfaction, about whose infectiousness Mr Tindemans very rightly warned, will subside. Fulfilment of the mandate remains as urgent today as it was in 1980.

Now the Falklands war has produced new thinking about the security of Europe and the West and awakened us to broader dangers than the Soviet threat. The Falklands war, both in its origin and prosecution and probable consequences, has contrasted signally with the parallel dangers to peace of the wars in other parts of the Middle East, in Afghanistan — about which Mr Israël has spoken — in the Gulf and in the Lebanon. All of which make our own peace initiative of 18 months ago look sadder than ever.

As to the Falklands, it was in this case an associated territory of the Community that was invaded. Last April the Community immediately closed its ranks behind the United Kingdom. The solidarity from that

Fergusson

date to this, not least in this Parliament, and the determination, shown by almost every one of our partners and allies, that military aggression must be resolutely resisted marked, I think, a new benchmark of political cooperation which will stand the Community in good stead again. Whoever harms one of us harms us all and will have to answer to us all. We shall never know what peace, what resistance to future aggression, this action has bought for the world. It is easier to speculate what weakness might have led to.

Now the battle of Port Stanley is clearly over. But peace is not yet sure. No doubt my country and its government, and especially its Prime Minister, will immediately be given a great deal of very friendly advice by very many people whose forces' blood has not been spilled and whose relations, national territory, interests and honour were not involved in a peculiarly unpleasant, uncomfortable and, at times, tragic military episode. I am sure that that advice will be noted, and it will be noted by a country fully aware of the driving need to restore Europe's good relations with Latin America and fully aware that the Falkland Islanders will need long-term security which does not depend everlastingly on a huge military garrison designed to inhibit a new war between two peoples who have always been friends.

Both these peoples are still in a state of shock, tinged, I suppose, with euphoria, relief and some pride on one side and with injured self-esteem, grief and anger on the other. Is the Argentinian junta really going to carry on the war from the mainland? Will the Argentinian people allow a regime to survive which so miscalculated the outcome and so consistently misled them as to the true course of that military disaster? We must wait and see. No one today is in any condition to be rushed into new negotiations. Tempers must cool.

What I think we all know now is that at no point in the last ten weeks was the junta genuinely prepared to negotiate, except on the basis of the transfer of the Falklands to Argentine sovereignty. No one here can now believe that the junta which sent battalions of teenage soldiers into war alongside its other troops, which imprisoned the islanders and violated their property, would have obeyed Resolution 502, except, as now, at the point of a gun. It is up to the Community to help us today to ensure that the battle does not break out again, not with advice about magnanimity — we can handle that ourselves — but with continued support for the cause of freedom and of peaceful settlement. It is up to the Community and up to Spain, as it prepares to join us, to help repair the broken trust and strained relations that come between us and South America.

As for those who still entertain some doubt about whom the Falklands belong to — a matter that has not really been discussed here — let them persuade Argentina to take the matter to the International Court or to

some forum where it belongs. This course of action has always been open to her.

In conclusion I would ask the Commission and the Presidency what steps are now proposed to enhance or modify the successful measures that have so far been so admirably provided by the Community. I would also ask the retiring President-in-Office what steps he will commend to his own successor with a view to turning today's ceasefire and the repatriation of Argentina's forces into a lasting peace for tomorrow.

President. — I call the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Bonaccini. — *(IT)* Mr President-in-Office of the Council, Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, it can certainly not be said that the popularity and prestige of the Community have increased during the last six months. Quite the contrary! We note this also on the solemn occasion of the celebration of the 25th anniversary of the Treaties of Rome. Headlines and articles of various political leanings discussing the impotence or even the impending dissolution of the Community have become very frequent.

Mr Tindemans cannot be angry with the journalists alone; he himself, in speaking to us here, chose to say more about what must be done in the future than about what has been done in the past six months.

Everything is contributing towards the tarnishing of the European image, and this justifies the disaffection and scepticism to which the President of the Council referred. The tendency on the part of some Member States to provide a doubtless illusory solution to the serious problems of the moment must be considered as both cause and effect of the 'blockage' now experienced by the Community.

During the last six months as well there has been no departure from this logic. We certainly do not intend to make a personal issue of this with President Tindemans, but this is a matter which links an entire series of presidencies of the Council of Ministers; in fact, by coming last the Belgian experience inevitably felt the effects of a negative accumulation of events, beginning with the process of improvement and development of Union and the relationship among the Institutions.

The rumors issuing from the debate of the so-called 'Genscher-Colombo Act' are alarming, and they conflict with the work of the institutional committee in advancing reductive interpretations of an Act which we already criticized for its inadequacy. This work of reduction and regression is allowed to proceed, and up to now no authoritative political will has opposed it.

We considered the practice, initiated by Lord Carrington, of meeting with the parliamentary Bureau as positive and promising; we are obliged to note, however,

Bonaccini

that it was not followed up over the six months in question. Concerning the budgetary issues on which President Tindemans spoke at length, we consider them improper from a legislative viewpoint; they constitute a usurpation of the rights and expectations of the European Parliament.

At the beginning of the new Middle East initiative decided upon at the Venice summit, the coherent sequence of actions and commitments then projected was not in evidence. President Tindemans said that there was no time to carry out certain missions and investigations. Now, as he said, it is a question of opening a debate on this and other matters. Our political group will speak tomorrow; but permit me to observe today that there has been and still is a lack of any initiative able to express the great and mortal dangers which threaten Europe's southern maritime frontier and involve the destinies of a large portion of humanity.

Mr Barbi consoles himself — although he is mistaken, in my opinion — by saying that détente and coexistence are not all that necessary for the development of the European process. Historical facts and newspaper accounts tell us exactly the opposite. In any case, we firmly believe that it will be very difficult to build a political Europe if the process of détente and coexistence is not effectively resumed.

The blockage and the retrogression affecting the process of integration must be more strongly criticized. Fundamentally, the connection recognized by President Tindemans between the policy on agricultural prices and the budget has in fact been made, despite its rejection in theory. Every problem whose solution was called for in the so-called Mandate of 30 May, by virtue of a decision by the Council itself, is still to be dealt with, and perhaps no one has yet been found to do this.

The issue of agricultural prices is still alive: it has nearly caused the ruin of the common agricultural policy, since the solution found is basically inadequate and far too late in coming. It also represents a dramatic loss of prestige, even in sectors of public opinion which have long been accustomed to evaluate problems from a European standpoint.

The areas of smallest merit, where there has been the most serious loss in the European credibility so painfully built up over a quarter of a century, are without doubt the financial problem posed by the refund of the United Kingdom's contribution, the failure — and I am amazed that some of my colleagues can take a different view of this — of the Versailles Summit, a failure now openly admitted by various sectors of public opinion, and the question of the European Monetary System.

In regard to the first question, after the decision of 24 May there are ample grounds to fear that a spirit

completely opposed to a Community approach to budget problems will gain acceptance. The weakest economies should be the ones to pay. It is said — if certain information is correct — that the Commission itself is preparing to carry out an operation on the VAT. We express as of now our strong reservations about this action, for it would constitute an attack on the prerogatives of Parliament, which, in any case — and we warn both the Council and the Commission — has the right to discuss and to be heard on legislation before it is adopted.

Concerning the second question, there is nothing that can be considered really positive, either in connection with the system of external relations and the problems raised here and mentioned by President Tindemans himself, or in connection with cooperation on a broader basis, including all the countries of the industrialized West, or in connection with the monetary war and its different aspects. Various Members have already spoken of this problem, which has been discussed in Parliament several times. I will therefore refer to this topic only briefly.

The third and last question is that of the EMS. Commissioner Ortoli, whose belief in the European idea and ability in presenting his arguments I appreciate, will permit me to say that today he spoke without a great deal of conviction. Parliament was certainly not responsible for preventing the completion of the EMS. If the EMS collapses, the hopes for a stable economic and monetary union will collapse with it. In reality no work is being done either to improve the System and its stringent rules or to develop the policies for economic convergence.

The programme to extend the use of the ECU should be considered as already buried, if what has been said here is true. We hear that the President of the Bundesbank is opposed to the programme. What monstrous power is this in the hands of a man who, without being in himself either a European or a German institution, can obstruct the process of the construction of Europe? Possible ways of getting out of the EMS are also being explored. This as well is consistently denied, but we know how these things are likely to go. Meanwhile unemployment, social malaise, and the deterioration of the living conditions of the people are becoming more pronounced. President Tindemans went so far as to evoke the 30's, an epoch so dramatic in European history.

In the face of this situation the Member States and the Community show signs of obvious impotence. I must say that I agree with President Tindemans' three final observations: that is, that one cannot envisage a Europe with the 1%, and one cannot envisage a Europe *à la carte*; it is necessary to provide a positive solution to the problems of the working masses. Parliament has expressed ideas, made appeals, and proposed action in these areas. This is the problem.

Bonaccini

We ask that the great design of Europe not be allowed to die or 'bog down'. We do not resign ourselves to the notion that a Europe desired by the workers and the great masses of our continent can be miserably ended by an administration incapable of providing an adequate space for the ideals and political requirements of our continent.

(Applause from the Communist and Allies Group)

President. — I call the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Bangemann. — *(DE)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, Mr Tindemans, I find myself in a very pleasant and in fact an unusual position when I think of reports on past presidencies. I can begin by congratulating the President-in-Office of the Council without reservation and with a clear conscience on the successes he has made possible during his presidency.

I believe that must be made absolutely clear, particularly when we remember that we have not on the whole been very satisfied with past presidencies. We have been very satisfied with this Belgian president. I would almost say that we would have no objection to his retaining the presidency for another six months.

We should, however, consider the background and the reasons for this praise, and this is not intended as criticism of the future presidency, I must make that clear. Our praise is due to President Tindemans' success in leading the Council back to the path of legality, to some extent at least. In other words, we are praising him because he has managed to persuade the Council to drop an attitude that has no foundation in the Treaty and to take majority decisions on at least three or four occasions. Majority decisions are, after all, the rule laid down in the Treaty.

I should therefore like to stress once again that the Council should bear in mind that in all its votes in the past it has not acted in accordance with the Treaty but, to put it very bluntly, illegally and that any attempt to apply such a procedure in future will undoubtedly meet with greater resistance in Parliament than has been the case in the past.

This is very clear from the solution to the problem of the UK contribution. I can understand — and my group was always in favour — that we must find a fairer solution for a Member State which has obviously not been able to derive the same benefits from membership as other Member States. But this solution must also abide by the rules as they stand. The present solution is in fact an emergency solution. It is not what Parliament would like to see happening. We naturally want the United Kingdom to enjoy benefits, to which it has every right, but these things must be done within the framework of the European budget and in accordance with the rules of the policy which we ourselves establish with the Council.

This has not been the case. Once again a cash refund has been agreed. That is not the right procedure in our view. You are quite right, Mr Tindemans, to say that the diplomats and bureaucrats have not succeeded in solving Europe's political problems. You also referred to the difficulty there will be in the future in finding basic solutions to the Community's major problems. Although our best wishes accompany you for the future, we must therefore consider why this is so.

This leads me to what Mr Ortoli said. Mr Bonaccini was quite right to say that his statement today was not very convincing. But someone who is not convinced finds it hard to be convincing. I would have liked to hear Mr Ortoli saying rather more, for example, about the factors which we have all read about in the newspapers and which led to the realignment of parities between the Deutschmark and the French franc, the lira and the guilder. Is all our talk about the convergence of European policies not just a pious hope, never to be fulfilled, as long as a national government, that of your own country, Mr Ortoli, continues to pursue a policy which is completely separate from the Community's general economic policy?

Is what you see here today not in itself confirmation of what we have repeatedly said to the French Government: you cannot leave the convoy, do something completely different and expect to achieve productive results. It would perhaps have been appropriate for the Commission to make this statement even if it is a criticism of a Member State's policy.

But what is the main problem? I believe we can compare the European Community to an aircraft that is travelling down the runway at such a speed that it can no longer be brought to a halt. Someone should now be operating the controls for take-off, but everyone is afraid of flying.

The Germans are afraid of flying because they believe it will cost more than staying on the ground. The Danes are afraid of flying because they do not know whether they will have precisely the same political influence as they do on the ground. The French want to pursue their own policy. The Italians would be quite willing to take part, but they want others to solve too many of their problems. So everyone has his own problem. No one has the courage to say, let us now solve these problems *together*.

Mr Bonaccini was quite right to ask who is in fact entitled to decide on the transition to the second stage of the European Monetary System? Is it not everyone — we the Community — who has begun this good work? Ought we not to be saying to the Federal German Government and the Governor of the *Bundesbank*: what you have done is anti-European and is in fact in conflict with your own policy? Because an anti-inflationary policy cannot be pursued unless it is pursued throughout the Community. Otherwise you are bound to fail. That is the basic problem, and is why

Bangemann

I believe in one respect you are right, Mr Tindemans, when you say there is a lack of political will. But I do not think you are right to say that this is not an institutional question, but I may have misunderstood you. Political will forms only when the right conditions exist. Political will depends on political institutions. And the Liberals, the members of my group, therefore regard the debate we are having about the future institutional structure of the Community as an important precondition for the emergence of this political will.

It must come. If it does not come in the next few years, if we do not accomplish a fundamental reform of the institutional conditions underlying the political action taken by this Community, we shall lose the battle for Europe in the next few years. This is why it is so important for us to see this in context. Political will is needed, but we also need the appropriate institutions to enable this political will to emerge.

(Applause)

President. — I call the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

Mr de la Malène. — *(FR)* Madam President, Mr President of the Council, I have only ten minutes in which to talk to you about your activities over the past six months, and a very full six months they have been in every respect. We have seen the deepening of external crises, those that have been with us for a long time, but in addition we have seen the development of new and bitter conflicts. At the same time, we have had the usual internal crises, ones which, sadly, come up year after year.

These six months have been characterized by a series of important summit meetings aimed at finding solutions to both the internal and the external crises. And I use the words 'aimed' advisedly. It does not seem to me at the present moment as if we are anywhere near finding any solutions, at least as regards the external crises.

I will concentrate the remarks I wish to make on behalf of my group on the internal crises. There, I am happy to say, the achievements of the Belgian presidency have been very positive.

We have been beset by two principal crises: the fixing of farm prices and the development in the European Monetary System.

Let me deal first with the problem of farm prices. We have obtained basically a rather indifferent result; indifferent, because the divergence of our economies that we have been witnessing for some time has resulted in our giving too much to some and not enough to others. I should add that the recent devaluation is going to make this indifferent result even

worse for some farmers by removing export opportunities which the devaluation could have created.

But along with this indifferent result there is a very positive result: a serious crisis was successfully averted, and all credit for that to you, Mr President-in-Office of the Council. I am referring to what has come to be known as the 'Luxembourg compromise'.

Curiously enough, the Luxembourg compromise came about as a result of an attempted abuse of procedure. The Commission at the time was seeking to force the hand of a particular Member State of the Community over an agricultural matter. This led to a crisis, followed by the Luxembourg compromise, an abuse of procedure by the Commission.

Last spring there was another case of abuse of procedure but this time in an attempt to use the Luxembourg compromise to get a result that was irrelevant to the subject under discussion. We are grateful to you for having done the right thing and insisted on the proper procedure being followed. In the Community, on certain matters there is no veto, but there is a common sense rule, which is that, taking into account the situation in the various Member States, decisions are then taken jointly. This common sense rule must be kept if the Community is to survive. However, it is not a mandatory law that applies at all times and means, in particular, that the procedure can be abused as it was in this instance. One must not make a mockery of a common sense rule and we are deeply grateful to you for having averted a really serious crisis.

I should also like to say a few words about economic convergence and the European Monetary System. We did have grave fears for the European Monetary System. We knew very well that it was not enough on its own and that if at the same time there were significant divergences between the economies the European economic framework would collapse. Well, these divergencies did occur. We saw differentials between the rates of inflation first appear and then grow, and we did not have long to wait to see the result: monetary realignment. We are grateful to you for authorizing this operation and thus, for the moment, saving the European Monetary System. Perhaps the lesson will have been learned and we shall now see, if we are to believe the information we were given a few days ago, a much closer convergence between economic policies. If that is indeed the case, then the European Monetary System will be able to survive.

Those are the two points I wanted to make on behalf of my group.

Before I finish, I wish to return to the external crises I mentioned at the beginning. Europe is confronted with external crises which keep on developing. The threat which hangs over us, our democracies, our peace, our living standards today may not be the same threat that hung over us twenty or thirty years ago, in the early

de la Malène

days of European integration, but if it has changed it is nevertheless no less serious. We fully appreciate that our governments' room for manoeuvre is limited and we do not hold that against them: we know it is difficult for them to adopt more common measures. But they must realize, as we do, that if we wish to preserve this little island of peace, democracy and relative prosperity, then truly, for them as for us, time is running out.

President. — I call the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members.

Mr Vandemeulebroucke. — (NL) Madam President, Mr President-in-Office of the Council, ladies and gentlemen, when the Belgian presidency began, the Community was quite definitely in an impasse. Six months later, we can say that the Belgian presidency has left its mark on a number of important events. On the other hand, various problems have not been tackled. There is, for example, the absurd situation as regards the seats of the institutions. Nor has a great deal been done about introducing a uniform procedure for the 1984 elections. The Arfè report on minority languages and cultures was shelved, and nothing came of the Jumbo Council.

Parliament has already expressed its disappointment at the outcome of the Brussels summit. The Community remained powerless to do anything about the vital questions of economic revival and unemployment. The Belgian presidency did, however, succeed in finding solutions to two serious problems: the British contribution and the adjustment of farm prices, two problems which, though different, are linked. The average 10% increase in farm prices was a good result. Belgium's farmers, who had suffered serious losses because the green currency was not devalued at the same time as the Belgian franc, were well satisfied with the price adjustment. What was very important was that this adjustment was made on the basis of a majority decision. This is undeniably a step towards a more effective decision-making process in the Community. It remains to be seen, however, to what extent this decision can be regarded as historical and even as pointing the way for the future.

A satisfactory solution was also found to the problem of the British contribution. The Community can breathe again. But in fact the problem of the British contribution has merely been put back for six months. In November the crisis will occur again, twice as serious, unless a long-term solution is found and unless the European Community widens the range of its activities and pursues an integrated economic, social and regional policy once and for all.

The reaction to the Malvinas crisis was not institutionally unimportant for the Community either. Initially,

the Community imposed an embargo and took trade policy measures to achieve a foreign policy objective. This was done quickly and unanimously, but there is no denying that relations between the Community and Latin America have deteriorated as a result of this war and the embargo. It was also expected that the Third World would regard Britain's action and thus Community solidarity as a bitter North-South conflict with post-colonial undertones. The question is, furthermore, whether the Community will now be found willing to apply the same standards and to react in the same way to similar situations in the world.

This brings me, Mr President, to a few less favourable aspects of the Belgian presidency. For example, the declaration on Turkey was completely unsatisfactory considering the gravity of the repression and the obvious violation of human rights in that country. The visit did not in the end produce anything. It is also clear that the whole problem of the Kurdish minority was not discussed during Mr Tindemans' visit to President Evren.

I have even greater difficulty with the attitude towards Israel, because during his visit to Israel the President of the Council turned from the traditional policy on the Middle East by speaking appreciatively of the Camp David accord and the negotiations on Palestinian autonomy.

The Venice declaration nevertheless stated that lasting solutions could not be found in the Middle East until the Palestinians were granted the right of self-determination and the PLO was actually involved in the peace process. The events in Lebanon are tragic proof that Israel's approach was a sham.

To what extent does this change of course reflect the Council's view? The European Community must have an original foreign policy of its own if it wants to stop being looked upon as a satellite of the United States, which prefers all consultations to take place within NATO or, as recently happened, thinks it can dictate to us how far the European Community's trade relations with the Eastern Bloc countries may go. We are thus still far from having a genuine European policy, and the President-in-Office has once again emphasized how many gaps there are. All in all, the Belgian presidency has had its bright spots and its drawbacks, but it must be stressed that the bright spots have clearly dominated.

President. — I call the non-attached Members.

Mr Pasmazoglou. — Madam President, fellow Members, I want to emphasize the great importance of the achievement in the field of European Political Collaboration with which the Belgian presidency was associated in the first six months of 1982, and I also want to commend the persistence, the devotion to the Trea-

Pesmazoglou

ties, but also the imaginative and systematic way in which the President and the Prime Minister of Belgium dealt with the various matters arising during those first six months.

European political collaboration is a basic aim of the European Community. I think that by now it has become generally accepted and it means an evolution towards a common foreign policy and European solidarity in relation to security and the defence of our peoples. However, the Belgian presidency in the first six months of 1982 was also associated with certain specific events. The solidarity of the Community with Great Britain in the vital matter of the conflict with Argentina over the Falkland Isles was a categorically positive development and now, only hours after the ceasefire, I think that while recognizing the importance of this solidarity we must express our sorrow for the victims of this conflict, and also echo what was said a little while ago by our British colleague who emphasized the importance of handling the matter in a way that will underline our common desire to maintain a steady friendship and collaboration with the peoples of Latin America. It was also impressive to see the immediate reaction of the European Community in condemning Israel's incursion into the Lebanon and its expression of sympathy and solidarity with the victims of this invasion, both Palestinian and Lebanese. At this time I would like to emphasize the need for the continued involvement of the European Community in matters relating to the Middle East, to bring to an end the vicious circle of violence and to restore the faith of all the Middle Eastern peoples, both of the Palestinians and other Arab nations and of the people of Israel, in Europe's involvement and in the need to secure the preconditions for survival and progress of all the nations in the Middle East.

However, these positive achievements were associated with one serious negative experience, in which the picture presented was one of passivity, or rather I would say indifference to a critical matter that concerns the whole of the European Community. The President of the Council, Mr Tindemans, said that he had visited Turkey and referred to the possibility that democracy might be restored in that country. This is a very important matter, but it is not the only such matter. Turkey is guilty of an invasion of Cyprus, and when the position adopted by the European Community is one of condemnation for any invasion, a position which was maintained consistently over both the Falkland Isles and the Israeli invasion of the Lebanon, it is inconceivable and unacceptable for there not to be a corresponding condemnation of the invasion of Cyprus in 1974 and of the prolonged occupation of the island by the Turkish forces which are equipped with more than 200 tanks obtained from the West and supplied for the purpose of serving NATO. This attitude is unacceptable and the restoration of a position of responsible policy is vitally necessary. It is a precondition

for demonstrating the consequence and credibility of the Community in its international influence.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Moreau.

Mr Moreau. — *(FR)* Madam President, I have but a few minutes in which to talk about the realignment of the European Monetary System. Parliament should certainly have had a more extensive debate on this problem. Unfortunately, our agenda has been so arranged that only a very few of us can speak and we can cover only a few points.

The first point I should like to stress is that the recent realignment of the central rates proves, if proof were still needed, that despite the tensions and difficulties we encounter, Europeans can — but for how long? — work together with a common sense of purpose. Each individual is still able to take the necessary steps to safeguard the essential but, looking beyond the actual realignment, we have now to give careful consideration to the underlying reasons for the decisions that had to be taken. There seems to me to be no point in talking about convergence of economic policies unless we are prepared to deal with the fundamental problems with which Europe is beset; one or two speakers just now attacked some of the policies. I believe we really need to see exactly what problems we have to face. Europe, as every one of us keeps repeating, is suffering from the diseases of inflation and unemployment.

Any European strategy today must concentrate on combating these two evils which are undermining the construction of our Community as well as the bond that unites our peoples. We cannot combat one of these evils without being aware of the effects on the other and we hope that what you, Mr Commissioner, said about the German and Dutch revaluation leading to a lowering of interest rates and thus stimulating the internal economy will prove correct.

But should one not go further and call on these two countries to adopt controlled recovery measures, seeing that their external balance is in equilibrium? We are aware of the magnitude of the difficulties and we fear that the calm on the monetary front will remain precarious unless the United States, in particular, assume its responsibilities.

Everyone is convinced that, regardless of any short-term economic measures that may be taken, in the long term it would be fatal for interest rates to remain at their present level. The responsibility of the United States is today very much involved and there are one or two signs which suggest that they have decided to give a little. We still have to wait and see what decisions are to be taken and what happens before we shall

Moreau

know whether Versailles marks something of a turning point or the continuation of anarchy and the policy of 'everyone for himself'.

In conclusion, Madam President, Europe has to show proof of a genuine solidarity, but it is vital that we come to some decisions on how to proceed with the development of the European Monetary System — and I hope, for my part, that the Commission's proposals will be looked at and expanded by the Council. We must, moreover, give proof of real unity if we are to be able to deal in particular with the United States. Finally, it seems to me that the measures that have been taken under the Belgian presidency with regard to employment problems will need to be stepped up under future presidencies, for we cannot today talk simply about inflation without seeing the damage being done to our countries by the growth in unemployment. It is only to the extent that our policies are able to maintain a balance between these two poles that we shall succeed in stabilizing the European Monetary System and at the same time allow our Community to grow in strength.

(Applause)

President. — I think, before adjourning the sitting, that it would be natural for a British Vice-President to take this opportunity to express to Mr Tindemans personally great gratitude for the leadership he has shown during his presidency and the solidarity that has come out of his presidency on behalf of my country, and to say how thankful we are that it looks that, before the termination of his presidency, the conflict in which we have been engaged will have been brought to a peaceful conclusion.

(The sitting was suspended at 1.05 p.m. and resumed at 3 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR: MR KLEPSCH

Vice-President

President. — I call Mr Pearce.

Mr Pearce. — Mr President, I wish to refer to an article which appeared in a British newspaper, the *Daily Star*, on 18 May 1982. I wish it to be referred to the enlarged Bureau.

The article is derogatory and mocking of Parliament. It is entitled 'Euro-Gravy Train Takes the Strain'. It begins: 'The days of wine and roses may be numbered in exclusive canteens used by Euro MPs.' It refers to

costs, prices and losses in Parliament's restaurants and canteens and is worded in a way which is intended to convey the impression that Members and staff live a life of luxury here. It is inaccurate in a number of parts.

No Member of Parliaments is named or alluded to as being responsible for the sentiments expressed in the article.

Mr President, the by-line on this article indicating authorship is Tony Robinson. There is a Press Officer employed by the Socialist Group of this Parliament called Tony Robinson. I have been unable to discover the existence of any other regular journalist reporting on the European Community called Tony Robinson.

I call upon you, Mr President, to refer this article, of which, I understand, the President of Parliament already has a copy, to the enlarged Bureau. I call for an inquiry to be carried out as to whether the Tony Robinson who is a Press Officer for the Socialist Group wrote the article in question or had anything to do with it.

Furthermore, without prejudice to the answer to these two questions, I call upon the enlarged Bureau to lay down guidelines for staff employed by groups, and hence paid out of public funds and directly or indirectly servants of Parliament, so as to avoid them getting into any situation where they would make mock of the institution which employs them and its Members, or where they would pass judgment in their own name in public on the work of Parliament. I call upon the enlarged Bureau to lay down rules regarding any payments that might be offered by newspapers in such circumstances.

Finally, Mr President, I call upon the enlarged Bureau to report to Parliament on the conclusions which it comes to after considering these matters.

(Applause)

President. — I shall instruct the Bureau in this connection. We shall arrange for the appropriate examination when we have the text to which you refer.

I call Mr Beumer.

Mr Beumer. — *(NL)* Mr President, the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport met last week and it was asked that this item should also be placed on the agenda. It will therefore be submitted to the Committee. I just wanted you to know that.

President. — Thank you for that information, Mr Beumer, but I think we should leave things as I have just indicated.

President

The next item is the continuation of the joint debate on the report of the President-in-Office of the Council.

I call Mr Croux.

Mr Croux. — (NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Belgian Presidency has not yet ended. There is to be another important meeting, and we await an important decision on the conciliation procedure. That is what we hope at least. We also hope that some useful measures can still be taken with regard to the internal market and that progress can be made in the economic sphere and with the new industrial policy to which President Tindemans referred at the beginning of the Belgian presidency.

It can already be said that this Parliament is well pleased with the Belgian presidency. Many observers have not hesitated to say that this Belgian presidency has been of historical importance. I will not dwell on the various points that have been made. I merely want to put forward two ideas as a summary. The Belgian presidency has been important primarily because of the circumstances and the results which have been achieved in these difficult circumstances. President Tindemans gave a brief but dramatic outline: a crisis in the Community, a fresh outbreak of violence abroad, in Poland, the Falklands and Lebanon in particular. In the institutional field the Belgian presidency has achieved major results especially as regards farm prices, the British contribution, conciliation, the European Foundation, the enlargement of the Community and the renewed negotiations on this subject. In the economic sphere a new European start has been made. In the political sphere there has been cooperation with respect to the three major conflicts I have mentioned: a united reaction with a dual basis, respect for the international legal order, concern for peace and, finally, in Libreville and Versailles, new signs of a better approach to our relations with the Third World.

That is an impressive list, and now I come to my second objection, Mr President. It is a pity that the presidency has not lasted long enough to raise the objection that should now be raised. Perhaps there will be an opportunity in the next few weeks at the level of the Council, at the level of the Commission and at the level of the European Parliament. If we consider the circumstances on the one hand and the results on the other, we must once again review the internal situation on the Community and its position in the world, a world that is tortured by conflicts, war and the threat of new conflicts, a world that is also tortured by hunger and poverty, something we shall be discussing further tomorrow.

I feel this has been a very good opportunity for the Community to think about these things. Jean Monnet said that we must organize our actions and adopt a pragmatic approach, but with certain objections in

mind. We now have new objectives, which we must translate into political action, while taking account of the present situation.

President Tindemans, we very much appreciate what you have done for the European Community. We are sure that you and this Parliament will continue to deliberate, because there are fresh signs of hope.

President. — I call Mr Wurtz.

Mr Wurtz. — (FR) Mr President, Mr Tindemans this morning painted a picture of the present state of the European Community that was, to say the least, depressing. I am not surprised. The French members of the Communist and Allies Group believe in fact that presidencies may come and go, but their records, sadly, are the same: a deepening crisis, with all its attendant difficulties and sufferings for our peoples and our countries.

The period just coming to an end is no exception. Falling production, continuing high inflation and above all unemployment at well over the six million mark. How can we avoid seeing in this abysmal record proof of the fact that the policies pursued hitherto by the European Community, of which the Davignon plan is a particular example, far from helping to extricate our countries from the crisis, are plunging them ever deeper into it?

At the risk of repeating ourselves, we are bound to say again that if Europe genuinely wants to realize the ambition it claims to be pursuing, that is, to find the beginnings of a solution to the fundamental problems affecting our countries, or to put it another way, if we do not want to face the prospect in six months' time of finding ourselves in an even worse situation than the one we have today, it is necessary for the measures we shall be called upon to take jointly to be based on a radically different approach to the Community's role, in which the political and economic independence of each country is respected.

This new approach, as we French members of the Communist and Allies Group visualize it, still conforms to the Treaty of Rome. We have in mind, for example, a policy of harmonizing social welfare conditions in the Europe of Ten on the basis of the highest standards. Whether in the field of working conditions or social insurance or problems of poverty, there is broad scope for positive and constructive Community directives. The same can be said, to take another example, in regard to the use of European social funds. In our view these social funds should no longer be regarded as a sort of salve to be applied to the worst sores, opened up by the ravages of the strategy adopted by the multinationals.

One could, indeed one ought to, look upon the European social funds as socio-economic funds closely

Wurtz

linking the solution of social problems to the competitiveness of undertakings, to the development of a healthy and viable economy, and to the creation of stable jobs.

We believe that Europe can play a part in providing a positive stimulus to the gradual solution of the employment problem, so long as it combines technological progress with vocational training and a reduction in working hours without a corresponding cut in wages — as the French General Confederation of Labour is proposing to the European Trade Union Confederation itself — in order thereby to create new job opportunities.

Do you not think, Mr President of the Council, that the Community would cease to have this unfortunate image in the eyes of public opinion that you mentioned if it were to take the course we are advocating?

Clearly this original approach that we are proposing and which would constitute an important step forward along the road to this 'European social area' to which the new French Government is committed, requires, among other things, a very much firmer attitude to international constraints, in particular to the economic and monetary policy of the United States. These factors have contributed in no small measure to the need for monetary realignment within the European Monetary System.

Just to conclude — since I am being asked to wind up my speech — I should like, Mr President, to put to you two questions.

The first is: What concrete decisions does the Community propose to take to develop monetary cooperation among the Ten, in line with the undertaking given at the Versailles Summit to, and I quote, 'work towards a constructive and ordered development of the international monetary system'?

And the second is: How does the Community propose to fulfil that other undertaking at Versailles, that is, finally to open global North-South negotiations under the aegis of the United Nations on the basis of the resolution tabled by the Group of 77?

President. — I call Mr Haagerup.

Mr Haagerup. — (DA) Mr President, I should like to begin by saying that, in my Group and also in the Political Affairs Committee, we value the will to constructive cooperation shown by Council President Tindemans during the Belgian presidency. It has been all the more gratifying in view of the many serious international crises we have witnessed in recent months, in which the Community's unity and capacity for action have been put to the test. Nevertheless, we should not now simply congratulate ourselves — and I

am sure that Mr Tindemans would agree with me that we should not waste our time that way — but instead seriously consider the demands imposed on our Community by the world about us with its many dangers and threats to peace.

One of these demands is that there must be close coordination between what is decided in the framework of European political cooperation and what is decided within the framework of cooperation based on the Treaty. My Group has long stressed the need for the Community and the ten Member States to act in the face of common external dangers on the basis of a common strategy and not to allow themselves to be paralysed by institutional difficulties or political reservations at home with regard to the further development of European cooperation. Let me say this as an aside for the special attention not so much of the incumbent presidency as of the presidency to come.

We are fully aware that it is not only through institutional changes or revisions of the Treaty that the necessary basis for common action will be found, however important my Group may consider these institutional innovations to be. The basis should on the contrary be sought in the first instance in the individual Member States, and my Group regards the events of recent months — the Falklands conflict, the conflict in the Lebanon and the long-standing crises, such as the occupation of Afghanistan and oppression in Poland — as clear proof that our ten countries can only exert an influence on events by common, resolute action. There will be a greater need for such action in the time to come, and what Mr Tindemans has said here today merits putting into some relief. As Members of Parliament, we must play our part in seeking to spread the necessary understanding of this need in our own countries for, without that understanding, our Community will not be able to show itself strong enough to meet the challenges both of the present and of the future.

President. — I call Mr Romualdi.

Mr Romualdi. — (IT) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in the few minutes at my disposal it is not easy even to list the issues under discussion, stressing their importance, much less express a responsible judgment on them, as ought to be done. Is this a responsible way to deal with the vital problems of our Community? Can we seriously sum up in a few sentences the six months of the Belgian presidency, which coincided with so many economic events of immeasurable significance? There was the steel crisis and the resulting unemployment, the energy crisis, the crisis in agriculture; there was a series of manoeuvres within the EMS which some — among them Mr Ortolí, speaking for the Commission — believe will strengthen the System. Others think that such manoeuvres are on the contrary a sign of new and insuperable difficulties which will

Romualdi

make it even harder to overcome the divergencies existing among the various currencies and economies of the Community. During the Belgian presidency weighty and painful political events took place: the Falkland Islands conflict in the South Atlantic, the dramatic and tragic clashes in the Middle East and the Persian Gulf, the prolongation of the tragic situation in Poland, the occupation of Afghanistan.

Are we acting responsibly in trying to discuss all this? And — as if it were not enough — in completing our agenda with the examination of the situation illustrated in the Haagerup document or the study of the results of the Versailles Summit? What sort of discussions can give prestige to the work of our Parliament, or strengthen the interdependent relationship among the Community institutions called for by our President here this morning? What sort of discussions can respond positively to the expectations of the millions of Europeans who elected us so that we could treat their problems responsibly, attempting here to find the solutions that our individual countries are no longer able to find?

As for the Falklands, we have already said three times that it was a deplorable *coup de force* followed by a disproportionate reaction, with very serious political consequences.

As for the European Council of Brussels, we had already declared its failure last month, and if solutions were later found to break out of the impasse presented by agricultural prices and the now historic problem the British contribution, this does not mean that we have moved in the direction of stable solutions for these fundamental questions.

As for the Versailles meeting, its results were negligible, whether on the level of a common fight against inflation and recession, and thereby against unemployment, or on the issue of East-West economic relations. Interest rates have remained unchanged, and so have trade relations with the East. The difficulties in the realization of a common economic order in the industrialized nations and the role, unfortunately a minimal one, which Community Europe can play are only too clear. Someone wrote that in the competition between the United States and Europe, Japan has been the victor. We do not know if this is true, but the very fact that it has been said is already significant.

As for the Middle East, the failure of our various peace efforts and attempts at mediation can have no more dramatic and painful confirmation.

President Tindemans said that, on the level of the economy, our hopes have been shipwrecked in the whirlpool of a crisis which is no longer circumstantial but structural and endemic, from which there can be no escape without radical changes in our policies. This is the only statement that affirms, as President Tindemans rightly said, that a diplomatic Europe is no

longer enough. We need a political Europe, capable of political initiatives and willing to use the political instruments at its disposal with greater firmness and independence.

President. — I should like to welcome the members of the Belgian Provincial Government of Limburg, who are present in the Visitors' Gallery.

(Applause)

We are glad they take so much interest in our work.

I call Mr Ripa di Meana.

Mr Ripa di Meana. — *(IT)* Mr President, public opinion in our countries is justifiably anxious these days concerning the war in the Falklands, the invasion of Lebanon, and the intermittent war between Iran and Iraq; however, a forgotten war, or at least one followed without equal attention in Europe, has been going on for two and a half years in the heart of central Asia, where the Soviet Union, which invaded Afghanistan in December of 1979, is vainly trying to subdue the people of that country.

The war in Afghanistan has already caused the death of tens of thousands of soldiers and patriots, old people, women, and children; it has caused the destruction of towns and villages; it has caused famine in entire regions and, in the wake of unspeakable cruelties and privations, it has led to the forced exodus of more than three and a half million human beings, out of an entire population of about sixteen million.

If today this Parliament can discuss and make concrete decisions on solidarity, it is only because a people has fought and continues to fight, with heroic courage, against the military might of a superpower, maintaining before the world the problem of those who refuse to disappear from the stage of history.

The principal merit of the rapporteur, Mr Israël, lies in the fact that he explained, with extreme precision and a particular personal commitment, the central objective of the resolution that will be voted upon tomorrow: the political and diplomatic recognition of the Afghan resistance; a recognition prepared and justified, before the incredulous eyes of the entire world, by the battle of the patriots and the support of the entire people, who in this way have been able to keep more than threequarters of the national territory free. This point is clear and convincing in the report and in the text of the resolution.

For the Socialist Group, the promoters — as Mr Israël kindly mentioned — of this resolution, which follows the original Van Miert and Glinne proposal, this recognition is due because it has been earned by the resistance, and it is necessary for a diplomatic and po-

Ripa di Meana

litical solution. Indeed, François Mitterrand — then leader of the French Socialists — proposed it in the spring of 1980, amid widespread indifference both within the country and beyond, as an urgent necessity for the resolution of the crisis, adhering to an ideal continuity with what was done in the preceding decades, at the time of the Algerian and Vietnamese resistance.

The presence of the Afghan resistance appears as an indispensable element in the search for a way to resolve the crisis. The absence of this real force from the table in Geneva — where an initial contact is now being attempted, under the auspices of the United Nations — leads this effort to be regarded with justifiable scepticism. Without the sole authentic and legitimate representatives of the Afghan people — that is, the resistance movement — no lasting solution for Afghanistan will be found. The withdrawal of the Soviet troops and the return of Afghanistan to the ranks of the non-aligned nations must be guaranteed, first of all, by those who have resisted and still resist Soviet arms, and by those for whom a return to non-alignment is a central objective.

For its part the Socialist Group has drawn up several amendments, most of which have already been presented in the Political Affairs Committee. These amendments, without undermining the central points of the resolution — the recognition of the resistance and the increase of aid — tend to make it more succinct, eliminating the passages which are not founded on adequate international documentation — I am thinking of the use of chemical weapons in Afghanistan — or which are redundant because of the obvious relationship between cause and effect which exists between the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and the crisis of détente in the world and, therefore, also in Europe. We hope Parliament will adopt them.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Bournias.

Mr Bournias. — *(GR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Greek European parliamentarians belonging to the European People's Party have observed with satisfaction the activity of the Council of Ministers during the period of the Belgian presidency under discussion, a period marked by many difficult and unforeseen problems.

Even before we joined the European Community we were familiar with the personality and the great authority of Leo Tindemans. Indeed, during the course of his six months of service as President of the Council, he demonstrated his forcefulness and his faith in the European ideal which, realistically stated, aims to unite Europeans by closely allying their countries.

Under the Tindemans presidency the attempt to develop the EEC is continuing, as was discussed at the previous session of the European Council in London concerning the main themes, namely improving the way in which the statutes operate and developing the political collaboration from which the achievements in the economic sector stem. Unfortunately, in his speech today Mr Tindemans has expressed concern about this area and told us that the Member States are trying to act at a national and not at a Community level. Fortunately, during the period under discussion the close collaboration between the Council and the Assembly called for by the direct choice of the representatives of the EEC nations was continued.

However, the thing that above all characterizes the Belgian presidency is what I would call the revolutionary innovation in the statutory sector, concerning the determination of the prices for agricultural products in the period 1982-1983 by majority vote in spite of the 1969 Luxembourg agreements and the vigorous opposition of Great Britain. Of course, the solution found is a temporary one but the practical gain is that we have overcome a major crisis all over the world. In other words the initiative of President Tindemans, which we first saw on 26 January 1982, and by which our commercial policy towards Poland and the Soviet Union was decided by majority vote, has been repeated.

A further achievement of the presidency just lapsed was the signing, on 29 March 1982, of the agreement between the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Member States concerning the establishment of the European Foundation, which as Mr Tindemans emphasized in his speech on the occasion of celebrating the 25th anniversary of the signing of the Treaty of Rome, and as he has repeated today in our Assembly, will bring Europe closer to its citizens and will develop European solidarity.

Of course, there are detractors and I myself will not find it difficult to agree with the vigorous protest of my colleague Mr Beumer about a number of matters, chiefly about why the European Assembly was not consulted beforehand. This last fact is not to the credit of the Tindemans presidency, and the same applies in my opinion, which I made so bold as to express to him in person, to the optimism with which he regarded the situation in Turkey during his visit to Ankara, following which he invited us to support the ruling junta in spite of all that is happening in that country to the cost of individual freedom, democracy and human rights, because the military dictators and the academics surrounding them promise a return to parliamentary democracy by 1984.

You were optimistic Mr President, as I also told you on the Political Committee, when you were describing to us the results of your journey, but your optimism is inexcusable after the barbarous, and I repeat, barbarous invasion of Cyprus by the hordes of Attila, which

Bournias

has continued for almost eight years. You gave me no answer then, and I hope you will give me one now following the commendable stance of the EEC over the invasion by Israel and the invasion of the Falkland Isles.

President. — I call Mr Ephremidis.

Mr Ephremidis. — (GR) Mr President, for us the Belgian presidency has been negative from start to finish, and in all its aspects. Unfortunately, time does not allow me to refute, one by one, each and every point claimed as positive by Mr Tindemans. However, I cannot avoid mentioning that in this contrived discussion many and various matters have become mixed up together and that among these subjects we almost got as far as talking about the World Cup to divert attention from the main problems that preoccupy the peoples of the Community, the burning problems that are with us right now, so that policies might slip through which go against the interests of the people and of peace. Among all the other matters, Mr Tindemans has seen fit to refer to the barbarous invasion of the Lebanon, and with excessive self-righteousness, said that the statement by the Council of Ministers was made to condemn the invasion. But, Mr President, whereas for some days before the invasion Israel was announcing its intention to invade, Mr Tindemans was uninformed and what did he do in reply to deter the announced invasion? And what did the French president do when he visited Jerusalem a short while ago? What did the Versailles Conference achieve when this barbarous invasion erupted while it was in session? What did the NATO Conference achieve while the invasion was beginning and continuing?

*

* *

President. — I call Mrs Spaak.

Mrs Spaak. — (FR) Mr President, the Belgian presidency is coming to an end and no one will deny that it will have been a first-rate one, thanks to you, Mr Minister, and thanks also to the cooperation which has been established between the Council and the Commission. It is precisely the high standard of this presidency that reveals more clearly the inadequacy of the system and its chaotic side.

What is the record of the Belgian presidency? Positive as regards the regulation on farm prices.

The problem of the British budget contribution has been put off for six months: that is a partial success.

Little has been achieved as regards a more coherent social policy, an industrial policy or a renewed scien-

tific policy. And I cannot forbear to mention the complete absence of Council representatives at the debate on the Commission's new programme concerning equality of opportunity between men and women.

Mr Minister, Europe is sick. It is suffering from a sort of general debility. Politicians at the highest level — like yourself and your colleagues — keep giving it small doses of medicine when really major surgery is called for.

Is it not high time, in other words, that we moved on from *proceedings* to *procedures*?

Do you think, for instance, that this diplomatic exercise of starting every six months with a tour of the capitals is pointless? This feast of fine words, courteous welcomes and declarations of good intentions does nothing to mask Europe's lack of political weight. Your visit to Israel is a distressing example of what I mean.

It is said that, in contrast to the United States which forms a unit without complexity, Europe is a complex without unity.

It is time we found our true European dimension. The French moralist Pascal, in one of his discourses on the condition of the great, described admirably the difference between 'extrinsic greatness' and 'intrinsic greatness'.

Europe, today, exists, and as such it is heeded. Its ministers are received with interest, it holds ostentatious summits, it has acquired 'extrinsic greatness'. The day when it is consulted and its opinions are respected, when solutions it might propose are taken into consideration, the day, finally, when it has hit on a new and better way of living, on that day it will have acquired 'intrinsic greatness'.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr De Goede.

Mr De Goede. — (NL) Mr President, when the Belgian presidency began, a number of major problems still existed: the fixing of farm prices and a provisional settlement of the question of the British contribution. Both these problems, which paralysed the Community for so long, have now been settled. I should like to thank Mr Tindemans and Mr De Keersmaecker for their not insignificant efforts in this respect.

Where progress has been limited is in the question of the mandate of 30 May. The new version of the Hopper report is on today's agenda. I have already expressed my opinion on this on two previous occasions and as I have very little speaking time, I should like to say straight away that I fully endorse the rejec-

De Goede

tion of the idea of *juste retour*. After all, a purely budgetary approach does not take account of the Community's many achievements, and especially the enormous expansion of trade among the Member States. The rate at which the Commission and particularly the Council are dealing with the mandate of 30 May gives cause for concern. We have now been deliberating for about two years, and we have little to show for it. I should like to hear from the President of the Council whether he expects this matter to be settled before it is Belgium's turn to take over the presidency again. Is there a timetable which might make us feel more optimistic?

To conclude, I have two comments to make. Firstly, if we do not succeed in improving and, of course, speeding up our decision-making processes, there will be no further integration of development and what has already been achieved will be at risk. There is now some hope that the decision-making process in the Council — I am thinking now of the recent fixing of farm prices — will receive a new impulse. What is the view of the President of the Council on this? Secondly, one of the causes of the stagnation of European integration is the repeated enlargement of the Community. The decisions taken in the Council are an indication of this, since, in the short term at least, the two objectives scarcely seem compatible: on the one hand, progressive integration, particularly in the economic and monetary spheres, on the other, the equally desirable enlargement of the Community to include such countries as Spain and Portugal. The question is whether we can go on much longer without a two-speed system. I know there are major objections to this: it would weaken, perhaps even destroy the foundations of the Community. On the other hand, it would have the advantage of allowing certain countries, the stronger ones, to press ahead, rather than being held up by the weaker ones. An extremely difficult choice. This choice might be made easier if the stronger countries assumed greater responsibility for the weaker ones. But the establishment of this position will undoubtedly give rise to major problems and renewed polarities. I should also like to hear what the outgoing President of the Council feels about this.

And finally, the changes in parities. If I am not mistaken, last weekend's adjustment was the sixth since the introduction of the EMS in 1976. Furthermore, the time elapsing between adjustments is becoming shorter and shorter, which is a bad sign. The convergence of the various economies requires urgent agreements on balance-of-payments positions, government financing deficits and rates of inflation. Such balance can be achieved if the economic policies of the Member States have something like the same premises, objectives and instruments. We are still far removed from that, as regards inflation rates, for example. Mr President, I will conclude by expressing my satisfaction at the fact that consultations within the framework of European political cooperation have continued to

operate reasonably well in the last year. Poland, the Falklands crisis, the Middle East and Turkey — these are four examples which show that a joint position carries more weight than each of the Ten taken on its own.

President. — I call the Commission.

Mr Thorn, President of the Commission. — (FR) Mr President, allow me to begin my brief statement on the Versailles Summit of the industrialized countries with the general remark that the organization of this summit was, in every respect, outstanding. The representatives of the European Communities, be it Mr Martens, Mr Tindemans or myself, were present throughout and, whether from the point of view of protocol or speeches or discussions, we participated on an equal footing with the representatives of the invited countries. Versailles has thus confirmed the position of the Community in world affairs. I believe I owed it to you to put that on record.

As for the problems of substance, let us remind ourselves first of all of the topics that were the main object of the summit talks: technology, employment and growth. These topics were introduced by the President of the French Republic himself, who presented a very full report to the summit. It is the first time at a Western summit that a question has been broached which does not call for an immediate joint position from the partners and raises instead problems of a medium- and long-term nature.

The President of the Republic wanted to introduce this innovation and include these topics for two reasons, I think: firstly, to give a little bit of depth, of scope, to the standard items on the agenda and to place present-day problems within a time perspective; secondly, because new technology is starting to assume an importance that will eventually change the face of the world, its consequences being not only of a commercial and economic nature, but also of a cultural and structural nature. In other words, the theme of technology actually overlapped the principal topics discussed at the summit: growth and employment, North-South cooperation and trade.

Each delegation gave its initial reaction to the report presented by Mr François Mitterrand and in the light of this we decided to set up, for an indefinite period, a working party consisting of representatives of the seven governments and the European Communities whose task is to submit concrete proposals based on the objectives and guidelines jointly laid down. This working party, Mr President, will be submitting its report by 31 December of this year. The next summit, as you no doubt know, is due to be held in the United States in 1983 and will study this report.

The actual discussions were taken up by four topics: macroeconomic policy, international trade, the

Thorn

North-South Dialogue and East-West relations. I should say, in passing, that the subject of energy scarcely came up, since virtually all the participants hold similar views. If you consider the four topics I have just mentioned, you will find that they are the same ones that came up in Ottawa.

Three of them were explicitly linked throughout the whole conference, especially by the American delegation, which intended if you like to make their concessions on certain points dependent on the reaction of its partners on other topics. Needless to say, it was the question of East-West relations which presented the greatest difficulties, as everyone said it would.

Let us begin with the economic policies. The priority objective of the European Council of March 1982 essentially became the priority objective of this Council of industrialized countries. Growth and employment must be re-established, it was said at Versailles, as we for our part had already said. This objective must be attained without any relaxation at all in the fight against inflation, primarily through policies that encourage productive investment and technological progress. Mr President, that is almost word for word the main concern expressed by the last European Council. In order to revive investment it is essential — and here I quote from the communiqué — to bring down interest rates, which at present are intolerably high, and secure more stable exchange rates. That is what it says in the Versailles communiqué. In this respect I feel we made some progress at Versailles by comparison with the Ottawa Summit or, if you wish, and to use a more cautious formula, the conditions for progress to be made were fulfilled at Versailles, thanks to the monetary undertaking which was agreed and appended to the communiqué. This undertaking, Mr President, constitutes progress or, to put it more precisely because more simply, makes way for progress to be made on two counts: firstly, by the very existence of the undertaking and by virtue of the measures which must be taken quickly with a view to its actual implementation. Secondly, by virtue of its contents, which reveal that the United States has accepted, if not to change its philosophy, at least to abandon the rigidly doctrinaire policy it has followed hitherto, in particular by agreeing to the possibility, if necessary, of intervening on the foreign exchange market. For the markets and for the dealers, who, up to now, have worked on the firm basis that intervention by the federal government could be totally discounted, this is a new factor which may influence attitudes, even though we know that such intervention will take place only in exceptional circumstances.

We can now say that the Federal Reserve Board's intervention yesterday undoubtedly represents an initial application of this change in attitude. We shall in any event have an opportunity over the coming months to check on the true impact of this undertaking and on the degree to which the views of the United States and Europe have converged. You will

not have failed to observe that the undertaking imposes a special duty to cooperate which includes the European Communities and makes specific reference to the European Monetary System.

In the area of trade, we were all of us agreed in underlining that it is absolutely essential and vital to safeguard the open system of international trade and to resist protectionist pressures, so as not to repeat the tragic error committed in the 1930s which helped to turn recession into depression. In this connection, we expressed our desire to take an active part at the GATT ministerial conference, the first for almost ten years, and to make this crucial meeting a success. As regards more specific problems concerning trade, I felt obliged to point out to our partners that the success of this GATT conference would be made more certain if, between now and November, we could devote ourselves more single-mindedly to finding a solution to the following three problems: first, the problem of the worsening commercial tensions between the Community and the United States; second, the problem of the unprecedented surpluses that Japan is running up *vis-à-vis* its partners, ourselves in particular; third, the problem of the support to be given without delay to growth and to import capacity in the developing countries, which are sinking dangerously deeper and deeper into recession and debt, especially since last year.

As regards Japan, I took the liberty of telling its Prime Minister, Mr Suzuki, that the Community regarded the Japanese measures announced shortly before the summit as a significant move and an indication of his country's awareness of the need to open up its market further. I added, however, that the Community felt that these measures did not come up to the needs and expectations of the Community, which expects Japan to show political determination and adopt a package of coordinated measures corresponding more closely to the realities of the situation and, above all, to the scale of the imbalance.

As for the United States, I particularly drew President Reagan's attention to the dangers of numerous complaints being filed against European steel exporters on the basis of American legislation, as well as against our exports of farm produce within the framework of GATT, not to mention the repeated public attacks on the CAP launched by members of the American administration. I have told our American partners that such an attitude could snowball and get out of control. To my very great regret, Mr President, I cannot say that this appeal, which had the advantage of being very clear, elicited a positive response from our American counterparts. It is damaging to the credibility of these summits and to the cohesion of the Atlantic partnership that, five days after Versailles, the American Government unilaterally adopted protectionist measures against European steel exports, thus creating a serious political situation between the United States and the Community. The Community cannot accept

Thorn

either the complaints made to it regarding the conditions in which it exports to the United States, or any measure that would unjustly penalize our exports. The present attitude of the American administration does not seem to me to be consistent with the spirit of the Versailles discussions and guidelines. I should like to recall, Mr President, that the Community has embarked on a programme to restructure its steel industry which entails considerable sacrifices in terms of jobs and production capacity. The aids that are granted are intended for investment with a view to rationalizing and modernizing the production process.

They are regulated at Community level by the code on aids which ensures both their transparency and their consistency. In no way do they constitute export subsidies. The Community is ready to enter into a dialogue to overcome these difficulties but it cannot accept a *fait accompli*. It intends to present its case in accordance with the relevant procedures and before the appropriate international bodies. It will act with determination, concerned to see preserved a just balance between the rights and obligations of protagonists in international trade.

As for the East-West question, it was, as I told you earlier, the most difficult because the most complex, politically the most sensitive, the one on which divergences of views and divergences of interests stood out most sharply.

After long discussions, which took place in restricted session and also in plenary session, we finally came up with a compromise text which identifies three areas for concerted action and provides for periodic joint review of developments. This text was judged by all to be suitably moderate and balanced, suggesting as it does that our approach in relations with the USSR and the countries of Eastern Europe should remain cautious, compatible with our political and security interests, and flexible. This means no doubt that the guidelines laid down at the summit can be applied differently, depending on the specific situations of individual partners, but on the basis that such application is in keeping with the agreed formula counselling caution, sound business management and compatibility with our interests.

Finally we come to the North-South Dialogue, the last topic of discussion. Two results deserve to be highlighted because they offer the prospect of some progress in relation to the Ottawa Summit. The first concerns the global negotiations. The participants in the summit are now agreed on the conditions for the opening of global negotiations, an understanding having been reached on certain amendments proposed to the draft resolution tabled by the Group of 77. Given that the amendments are of relatively minor significance, it is to be hoped that an agreement may quickly follow. In that event, it would no longer be unreasonable to expect at least the preliminary phase of the global negotiations to begin before the end of the year.

This would after all be an important step forward because this matter has been blocked for over two years now and is liable to become a potentially explosive element in the North-South situation.

I am happy to say that the Communities, and the Commission in particular, have played an essential role in reconciling the various points of view in this area.

The second point concerns the real desire expressed by all to make progress at the annual meeting of the IMF and the World Bank with a view to improving the financing of the balance-of-payments deficits of the developing countries. This expressed desire comes at just the right time and leads one to hope that we shall see the launching of a short-term programme of assistance to the developing countries, especially the African countries.

In conclusion, if you were to ask me, Mr President, to sum up in a few words my verdict on this summit, I would not tell you that Versailles saw the emergence of a united front firmly resolved to tackle all the problems and the crisis, following the same policies and with the same sense of urgency. However, I do believe that on the three main topics on which the outline of a compromise was mapped out — economic policy, North-South Dialogue, East-West relations — we at least saw evidence at Versailles of a better mutual understanding of individual positions and a partial reconciliation between points of view or, if you prefer, a lessening of differences which could produce results in the months immediately ahead. To go any further than that would be to run the risk of misleading you, and that I refuse to do. Let us wait and see if the intentions expressed at Versailles will stand the test of time, between now and the end of the year, and then we shall have a better idea.

Mr President, allow me to say just one more thing concerning the order of business here today. I understand that the House will now be considering in open debate questions relating more specifically to the Community's internal activities. Mr Hopper's report on the response of the Commission of the European Communities to the mandate of 30 May 1980 will be considered in this context. I will therefore, if I may, come back to that in the light of what Members may have to say in that connection.

(Applause)

President. — The first part of the joint debate is closed.

The vote will take place at the next voting time.

The next item is part two of the joint debate on

— the report (Doc. 1-307/82) by Mr Hopper, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Economic and

President

Monetary Affairs, on the Commission's response to the mandate of 30 May 1980;

- the oral question with debate (Doc. 1-156/82) to the Council by Mr Beumer, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport:

Subject: European Foundation

- (a) On 29 March 1982 the Foreign Ministers of the Member States of the Community signed the Agreement establishing the European Foundation (the creation of which was originally recommended by Mr Tindemans in his report on European Union), thus implementing the agreement of principle adopted by the European Council in December 1977.
- (b) By virtue of its legal status this Foundation is an instrument of inter-governmental cooperation and as such prevents the Community institutions from exercising the powers and responsibilities laid down by the Treaties.

In the light of the provisions of the Agreement and the Final Act, the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport puts the following questions to the Council:

1. Why was the Foundation not set up by a regulation based on Article 235 of the EEC Treaty, as suggested by the Commission of the European Communities in its 1977 report to the European Council, especially when one considers the advantages of such an arrangement of the financing of the Foundation?
2. Why was the European Parliament not informed or consulted on the provisions governing this Foundation as it had requested in its resolution of 18 April 1978 (Doc. 575-77)?
3. Is it true that in order to finance the Foundation it has been agreed that the Community budget should contribute 4 million ECU, spread out over the first three years as follows:
 - 1 million for the first year, 1.5 million for the second and 1.5 million for the third?
4. As this contribution would have to be charged against non-compulsory expenditure — on which the European Parliament has the final say — is it intended that there should be a 'political agreement' between the competent Community institutions so that a presumption in favour of the renewal of the subsidy for the following years might, at least partially, guarantee the implementation of the programme, as deemed necessary by the Commission in the abovementioned report?
5. Does the Council consider that it should be the responsibility of the Commission of the European Communities to nominate the 10 Community members on the Council of the Foundation and

that Parliament, whose opinion would be binding on the Commission, should first be consulted thereupon?

6. Does the Council find it satisfactory that the links between the Foundation and the Community institutions are confined to financial control by the Court of Auditors and to the forwarding of the annual general report, for information, to the institutions of the Community? Does it not think it would be useful to provide for closer contact with the European Parliament in the form of, for example, an annual 'colloquy' between its Committee on Culture and the Council of the Foundation, along the lines of the mechanisms governing European political cooperation?
 7. As the activities of the Foundation are supposed to complement those of other institutions and bodies, how will the Council be able to ensure that there is no duplication of activities already organized by the Community (exchanges between young people, language learning, etc.) and by the Council of Europe?
 8. Does not the Council agree that there is a real danger that the European Foundation may, not only by its indirect activities but in particular by the activities it may carry out directly, ultimately have the effect of curtailing the powers hitherto acquired by the Community or preventing the extension thereof to other areas?
- the oral question with debate (Doc. 1-157/82) to the Commission, drawn up by Mr Beumer on behalf of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport:

Subject: European Foundation

- (a) On 29 March 1982 the Foreign Ministers of the Member States of the Community signed the Agreement establishing the European Foundation — recommended by Mr Tindemans in his report on European Union — thereby implementing the agreement reached in principle at the European Council of December 1977.
- (b) The European Foundation is based on an inter-governmental agreement between the Member States of the Community contrary to the European Parliament's opinion expressed in its resolution of 18 April 1978 (Doc. 575/77) calling for Article 235 of the Treaty to be taken as the legal basis.
- (c) Since the legal basis of the Foundation makes it an instrument of inter-governmental cooperation, the Community institutions are prevented from exercising the powers and responsibilities laid down in the Treaties.
- (d) According to the terms of the agreement, the Foundation's financial resources are provided primarily by a contribution from the Community, in

President

addition to which it may receive contributions from charitable, public or private bodies.

- (e) The Community is required to appoint to the Foundation's decision-making body, the Council, 10 members in addition to the 20 members designated by the Member States, while the remaining 10 members are co-opted.

In view of this:

1. What appropriations does the Commission intend to enter in its 1983 draft preliminary budget for the Foundation?
2. Does the Commission consider that the requirement on Parliament to approve the necessary funds to allow this Foundation to operate can be reconciled with the fact that it is not able to exercise political control over the Foundation's plans or programme?
3. In the Commission's view, which body should nominate the 10 members that the Community is required to appoint to the Foundation's Council and does it not consider that, while this task falls to the Commission, it should consult Parliament in advance and be bound by its opinion?
4. As the activities of the Foundation are supposed to complement those of other institutions and bodies, to what extent can the Commission as 'guardian of the Treaties' ensure that there is no duplication with the activities currently being carried out by the Community and the Council of Europe (youth exchanges, language learning, etc.)?
5. Since the Foundation may also take direct action at its own initiative, does the Commission not consider that this may prevent the Community, and the European Parliament in particular, from taking any initiatives in the field of cultural cooperation leaving this entirely in the hands of the Foundation?
6. Finally, does not the Commission consider that there is a real danger that the European Foundation may eventually become a privileged body directly empowered either to take or to propose action to the Member States, thereby curtailing the responsibilities already vested in the Community and preventing their extension to new sectors?

— the oral question with debate (Doc. 1-341/82) by Mr Møller and others, to the Commission:

Subject: Basis for decisions in the Council

In its capacity as guardian of the Treaties, will the Commission answer the following questions:

1. On what legal basis were the Community regulations on agricultural prices for 1982 and the trade sanctions against Argentina adopted?

2. In taking these decisions, has the Council complied with the provisions of the Treaty?
3. What is the Commission's attitude towards the so-called Luxembourg compromise?

I call the rapporteur.

Mr Hopper, rapporteur. — Mr President, two years ago the Council of Ministers drew up its mandate of 30 May and entrusted it to the European Commission. It is a document that has been much criticized, and rightly so. It called for the prevention of unacceptable situations but did not tell us what an unacceptable situation was. The most extraordinary aspect of this document was that it expected new policies to be introduced and all policies to be reformed in time to prevent unacceptable situations arising in the year 1982. I quote the actual document. For 1982, the Community is pledged to resolve the problem by means of structural change. Its authors took an unbelievably sanguine view of the decision-making capacity of the European Community, and one which very few in this House will share.

There has also been criticism of the European Commission for the way it executed the mandate. The Commission's response appeared on 24 June 1981, one year after the mandate was issued. The delay in publication was excusable: the Commission was awaiting the outcome of the French elections. What I find inexcusable is that this long delay was not put to good use. It surely provided an opportunity for the leisured production of well thought-out draft papers on all relevant subjects.

I support the Commission in its general approach to the mandate exercise — and would be grateful if the President of the Commission could give me a little attention, since I am addressing him through you, Mr President. The Commission interpreted the mandate as an opportunity of a badly-needed review of all the Community policies and for putting forward broad-based ideas for reform. The budgetary deficit of one Member State was the excuse and the starting-point for the exercise; but the scope of the documents prepared by the Commission went far beyond the problems of that Member State. I regret, and the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs regrets, that these documents were not sufficiently specific and that taken as a whole, in our opinion, they lacked a clear sense of direction.

I now turn to the three chapters of the mandate and shall discuss some of the priorities for each chapter as seen by the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs. The first chapter concerned non-agricultural policies. The committee believed that in the long term the answer to the problem of budgetary imbalance was the development of new Community policies and the reform of existing policies. It called for social policy to have the highest priority. It strongly supported the

Hopper

emphasis in the Commission's paper on job creation. It also called for a strengthened regional policy endowed with more resources and with much better coordination between Community and national objectives. It called for the development of a proper Community industrial strategy and the completion of the common market by, for example, removing obstacles to the provision of services. On all these questions, the committee asked for more specific proposals on which the Council would be obliged to take a position.

With regard to agriculture, the committee was divided between those who thought that reforms were required and those who thought that the policy merely required amelioration. The entire committee believed that there was a need to improve the organization of production in order to permit structural surpluses to be brought under greater control. It also believed that there was a need to eliminate disparities between more and less-favoured countries.

With regard to the budgetary chapter, the committee reiterated the views expressed on many occasions by this Parliament on the need for a new, general and permanent financial mechanism. I refer in particular to the excellent reports by Mr Lange and by Mr Pfennig on this subject. A general mechanism set up in 1976 certainly exists, but quite simply, it has not worked. The committee warned of the harmful effects of repeated annual negotiations about the deficits of one Member State.

Mr President, I regret to say that there are some Members of this House who feel that the mandate exercise is over. Indeed, there are those who question whether we should be debating it all today. If you take the narrowest possible view of the mandate exercise, that it is about the budgetary problems of one Member State, then clearly it is not over. Nothing has been decided, not even the arrangements for 1982: they may be resolved at the ministerial Council meeting next week. For 1983 and later, the arrangements are supposed to be resolved by the end of November. I hope they are.

The problems of budgetary imbalance between Member States will be much more acute next year than they have been in 1981 and 1982. In those years, the decline in real prices for agricultural products within the Community, taken with the rise in world prices, helped contain the Community's agricultural expenditure. This relieved the burden on those Member States which are net contributors to the Community budget. I am sorry to say that this situation is now reversing itself. Domestic prices in the Community will rise sharply with the new harvest, and at the same time world prices are falling sharply. In 1983, we are likely to see increasing food surpluses once again and an increase — a sharp increase — in restitution payments. Budgetary imbalance between Member States will become much more serious, and the problem will be exacerbated the following year by enlargement.

On the wider view of the mandate which has been espoused by the Commission and strongly supported by this Parliament — that is, the view that it is an opportunity for the relaunching of the Community — the exercise is most certainly not over. Indeed, in an important sense, it is only beginning. Up to now we have had a dialogue between the Commission and the Council, with an occasional doleful commentary by us in the Parliament — like a Greek chorus, if my Greek friends will forgive the metaphor — but problems of real and lasting importance have been discussed and interesting proposals for reform have been put forward.

We now reach the second phase of the mandate, the phase of implementation. It is a legislative phase; it is the phase when Parliament comes into its own. It will be up to us to examine the draft directives as they come before us, and I hope we shall see them not as isolated draft laws but as part of a cohesive whole. We should keep the idea of the mandate permanently before us. Without it, our activity will become Balkanized. We shall lose our sense of purpose and of mission.

Mr President, I accept the view that the mandate is an opportunity to relaunch the Community. If we do not seize this opportunity, it will be a very long time before another one presents itself.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Beumer.

Mr Beumer. — *(NL)* Mr President, on behalf of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport I should like to say, how happy we are that the European Foundation has at last been established, albeit with some delay, and I believe that we owe this partly to the personal efforts of the President of the Council. A few doubts and questions nevertheless come to mind. The first Tindemans report refers to the need to bring Europe closer to the people. If we compare this with the agreement and final act of 25 March, we do not find any reference to the Parliament of the people. The Commission's report of 17 November 1977 called for a working party which would consist of a cross-section of the population, scientists, trade unionists, educators and would produce an opinion. Little has been done about this either. The conclusions contained in the report say that the tasks of the foundation must be performed in such a way that the people understand the situation better and are also more closely involved.

In 1978 Parliament expressed its satisfaction at the idea of setting up a European Foundation and hoped this would be done on the basis of Article 235 so that it might be actively involved. Reference was made, for example, to the situation in the United States, where

Beumer

there is close cooperation between the Congress and independent foundations. But what do we now see? I find that this Parliament of the people has not been formally involved in the establishment of this foundation for the people. That is the reason why we have asked question after question on this subject. What a contrast with the 1978 Copenhagen declaration on democracy! But an inter-governmental basis is then chosen. Does this not conflict with the importance that was attached to the direct election of the European Parliament? And then we must ask ourselves whether the situation in Copenhagen in 1978 was not more favourable than it is now. I also find that Annex (e) to the Council's document says:

There is no mention of this in the present act, even though the Commission's working document of 8 May 1979 also said that appointments should be made after the European Parliament had been consulted. My question is therefore: how is Parliament to be involved in these appointments? The original Article 21 states that the annual report will be forwarded to the Commission and the Member States. And what does it say now? It says that it will be forwarded to the Commission for its information, and that is quite a difference. And I should also like to ask: will Parliament also be receiving this annual report like any other passive recipient? Why is this unfavourable distinction made?

A preparatory committee has also been set up. It will be listing all the institutions active in the same areas as the foundation and also examining the activities and aims of these institutions. My question is whether Parliament will also be involved in the definition of tasks. The European Parliament is also concerned with this area, and I am reminded of two recent reports, the Hahn report on the cultural heritage and the Viehoff report on illiteracy. I think I can say that our attitude as a budgetary partner will ultimately depend to a very great extent on the answer we receive to this question.

And I have also heard, not officially but through *Agence Europe*, that the details of Article 16 have been discussed. My question is: when will matters concerning the financing be submitted to Parliament for its opinion? And if provision is made for the settlement of disputes among the Member States, can the same provision not be made for disputes between, say, the Community and the foundation? I will conclude, Mr President, by saying that we support the contents and the intention, but our final opinion will, of course, depend on the answers we receive to these questions, and the principal criterion will be: what role can Parliament play in this?

President. — I call Mr Møller.

Mr Møller. — (DK) Mr President, it is no secret that there has been a fair amount of confusion in several of the Member States during the past month with regard

to the interpretation of the facility for majority voting in the Council. It is also generally known that many believed that the Luxembourg settlement was a binding agreement supplementing the Treaty of Rome, such that Council decisions now not only required majority decisions — qualified majority — but also unanimity. I do not share that view, but I can say that, up to the level of the Danish Foreign Minister, who takes over on 1 July as President of the Council, the view is held that the Luxembourg settlement was a binding agreement.

Since it was the Council which reached the decision, I must assume that it shares my view that the Luxembourg settlement does not form part of the Treaty legislation which is binding on our Community, and I should therefore like to put the following questions to the Commission, because it has a duty to ensure that the Council adheres to the legal basis of our Community: with the adoption of the farm price arrangements for 1982, did the Council adhere to the rules which are applicable to our Community, in other words was it possible by a majority vote to set aside the Luxembourg settlement? Is the view correct which has been put forward in Danish legal circles, for example, by my humble self, that the Luxembourg settlement was a political declaration of intent which says that the parties shall strive for unanimity but does not impose unanimity, so that decisions can be taken by a majority where necessary?

It is essential, in my opinion, for us to achieve complete clarification of this problem, if we are not to be bogged down in this legal debate as to the extent to which we have infringed the Treaty by the action taken in the fixing of farm prices for 1982. For this reason I felt prompted to put that question to the Commission, as the guardian of the Treaty. I hope we shall be able to get an answer from the Commission today on the lines of my own view of the matter, namely that the Council has acted within the Community's binding legislation.

President. — I call the Council.

Mr Tindemans, President-in-Office of the Council. — (NL) Mr President, with your approval I will first answer Mr Beumer's questions and then the questions put by other speakers.

Mr President, the Council would remind the House that the European Council decided at its meeting in Copenhagen on 7 and 8 April 1978 to establish the European Foundation under agreements concluded by the governments of the Member States. Consequently, the Council never received a proposal from the Commission for a regulation based on Article 235 as called for in the European Parliament's resolution and referred to by the honourable Member. There has therefore never been any question of consulting Par-

Tindemans

liament. However, the Council has published reports on current activities on several occasions in the past. Thus the President of the Council referred to these activities in the annex to the speech he made during the plenary sitting on 21 January 1982.

As a result of the signing of the convention setting up the foundation, the Council empowered the Commission to negotiate by means of an exchange of letters between the European Economic Community and the foundation as soon as the latter was actually established. The negotiating mandate given to the Commission requires the Community to appoint ten members of the foundation's board for a period of four years and to make a financial contribution of 4 million u.a. to the foundation for a period of three years. This contribution will be divided up into 1 million in the first year and 1.5 million in the second and third years. As soon as these negotiations are concluded, the Council will be requested to take a decision on the basis of Article 235 to wind up the exchange of letters. This procedure includes the consultation of the European Parliament.

It is for the Commission to propose to the Council in due course the procedure for the nomination of the members of the foundation board to be appointed by the Community. The agreement on the establishment of the foundation guarantees it complete independence in its activities. It is for the foundation board, its executive body, to ensure there is close cooperation with the European Parliament. The Council could well imagine this cooperation taking the form, for example, of annual colloquies. The foundation is completely independent in its activities, but it must ensure that they do not duplicate what is being done under the Community's programmes.

The presence on the foundation's board of persons appointed by the Community will ensure satisfactory and constant coordination of the foundation's and Community's activities. It also goes without saying that the foundation will be subject not only to the financial control of the Court of Auditors but also to the supervision of the Commission pursuant to the appropriate provisions of the Financial Regulation. Furthermore, the foundation must cooperate with other institutions and organizations, including the Council of Europe, whose activities run parallel to or have the same aims as its own activities.

President. — We shall accede to your proposal.

I call the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs.

Mr J. Moreau, Chairman of the Committee. — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I wish to use the few minutes at my disposal to draw the attention of the Assembly to the importance and implications of Mr Hopper's report.

This report has suffered a great many vicissitudes; despite last-minute difficulties we are now able to discuss its content. I wish to pay tribute, and this is no mere formality on my part, to the stubborn endeavours and hard work of the rapporteur. The text, which was almost unanimously adopted by our Committee, reaffirms the positions subscribed to by Parliament. This was of course a difficult exercise because the substance of Parliament's position like that of the Commission had already been defined following the report by Mr Giavazzi and the Commission's own text. The exercise of the mandate of 30 May gave the Community and the Commission an opportunity to make proposals relating to various areas of activity of the European Community.

I shall not dwell on the budgetary, financial and agricultural aspects of the mandate because other Members will probably do so. For my part, I wish to draw your attention to the problems which we in the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs consider essential.

The Community cannot be content to act as a kind of hospital for sectors in difficulty. In our view the Community is only of interest to the extent that it now enables the European countries to take up the great challenges of our age i.e. the challenges of technology, competitiveness, north-south relations and so on. That is the background against which the Commission's action must be judged. Europe will be of no interest to our citizens unless it meets these expectations in an effective and practical manner. Now we note — as we already pointed out this morning — that time is short. We are sometimes surprised by the Commission's proposals just as we are surprised by the Council's decisions. We must take bold action today in the area of research; in particular, everything possible must be done to facilitate the development of European companies in sectors such as micro-electronics and telecommunications.

Mr President, in agreeing to discuss this report, our Assembly wishes to give a warning to the Commission and Council because we were surprised by the way in which we have been obliged to deal with these matters and by the fragmentation of the issues placed before us. I believe that in adopting the Hopper report our Assembly will be giving the Commission and, to some extent, the Council, authority to take a number of decisions enabling us to escape from the present state of mediocrity.

(Applause)

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

Mr Giavazzi. — (IT) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, first of all I would like to join in complimenting

Giavazzi

Mr Hopper for the complex and delicate work he performed under difficult conditions.

In speaking on behalf of the Group of the European Peoples' Party I will say immediately that the group will approve the resolution, and this even though the activity connected with the carrying out of the Mandate of 30 May is being pursued in a far from satisfactory manner. It is obvious that the content of the resolution has also had an influence on this, but it is also obvious that the approval of the resolution cannot remove a deep sense of dissatisfaction with the way things are going in general.

Parliament was immediately aware of the exceptional opportunity represented by the dispatch of the Mandate, and it is a significant and politically noteworthy fact that with the two resolutions approved just a year ago at the June part-session Parliament provided the guidelines to make this opportunity what it had to be: that is, a revival of Community policies.

We all know what happened. It is our duty to acknowledge that the Commission made praiseworthy, and in some ways timely efforts of preparation, but then everything ran aground in the face of the exasperating negotiations, which allowed no provision directed at truly solving the Community's fundamental problems to be made. It is for this reason that the Group can feel only strong dissatisfaction at the inertia now existing in regard to the solution of essential problems, and especially in regard to the formulation of a coordinated, overall general policy of Community restructuring and revitalization.

This must be affirmed without diminishing the importance of certain results obtained. We willingly acknowledge the merit of these results to those who strove laboriously and intelligently to accomplish them.

The resolution we are discussing today mentions problems and needs in detail; it outlines approaches for agricultural policy, for the budget — on which Mr Pfennig will speak at greater length — for social, political, and industrial policy. It deals also with monetary policy, which has just recently received a further and distressing shock, another demonstration that the difficulties arising from the failure to carry through with the policy fully and courageously are steadily increasing. What Commissioner Ortoli told us this morning is significant in this regard. Meanwhile, however, things go on as they did at the time when the Mandate was granted; not as well, indeed if only because of the effects of world events.

It is for this reason that we wish to underline — for we cannot do more in the time allotted to us — three points in the resolution, points which concern the Member States, the Commission, and the Council.

Point 37 — in reference to the States: we solemnly appeal to them to return to the Community model and rise above particularistic interests.

Point 48 — in reference to the Commission: we ask the Commission, in the dissatisfaction resulting from the present state of the proposals, to respond to Parliament's request that it make use of the power of decision laid down for it in the Treaty to confront the Council with its political and legal responsibilities. Only if this request is acted upon — and we wish to believe it will be — will our Group be able to distinguish, in its political judgment on the inadequacy of the measures taken, the work of the Commission from that of the Council.

Point 52 — in reference to the Council: it should acknowledge the fact that the lack of decisions cannot be justified by pleading the difficulty of reaching a consensus after the Council itself, in conferring the mandate, recognized the urgent need of such a consensus.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in conclusion I cannot fail to stress two requests and a judgment. The first request is that the formulation of suggestions be immediately followed by the elaboration of operative proposals: only in this way can we measure the will that exists to bring the Community out of its present disturbing state of inertia. If this will really exists, nothing prevents it from being demonstrated in the immediate launching of those provisions which an attainable consensus already makes possible. The second request is that the role of Parliament — whose vision was correct and timely, as is borne out by the facts — be respected in this area as well. Parliament should be allowed to participate with opinions presented before, and not after, the necessary decisions are made, especially if these decisions — as is now being said — concern budget problems, like those having to do with the VAT, where Parliament functions as budgetary authority.

As for the judgment, I will say that we feel anxiety and dissatisfaction at the ever more disturbing situation of the Community, especially in the area of social economics and in the area of cohesion, and at the lack of Community action in these fields. It is for this reason that in reiterating the urgent need to correct this state of things we reserve all future decisions, subordinating them to the positive or negative result of our new initiative. It is on this basis that we will make a political evaluation of the situation and the behaviour of the Community bodies.

President. — I call the Socialist Group.

Mr Ruffolo. — (*IT*) Mr President, I wish to say at once that the motion for a resolution presented by Mr Hopper can be considered as an example of pessimism from the standpoint of reason, and of optimism from the standpoint of will.

We Socialists particularly appreciate the objectivity and the commitment shown by the rapporteur in

Ruffolo

attempting to fix a point of reference amid the great confusion of the present Community picture. He took advantage of a futile occasion — the attempt to cover up a dispute on the distribution of budget expenditures with a Community 'fig leaf' — to initiate a serious discourse. On this basis he made the correct decision to link the three themes of the Mandate — the reform of the agricultural policy, budget reform, and the introduction of new common policies — and to deal with them from a broader viewpoint: the so-called problem of convergence, or, more properly, the problem of the economic coherence of this Community, which is now going through an identity crisis. The problem has two aspects: the coordination of the economic policies and the reduction of economic disparities between the participating countries.

It is a shame that the motion for a resolution, having begun with this correct premise, does not go on to develop it fully. All three themes of the Mandate, in fact, are reasonable and credible only by virtue of the way in which the problem of convergence is approached. Few words should be necessary to emphasize this concept in the face of the new turbulence which is affecting the EMS.

I must say that I envy the optimistic complacency displayed this morning by Mr Ortoli. It is a fact that this is the sixth time that we have fastened our seat belts, so to speak, and each time we are told that the System has withstood the impact. When the EMS was established, we expressed the opinion that, in the absence of a basic understanding on political economy and centralized monetary instruments, this system of adjustable fixed exchange rates would be too 'adjustable', and therefore not very fixed. Today the frequency of the adjustments leads us to think that the system is becoming an apparatus which records and follows the divergencies instead of reducing or preventing them.

The instability of the system reflects the economic incoherence of the Community, its structures, and its policies, but the incoherence of the policies is not the result — as many seem to believe — of the irresponsibility of some and the wisdom of others; it is due rather to the diversity of economic and social structures and therefore to the degree to which the crisis can be socially and politically tolerated in each country.

This is the knot of incoherence, the knot which it is necessary to cut. In its turn, the instability which derives from this incoherence, in the form of imbalances in external payments and monetary disturbances, aggravates the crisis, because it involves restrictive policies which are constantly making economic recovery for all countries a more and more distant prospect.

The only way to break out of this vicious circle is to make the crisis more tolerable for everyone by means of concerted policies aimed in two directions: that of a vast, organic action directed at dealing radically with

the running sore of unemployment, and that of a coordination of the policies on demand, particularly the monetary policies, which would define both the objectives and the needs of development for each of the participating countries. Only on the basis of a fundamental agreement on these two questions will it be possible to build a foundation for the revitalization of the Community, the basic theme of this discussion of the Mandate. Frankly, it does not appear to me that, either on the level of the Council or on that of the Commission, this degree of political awareness has been reached.

Here I will make a concluding observation on the role to be assumed by this Parliament in such a critical phase of Community existence. The Hopper report expresses pessimism concerning both the political will of the governments and the role of the Commission. Today we heard the melancholy adieu of Mr Tindemans and his grave and sorrowful words on the seriousness of the crisis now being experienced in Europe — this 'technocratic-diplomatic' Europe, as he defined it. We must recognize once again that the presidents of the Council, for some mysterious reason, come closer to striking the right note when they leave their mandate than when they exercise it.

We, as a Parliament, should not follow this pattern. We have little time left to express our judgment on the behaviour of the other Community institutions and especially on the reform of the Community: the reform of its institutional powers and of its policies, two elements which are inextricably combined; a necessary and urgent reform if we want to overcome this paralysis of both reason and will.

This, Mr President, is the true meaning of the mandate — not the one the Commission received from the Council, but the one Parliament received from its electors.

(Applause)

President. — I call the European Democratic Group.

Mr Purvis. — Mr President, I am glad to see that Mr Ortoli is still here with us. May I just briefly refer first to the currency realignments within the EMS, since the EMS is also a vital element in the mandate and the whole future of the Community. From this group's point of view, we would again reiterate our concern lest the flexibility of the EMS becomes its predominant characteristic rather than stability. But nevertheless we are greatly encouraged that the realignment has been effected smoothly and most important, that there is a commitment, we understand, by the governments of the countries concerned to take economic measures in support of their respective adjustments.

This shows welcome signs of an effort towards convergent economic policies, both by the weaker and the

Purvis

stronger currencies. If this is in fact a new Versailles spirit then certainly it was all woth-while. This group hopes that this trend towards convergence of economic policies will be pursued and be built upon; not just following realignments but also in order to avoid the very necessity for such adjustments.

No doubt other colleagues will be quick to criticize the economic policies which cause this state of affairs, but I will be content to applaud the recognition that we all are now so intertwined economically that convergence of economic policy is not just a bureaucratic abstract to support the EMS, but a very necessary prerequisite for the European economy and the economies of all our countries if they are to meet the challenges facing them.

Although we welcome Mr Hopper's report in its overall impact and in very much of its detail, it is not everything this group would like to see. Indeed, there are certain points which would be best altered, and amendments from members of this group seek to do so. These relate to the following specific matters.

Firstly, the reform — or improvement if you prefer — of the common agricultural policy. This is indeed an essential element in, or a condition for, the development of other policies which we so earnestly desire, including an increase in own resources. We do not question the fundamental objectives or the principles of the CAP, but none of us would deny that with the improvements already made and the improvements that can still be made in its execution and its management, substantial extra funds could be obtained from within the present ceiling. When these new guidelines and management techniques are in place and we have the range of new policies justified and ready to proceed, there is no doubt that we as part of the budgetary authority could justify our competence to be entrusted with additional own resources. At the very least these advances must proceed in parallel, but we must indeed be satisfied that progress on CAP reform is far enough advanced and strongly enough assured to justify any relaxation in the own resources ceiling.

Futhermore, we must be sure that when such CAP reforms are agreed, they are in fact translated into action and not just postponed from one farm price fixing to the next.

Secondly, we accept that there are special problems for mountain, hill and Mediterranean small farmers. This and related costs will be accentuated by further enlargement to include Spain and Portugal as it has done already with Greece. We cannot just hope that this problem will go away, because it will not. It will only become more acute. The Commission should be much more precise on the implications and on what it thinks should be done because it is vital that we do not just repeat the early errors of the CAP in dealing with this particular problem.

Thirdly, paragraphs 19, 21 and 23 we find objectionable if they insinuate that the budgetary contribution problem applies to only one Member State. This is not so now, and it will not be in the future unless we achieve a general financial mechanism which will deal with the problems of any Member State which finds itself in such a position. We had very much in mind the likely situation for Portugal, but it could happen to any Member State as we introduce new Community policies. It cannot be a criterion of such new policies that their financial implications are exactly equal for every Member State. We do not espouse *juste retour* either. If there is no general mechanism to make some measure of financial adjustment, the budgetary implications will be uppermost in every national Treasury Minister's mind. We will get nowhere. Stagnation will persist and the Community will die. It is essentially a way — the only way — of unlocking the door to further Community developments. Certainly, no one wants to be continually returning to these financial haggings.

We need only a system that is fair and that is seen to be fair to all the Member States and all Community citizens. We have had temporary expedients; some have worked well, perhaps even too well, but only temporarily, others have certainly not worked at all. But now we need a permanent solution; Parliament has proposed such systems in the past, but we must be free to get on with building the European Community, not just moving the bricks around the building site.

Lastly, we also have amendments down on some of the new policies, especially transport and energy, for which I recommend support from the House. These could certainly be given more bite by the Commission.

But to conclude, the mandate will have been a useful exercise, perhaps a turning point for the Community, if it gives us all new heart to take the Community forward, if it results in a new and positive spirit and if it gives a new sense of direction and purpose to all our institutions.

President. — I would inform the House that I have received two motions for resolutions with request for an early vote, pursuant to Rule 42(5) of the Rules of Procedure:

- from Mr Beumer, on behalf of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport, to wind up the debate on the oral question on the European Foundation
- from Mr de la Malène, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, to wind up the debate on the oral question by Mr Møller and others on the basis for decisions in the Council.

The vote on these requests for an early vote will take place at the end of the debate.

President

I call Mrs Boserup.

Mrs Boserup. — (*DA*) I speak, as usual, not on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, but on my own account. I have chosen — and that may appear somewhat abrupt after all the economic verbiage — to speak on Mr Beumer's inquiry. Mr Beumer's text is very clear: he puts a question which cannot be difficult for the Commission or the Council to answer. Now I am neither the Council nor the Commission, and my party and our voters have only one way open to us, and that is to exert an influence on the Danish member of the Council, but we need a lot of time for it, I can tell you. Mr Beumer asks why a regulation based on Article 235 of the Treaty was not used. Well, that's very easy to answer: Article 235 requires unanimity in the Council, and that is impossible to achieve. The Danish government can never agree to the use of Article 235 for this purpose. It is a political reality which Mr Beumer and others must understand and learn to live with. We have said it often enough, but it still has to be driven in.

Why is Mr Beumer so dissatisfied though? The European Foundation has been brought to fruition on a very clear basis. The governments of the ten countries are inviting prominent and independent figures to work for mutual understanding between the peoples of our countries, that's marvellous! We shall all grow wiser by learning something from one another, but no good can come from dictating to people, and certainly not young people, what consequences they should draw from this learning. When all the activity being launched is to promote a greater understanding of European integration and to support efforts for the establishment of a union, it is unworthy and far removed from genuine cultural development, and it is a misuse of culture for political ends.

Back home in Denmark, when this agreement is to be approved, our party will tell our Foreign Minister that he will have no popular support when he has put his name at the end of a piece of paper which, in spite of high-sounding phrases about culture and social and human understanding, is an agreement on a propaganda machine for a union which the majority of Danes are against. This debate is exciting, but it is taking place far from here. Fortunately we shall have something to say there.

President. — I call the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Delorozoy. — (*FR*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, this morning Mr Bangemann paid tribute to the efforts of the Belgian Presidency. However, most of us share the disappointment felt by a large number of European citizens and, with Mr Hopper, I want to dwell on the shortcomings of the report drawn up by the Commission in response to the mandate of 30 May

1980 as well as the inadequacies in the guideline documents which accompany it.

In the two years which have elapsed since May 1980 we have had time to measure the scale of the difficulty in arriving at even a minimum of convergence between the policies of the Member States and to see the wide gap which separates speeches from reality. Time is too short to remind you of all the divergences, disparities, controversies, hostilities and even confrontations which have occurred in the period that now lies behind us and with which you are all familiar.

The Commission has been almost totally unable to formulate specific proposals capable of creating the new dynamic which the Community so badly needs and the Council has therefore not been in a position to take precise decisions; it is therefore not surprising that, apart from the agreements reached on agricultural prices and the provisional agreement on the British contribution to the budget, no significant progress extending beyond the short term has been made on most of the other issues.

On issues such as the strengthening of the European domestic market, the development of industrial production through the definition of Community strategies for sectors hit by the crisis and for other sectors with a real future, the improvement of the common agricultural policy which was one aspect of the mandate with particular reference to more effective budgetary management since we believe that the Commission is now putting forward new proposals for a different budgetary scale to restore the balance of the Community budget, and also on other issues such as new technological research and innovation, raw material supplies and energy resources, economic revival to counter the spread of unemployment — on all these issues the Community countries are demonstrating to the whole world their inability to adopt a common strategy or, at the very least, convergent policies capable of facing up to the crisis and bringing about the necessary restructuring.

This grave lack of unity and of a common approach is now bringing in its train the risk of an even more lasting recession throughout the European economy. It is deeply disappointing to note that at a time like this both the Commission and the Council have been unable to, as it were, change gear to respond to events.

The Commission is drawing up reports to stress the need for economic revival and for a greater investment effort which may be followed by more specific proposals for the European Council meeting at the end of the year. That meeting will conclude with a soothing communiqué or a solemn declaration on the need to adopt a new policy leading towards a genuine European union; then, sterile discussions will continue for month after month while the economic and social situation deteriorates further in the absence of any real desire by certain Member States to resolutely implement the

Delorozoy

necessary policies within the Community and in relation to the outside world.

In this context it is inadmissible for one Member State, instead of leaving the European Monetary System, to make use of it to correct the consequences of its own laxist economic, social and budgetary policies by effecting parity readjustments twice in a single year. Solidarity then appears to take the form of a rescue operation rather than that of monetary convergence.

Under these circumstances, Commissioner Ortoli, how can we consolidate the credibility of the ECU? The answer is obvious in the parity level reached by the dollar yesterday. How, under these conditions, can we move on to the new institutional phase of the EMS allowing the creation of the European Monetary Fund and the floating of loans in ECU capable of contributing to a lasting revitalization of investment which is the only possible solution today?

It has become imperative and urgently necessary for the institutions of the European Community to establish a genuine European union in which they would have the resources and the resolve to pursue a European strategy through combined action at national and Community level. We must restore the necessary capacity for further progress towards the construction of a strong and united Europe capable of meeting all the challenges and assuming its rightful role in the world of tomorrow: that is what the citizens of Europe are hoping for.

(Applause)

President. — I call the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members.

Mr Bøgh. — *(DA)* When one looks at the agenda for this afternoon, one is inclined to wonder a little at the system by which these problems have been strung together — the Mandate of 30 May and the European Foundation. I see the explanation in the third document in the bag, the question by Møller and others on the decision-making basis for the measures adopted by the Council.

I treat this as a debate, a general debate, on the course of action taken in the decision-making process for a number of questions settled in recent months. I refer to the pre-empting of the 30 May Mandate requirement of a more forceful and more effective decision-making process, which took place when the right of veto was set aside in the farm price settlement. I refer to the Community sanctions first against the Soviet Union, then against Argentina, which were put through despite Danish misgivings. I refer to the triumphant assertion of high-ranking Commission officials that a precedent has now been created for for-

eign policy action under Community auspices, so that the detour via the institutions of European political cooperation can now be avoided. And I refer to the parallel action on cultural policy under Community auspices, which has been brought about by letting the European Foundation get its money from the Community and by involving Article 235 to determine that it shall be a Community institution instead of an inter-Member State cooperation venture.

Mr President, I am well aware that these things are laughable formalities to the big powers in the European Community. But they are formalities which are there to secure the independence of the small countries amid the union mania which prevails at this time and in this Chamber. At the time when there was a majority in Denmark in favour of joining the Community, i.e. at the time of the referendum in 1972, the politicians, including Mr Møller's party, handed out precious guarantees in abundance. All this has gone. Now we have reached the stage where the legal basis for the participation of the Danish State is no longer present. It may in a way be a relief that we can talk openly of these things and that the Community is now showing its true face, that of one aspiring to big power and superpower status. We should only bear in mind that it is this sort of development which stiffens opposition among the Danish people.

President. — I call the Non-attached Members.

Mr Pשמazoglou. — Mr President, I do not believe that the general orientation of the Community's policy can lead to a successful fight against unemployment and inflation. A new strategy is needed by the Community, basically directed towards the activation and the development mainly of the developing regions and particularly the Mediterranean South. The President of the Commission, Mr Thorn, proposed certain solutions along these lines to the European Council and these solutions were also supported by the Belgian Prime Minister. I am sorry that the requisite decisions were not taken. It is necessary for an initiative of this kind to be taken up at the Community level. At the same time it is impossible for the budget to remain 'at the level of 1%' as Mr Tindemans very correctly pointed out. The need to face the problem of Great Britain's contribution, and indeed the more general problem of the Community's resources as a whole, begins with the proposals submitted last year by Parliament following the most noteworthy report presented by Mr Spinelly on behalf of the Committee on Budgets. My final comment is that control can be exercised over both the interest rates and the exchange rates. The recent reports by the 'Committee of 30' and by the Management Committee of the International Monetary Fund have proved this. However, we need to make progress towards the unification of our currency system, in other words towards the establishment of a true European Monetary Union within

Pesmazoglou

Europe, whereupon the European monetary authorities will be in a position to take effective initiatives in this direction.

IN THE CHAIR: MR GONELLA

Vice-President

President. — I call Mr Papantoniou.

Mr Papantoniou. — (GR) Mr President, Mr Hopper's proposed resolution envisages applying pressure on the Commission and the Council to achieve a final integration of the Mandate of 30 May.

As we know, the temporary agreement concerning Great Britain's contribution for this year to the Community's budget leaves open the long-term problem of the budget, while existing proposals for the reorganization of the CAP and the development of new Community policies remain outstanding.

The Hopper report contains many points with which the Greek Socialists are in agreement. Such points include the reference to promoting the convergence of the economies of the Member States and to the need to reduce economic inequalities, as central principles that must govern the implementation of the mandate. There is also condemnation for the Commission's failure to take into account the consequences of enlarging the Community, particularly in relation to problems connected with the applications of the new and future members from Southern Europe. Here, I should point out that the problems connected with Greece's adaptation have been set out in the memorandum submitted by the Greek Government concerning which the Commission has only recently adopted a position. However, some of the problems mentioned in the Greek memorandum can be met in a more general and a more simple way written within the framework of the mandate of May 30th.

We also subscribe to the distaste expressed by the resolution for the vagueness of many of the Commission's proposals relating to the reorganization of the CAP and the development of new Community policies, particularly as regards the means of financing these new policies.

We also agree with the emphasis placed on the need to reduce inequalities in agriculture within the Community, with effective protection for smallholders, support for the social and organizational policy in disadvantaged areas, particularly in mountainous and hilly regions and in areas of the Mediterranean, and the elimination of the negative attitude that exists

today concerning the policy of support for the prices of Mediterranean products by comparison with products from the north.

Finally, we agree with the reference in the resolution to the formation of a Mediterranean programme designed to benefit the Mediterranean countries that already belong to, or that are to join the Community.

However, Mr President, there are also points in the resolution concerning which the Greek Socialists have reservations.

Specifically, we believe that paragraph 4, which deals with the procedure for taking decisions, serves no purpose since the main cause of the difficulties that are hindering the implementation of the mandate is the inadequacy of the Commission's proposals and the lack of any firm political will within the Council.

The paragraph dealing with the general mechanism for financing is far too general and timid, and while it acknowledges that the new mechanism should promote the convergence of the economies, it does not refer to the essential need to introduce the principle of progressiveness in the collection of the Community's resources, which would link the size of the budget contributions to the per-capita income and the economic strength of each country.

Finally, the Greek Socialists believe that further progress in the direction of economic and monetary union is meaningless while the economic structures and performances of the Member States continue to show such large differences.

Mr President, the reservations I have expressed are important, but they do not negate our general appreciation of the fact that the proposed resolution conforms to our basic aims. For this reason, unless it becomes distorted during the voting stage we shall vote in favour of it.

President. — I call the Committee on Budgets.

Mr Pfennig, draftsman of an opinion. — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, a few weeks ago the Community had reached an extremely dangerous stage. It had to take five decisions simultaneously in important areas: a foreign policy decision on the Falklands crisis, a monetary decision on an adjustment of parities within the EMS, a budgetary decision on further compensation in favour of the United Kingdom, an economic decision on the new farm prices and an institutional decision on a method of overcoming the block on decision-making caused by one Member State threatening to abuse the veto.

In all five areas the Community managed to take acceptable decisions, thanks to the leadership of the

Pfennig

Belgian Presidency. Everyone here has welcomed this. We must nevertheless bear in mind that all the Community has done with these monetary, budgetary and economic decisions is give itself some breathing space. The basic problems referred to in the mandate of 30 May 1980 remain no nearer solution today than they were two years ago. A major effort must therefore be made in 1982.

This is particularly true of the Commission. It must at last come forward with proposals for solutions to the problems raised by the imbalances in the Community. We have stated often enough what we expect of the Commission where the budget is concerned. We expect, firstly, practical proposals for Council directives, decisions and regulations, accompanied by statements on the financial resources that will be required. This goes for the social and regional policies, including the Mediterranean policy, harmonization of the market, support for high-technology industries, the energy and transport policies and development aid. We also expect, secondly, the budget to be reorganized under a financial agreement among the Member States which shares tasks and expenditure between the Member States and the Community on the principles of subsidiarity and effectiveness, ensures that the Community has the necessary financial resources and introduces a general system for the financial compensation of the Member States, as the European Parliament has proposed in its resolution on the future of the Community budget.

On the Commission's activities so far I should like to say the following: it was obviously glad that the Council was compelled to take rapid decisions in the five areas I have mentioned, since this distracted attention from its own indecision in the question of the mandate. All that the Commission has so far put forward has consisted of communications and vague statements of principle with various guidelines and priorities. As regards the financial mechanism, in fact, the Commission has done no more than submit a progress report on its application in the past, although everyone must realize that the problem has to be solved by the time Spain and Portugal accede.

This makes me suspect that the Commission was hoping that, as happened when the Community was enlarged in the 1970s, one or more Member States would make their agreement to enlargement to include Spain and Portugal conditional on the adoption of a new financial constitution and that all the decisions could then be quickly taken by the Council and the Member States.

If that is so, the Commission is playing a dangerous game that could go wrong as early as the time of the 1983 budget. I feel that the Commission's activities hitherto as regards finance and the budget reveal that it has been incompetent, when it is remembered that the Commission is supposed to be the Community's prime mover.

It proves once again that we should not expect too much, as was the case after the Commission's first report on the mandate of 30 May. It remains to be seen whether the Commission can show us that it is capable of better things.

President. — I call Mr Prag.

Mr Prag. — Yesterday in the Falklands a battle was won for the rule of law in international relations. A battle against aggression. It was also a battle, however, for freedom and democracy. Even a land of 1 800 people has the right to live under the regime that it prefers.

You may think that a curious introduction to my subject which is the problem of decision-making in the Community. Not so. The effectiveness of this Community is crucial to our future. This Community is not only crucial to peace, it is a bulwark of freedom and democracy in our own lands and in the world as a whole. That is why we must make it work effectively. It is also why in my group we wish the Council of Ministers success in improving its decision-making procedures. We hope that the *ad hoc* committee on the Genscher-Colombo proposals for European union will produce proposals that the Ministers will be able to accept unanimously when they meet on 30 June. We congratulate Mr Tindemans on the urgency and skill with which he has pushed forward with work on the Genscher-Colombo proposals and the truly European spirit which has motivated the Belgian Presidency under his able guidance.

In my group we believe that far too many minor and technical matters which are not of vital interest to any Member State go on being discussed *ad infinitum* without a vote being taken. As our deputy Foreign Secretary, Douglas Hurd, said in the Commons debate last month, and I quote: 'It is absurd that Ministers of Foreign Affairs and governments should argue for hour after hour on immensely complicated matters of detail. For some time it has been in the national (and he meant British) as well as in the European interest that decision-taking should be improved.' Earlier in this Parliament Britain's then Foreign Secretary, Lord Carrington, welcomed that Genscher-Colombo proposals.

I hope the Parliament will forgive me, Mr President, if I now become more controversial. As a Briton, and as a convinced and active European, I feel it is a pity at a time when the whole question of decision-making in the Community, and in the Council of Ministers in particular, is under examination in the Council itself, that views in my own country should have been clouded by the vote on the farm-price review. The Community cannot function effectively except in a climate of trust between its Member States and this climate of trust cannot exist unless all the Member States

Prag

can have confidence in agreed procedures. We must know where we stand; we must know what can be done and what cannot be done. There are many cases of divergence of interest of course, but one which inevitably occupies our minds is Britain's budgetary contribution.

All I want to say about that is that it is unthinkable in any grouping, whether a federation or a confederation, a grouping *sui generis* like our own Community or any other, that transfers of wealth should be made from the less wealthy to the more wealthy. There is no state or grouping of any kind in the world where such a process would be defended. The operation of the Community must be such as to remove such divergences and such sources of perennial conflict.

Now I turn again to the Luxembourg Communiqué of January 1966. It was no compromise — merely a statement of two diametrically opposed views. On matters considered by a Member State to be of great importance to it, France wanted no decision until and unless unanimity could be reached. The other five wanted a vote after discussion had continued for a reasonable time. Today the immediate problem is not whether we are in favour of some supposed and indeed mythical compromise in Luxembourg. If we could actually get back to the French thesis in the Luxembourg Communiqué, the veto would only be used in matters considered by a Member State to be of great importance to it. And less important matters could be voted on in accordance with the Treaty rules. That in itself would be an enormous step forward and one which would be even more necessary when we have twelve Member States, instead of ten, trying to reach agreement. I believe if we could do that we would electrify the decision-making process and, indeed, electrify the ministers themselves at Council meetings.

And I hope I may, before I conclude, remind my fellow-countrymen that the EEC Treaty with its full legal weight already provides each Member State with a veto on 26 important matters, such as accession of new members and even changes in customs duties and tax harmonization. And we know that it has always been a rule of the Community that a majority vote would never be forced against a Member State on a matter which it considered to be of vital importance.

May I also remind both the House and my fellow-countrymen that many matters of great interest and importance to the United Kingdom, such as greater freedom of establishment and freedom to supply services in insurance and banking, are held up by the vetoes of *other* countries. So I hope we will not pose any false problems. The real problem is to stop the endless discussions in the Council about everything, regardless of its importance. We must make the Community once again what it was always supposed to be: a Community able to take decisions and to act; a Community able to resolve differences between Member States; a Community able — and this is crucial —

to develop new policies; a Community able to help meet the urgent and justified needs of its 270 million people.

(*Applause*)

President. — I call Mrs Viehoff, who is deputizing for Mr Arndt.

Mrs Viehoff. — (*NL*) Mr President, four years ago this Parliament expressed its views on the Council's decision to establish a European Foundation. For various reasons my group was at that time opposed to the foundation. Speaking on behalf of the Socialist Group, Mr Seefeld suspected that the members of the Council felt they must make a friendly gesture to Mr Tindemans because none of the plans in his document on European Union had been put into effect and, by establishing the European Foundation, they would at least create the impression that something was being done. Is it a coincidence that four years later the ministers have signed the agreement while Mr Tindemans is President of the Council?

Mr President, the Socialist Group still has doubts about the foundation. It still believes that the Community cannot be brought closer to the people by adding all kinds of organizations to those that already exist. Another strange thing about the foundation is that most of the activities it is to undertake are covered by the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport and that every year this committee has to fight to see that the items needed for these activities remain in the budget, items which the Council constantly cuts. But now, it seems, the Council thinks these activities are important after all.

Mr President, over a million EUA must be set aside for the foundation in the budget. Parenthetically, but with a great deal of emphasis, I would point out that the budget is intended for Community tasks, not for intergovernmental matters. But how will this million be spent? How much will be left after salaries have been paid to the staff and travel and subsistence expenses to the members of the Foundation, how much will be left for the actual activities of the foundation?

Those are our objections, in 1978 the majority of Parliament gave its approval, and as good democrats we shall not contest that decision. However, this undoubtedly gives us Socialists the right to expect the same of the Council. An intergovernmental institution was never what was intended when Parliament expressed its approval of the Council's decision in 1978. It is incredible that the Council should ignore Parliament in this way. Mr Tindemans said this morning that the foundation's foremost aim will be to strengthen the feeling of belonging together. Well, any feeling the Council and Parliament may have of

Viehoff

belonging together is certainly not strengthened by this Council decision. Mr Tindemans also made two other comments this morning. The institution's doubts cause him concern, but why then a decision which undermines Parliament's powers? His second comment was that it had been his aim to strengthen relations between the Council and Parliament, but he can hardly believe that the establishment of the European Foundation in this form will improve relations.

Mr President, the Socialist Group will support the resolution tabled by Mr Beumer on behalf of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport, but without any great enthusiasm because it does not really see what use the foundation will be. But if there has to be a foundation, then it should at least comply with the conditions laid down in the resolution.

President. — I call Mr Estgen.

Mr Estgen. — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we have heard it said repeatedly on previous occasions and again today that we must show the political determination and courage to embark upon the measures necessary to ensure the development of Community policies, to reform our agricultural policy and restructure the Community budget.

I interpret the mandate given by the Council to the Commission as an obligation, as a form of authority given to achieve a certain result. But a mandate also implies clear instructions from the body which has given it and I feel sorry for Mr Thorn and his Commission in that they have received such an imprecise mandate. I pay tribute to their efforts to achieve tangible results in spite of it all. Nevertheless, the documents submitted to us are far from satisfactory; the gaps are too numerous and the practical guidelines, indicating instruments and means of action, much too few and far between. This is particularly apparent in the social sector.

It must be admitted that while we are confronted with a very serious economic crisis, the social crisis and accompanying moral crisis are no less severe and this generalized crisis may well become, as the President-in-Office of the Council, Mr Tindemans, so aptly pointed out this morning, *the crisis* of the Community. We shall never succeed in dissipating the doubts and scepticism of the younger generation, in other words of tomorrow's Europeans, if we fail to address ourselves to their everyday problems. Their principal problem is that of unemployment which is already affecting more than ten million European citizens and we are moving with giant strides towards a figure of 20 million unemployed, half of whom will be young people! It is on this point that we must show our resolve to act together and, in this area more than any other, a policy of slow progress is not sufficient. This

idea of slow progress in the Community reminds me of the Echternach procession in my own Grand Duchy: two small steps forward followed by two large steps back.

Ladies and gentlemen, let us stop talking about unemployment. Our debates will be no more than a sinister farce if we do not succeed in defeating the scourge of our modern era. What we need is an anti-crisis policy in this Community with effective common policies in the areas of technology, energy and industrial development and with especial attention to the steel industry. We are in still greater need of a dynamic policy in the monetary sector. Without these preconditions there can be no further social progress. Another imperative today is to make the Ministers of Education of our Member States realise that it is no longer sufficient for our educational systems, and above all our professional training systems, to follow the development of technology; on the contrary they must keep in step with the inherent dynamic of modern technology.

President Tindemans pointed out that all these objectives must be attained through an ambitious policy and that we can no longer be content with a Europe of one per cent and so on. But you were speaking to the converted, Mr President! Our Parliament has been convinced of this for a long time. You should talk instead to your colleagues in the Council of Ministers. You have always been of great service to Europe and you will have a great deal of work to do even after relinquishing the presidency.

President. — I call the Council.

Mr Tindemans, President-in-Office of the Council. — (NL) Mr President, I believe that I shall not witness what has happened today too often in my political career. I should therefore like to thank sincerely all the Members of the European Parliament who have expressed their appreciation of the Belgian Presidency. I cannot name them all individually. You are all familiar with the vicissitudes of political life. I also express my sincere thanks to all my colleagues who have also presided over Councils and to all our staff for the efforts they have made.

By way of introduction I would draw your attention to three points. Firstly, what is the Presidency? In January, when I explained the programme of the Belgian Presidency here, I tried to make it clear that the country which has the Presidency cannot impose the policy it wishes to pursue. At best, it can encourage the other countries to put certain items on the agenda. Furthermore, there must be deliberations in the Council and, of course, consultations with the Commission and Parliament.

Secondly, I would point out once again that, if a position is to be adopted or a decision taken on political

Tindemans

cooperation, unanimity is required. I believe this also needs to be emphasized once again on this occasion.

And thirdly, a presidency lasts only six months. Consequently, however hard you may work, six months is a very short period to propose a new policy, to get it approved and to implement it. I entirely agree with you, Mr von Bismarck. If you want to see the fruits of your labours, six months is too short, but I can assure you that, after working for six months as we have done, you wonder if a human being could continue for twelve months. I am not complaining, but I would like my successors to note what I have said.

As regards political cooperation I should also like to say this: some speakers welcomed the recent developments within the framework of European Political Cooperation. I would summarize these developments as three points. Firstly, European Political Cooperation has become distinctly operational in recent months, since it has kept up with political events. We need only think of Poland, the Falkland Islands and Lebanon. This is a new development which has enabled the Ten to grow in stature on the world stage.

Secondly, European Political Cooperation and actual Community activities joined in tackling the same problems. For Poland, the Falklands and Lebanon European Political Cooperation has created a political framework in which it has been possible for trade policy and other measures to be taken in the Community's organs. We thus have here numerous examples of the convergence of European Political Cooperation and Community activities, a form of cooperation which can be regarded as a basis for European Union.

In this context, it should also be said that the Ministers have already translated the idea of *'le centre de décision unique'* into practice during one and the same meeting, both within the framework of political cooperation and in their deliberations on Community matters. In my opinion, this is a second important development.

I should like to emphasize that the Belgian Presidency has attached particular importance to the relationship between political cooperation and this Parliament. I have myself agreed to attend an urgent discussion on Poland in the Political Affairs Committee. The Presidency has also attended two urgent plenary debates on the Falklands crisis. These are new forms of dialogue between Parliament and those engaged in political cooperation, which have been used to give expression to the willingness to involve Parliament more closely in European Political Cooperation.

I said earlier on in my statement that I regretted the fact the Community cannot pursue or is not pursuing a better anti-crisis policy. This is, of course, due to some extent to the situation in the Member States, the view taken of economic policy and of monetary policy, inflation and the budgetary situation in the Member States. All this has an effect and often prevents us from

adopting a united policy at European level. And yet positive results have been achieved.

In the European Council, for example, decisions have been taken on youth unemployment and investments, and at the Western summit in Versailles, thanks largely to the position adopted by the European Community, decisions were also taken on methods of combating the crisis, monetary measures, investments and measures to the benefit of the young unemployed. At European level, as I said this morning, although I was not perhaps emphatic enough, the Council of Social Ministers had taken a number of important decisions in the last few days. Thus those who claim we do not pay enough attention to such issues are mistaken. These social measures supplement the economic measures approved by the European Council. I will not go into what has been said about the European Monetary System. I assume the Commission will be discussing this point. I would merely point out that it is not the Community but usually the Member States who are resisting the further development of the European Monetary System, the second phase which should really have begun in March of last year, the further strengthening of the system.

Secondly, two Member States, Belgium and France, have indeed taken supplementary measures when the value of their currencies was adjusted. I would also say that we have not forgotten that last year Lord Carrington succeeded in bringing the ten Foreign Ministers to Strasbourg, where they had a meeting with the enlarged Bureau. We intended to do the same, but it was agreed last year that such meetings should be held only once a year. This year's meeting will therefore be held under the Danish Presidency.

Mr Bangemann raised a particularly interesting point. Is the lack of political will the only cause of the stagnation in the Community, or is this political will also connected with the institutions? In other words, can the difficulties be overcome if there are better institutions? This is an extremely interesting point, and I am myself an institutionalist. Jean Monnet convinced me that no community can work without good institutions. But as things stand today and as a famous man once said, *'les choses étant ce qu'elles sont'*, it is not possible to change the institutions at the moment. Responsibility must at present be ascribed entirely to the political will of the leaders of the Member States of the Community. I would also point out that during the meeting between the European Community and the ACP countries in Libreville a result was achieved to which insufficient attention has been paid. We succeeded in putting forward proposals for the injection of 208 million units of account, and the developing countries did not therefore go home disappointed.

In Versailles we succeeded, once again principally as a result of Community action, in persuading the American leaders to join in global negotiations in the United Nations as part of the North-South dialogue. You will

Tindemans

recall that the special session of the United Nations devoted to the North-South dialogue last year was a failure and that the Community did not speak with one voice. But we now have the chance to adopt a united front with the United States as our ally, and to begin global negotiations. I was asked this question, and you have now heard my answer.

I was also asked about the importance of what the Versailles communiqué says about these global negotiations and monetary problems. What the communiqué says is very good, but its weakness is that it does not provide for any compulsory mechanisms for putting these good ideas into practice. Further negotiations must therefore be held, and these ideas must assume definite shape. It has been said that I have not referred to the next elections, or rather the election procedure for the next elections to the European Parliament.

Mr President, under the Belgian Presidency a committee has been set up, chaired by a Belgian official who is a specialist in matters connected with elections, and each Member State has appointed a specialist to examine the European Parliament's proposals and to see whether the Council can come to a conclusion. This committee has already met once and will be meeting twice in June. Here again, the Council is at present complying with the European Parliament's suggestions. As regards the Genscher-Colombo proposals, a working party has, as you know, been set up under the chairmanship of a Belgian specialist, and this working party has worked very satisfactorily. At the moment there are still four problems. The first concerns security. How can we discuss this in the European context? Secondly, there is the relationship between political cooperation and the Community and integration. Thirdly, relations with the European Parliament. Fourthly, the method of voting: majority, unanimity, simple majority and so on. But at 5 p.m. on Sunday, 20 June, the Ten will be meeting to discuss these Genscher-Colombo proposals. That has been agreed. I hope — I dare not express my views today — I hope that the Council will draw positive conclusions.

Mr Tindemans. — (FR) I should also like to say a word about the Hopper report. I want to thank all those Members who have made their opinions known in this debate because the matter is of great importance. The discussions surrounding what has become known as the Mandate of 30 May 1980 and the questions pertaining to it which have been under consideration for two years now, formed one of the central features of Community activity during the 6 months in which I have had the honour to preside over the Council. If we go back to the origins of the debate which opened on 30 May 1980 we will see that more than 2 years of the life of our Community have been marked in one way or another by this subject. I should like to take this opportunity to say how interested I was to read Mr Hopper's report. For my part I shall

confine myself to three considerations. One of the first questions raised in your report is that of determining whether the mandate should be interpreted in an extensive or a restrictive sense. On this vital point I am able to assure you that the Council has not resigned itself to viewing the mandate as a mere answer to a budgetary problem.

With reference to the budget, the Foreign Ministers agreed on 24 and 25 May last to the principle of an arrangement for the year 1982 only which provides, under certain conditions, for compensation amounting to 850 million ECU to the United Kingdom. The detailed procedures for this arrangement are to be adopted by the Council on 20 and 21 June next. At the same time the Ministers have undertaken to find a definitive solution for the period beginning after 1982 by the end of November this year. This is of course a partial agreement which does not entirely correspond to the objective of the mandate and therefore does not allow the other aspects of the mandate to be considered closed in accordance with the guidelines drawn up by the European Council in London in November 1981. I want to stress the fact that this agreement has had the undeniable merit of breaking a political deadlock which was alarming in many respects; without prejudice to the future, it evidences in the clearest terms the Council's desire to reach a definitive solution at the earliest opportunity.

In the areas of social policy and employment, following the London commitment, the European Council meeting in March 1982 placed particular emphasis on professional training for young people which is one of the keys to the problem of unemployment. In the same vein, the Council of Social Ministers meeting on 27 May last adopted a very detailed resolution on Community action to combat unemployment.

At Community level, specific decisions have been taken to this end including the new Euratom loan amounting to 1 000 million ECU and the assignment of a further 1 000 million ECU to the new Community instrument (NCI). I might add that the Commission has recently announced that it would be proposing a further increase in the NCI endowment to 3 000 million ECU. The Council will be considering this proposal at the earliest opportunity.

Finally, the European Council meeting in June will have on its agenda a very detailed study by the Commission on investment policy.

Regional policy is a third example. The Commission has put forward a substantive proposal and the Council already held an extremely detailed debate in April on the various options open to us.

My fourth and last example will be that of research and development policy. The Commission submitted a communication on a global research and development strategy which was discussed in detail last March and

Tindemans

is due to be re-examined at the end of the month with a view to the adoption of precise guidelines. In parallel with this, extremely concrete decisions have been taken in certain areas such as the fusion programme or the raw materials programme adopted last March. Finally, in the area of agricultural policy which is the third aspect of the mandate, I might simply point out that some of the guidelines contained in the provisional London conclusions were already implemented when farm prices were fixed for the 1982/83 marketing year.

I should like to comment briefly on the third point which is perhaps the most important since it relates to the future. It is true that the London conclusions on Chapters one and two, i.e. new policies and agricultural policy, have not yet been formally adopted. I am sure that the next Presidency will use its best endeavours to see to it that there is no loss of momentum. The Commission shares this conviction since its President, Mr Thorn, stressed his view that there was no longer any obstacle to the implementation of the commitments entered into last November; he said that the Commission would be putting forward the necessary proposals for this purpose.

Mr President, I should like now to say a word about the Middle East. In my capacity as President-in-Office of the Council, I was invited to visit Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Egypt and Israel. I did not take with me any proposals to put to the leaders of those countries. Wherever I went I was asked immediately whether the Community remained faithful to the Venice declaration. My answer always was that the Venice declaration is the only and therefore the latest text adopted by the Ten in political cooperation and that no other document exists although many things have happened in the Middle East since the declaration was approved in 1980. And I went on to list some of the events. First of all, there have been elections in three countries directly concerned by the events in the Middle East, the United States, France and Israel; secondly, there has been and still is a war between Iraq and Iran; thirdly, there have been certain incidents in Israel; fourthly, the Sinai has been evacuated and I could continue this list of events which have occurred in the Middle East and are liable to influence the situation in this explosive part of the world.

My conclusion was that the time had come to reassess the situation. I shall be reporting to my colleagues, and, on the basis of that report, a discussion will take place between the Ten; following that discussion it will be possible to decide whether to confirm the Venice declaration, to amend it or whether the Ten might adopt a new declaration. I think that you would have done the same thing if you had been in my place. This was the only possible explanation to justify my visit to these countries of the Middle East.

Almost everywhere I was asked whether the Community or the Ten — because these decisions are

always taken in the context of political cooperation — were for or against the Camp David agreements. I always answered that this was not a question for the Ten. These agreements were signed by Israel, Egypt and the United States. But I observed during my visit that the evacuation of the Sinai had everywhere a rather favourable influence on attitudes.

Another question always followed immediately: are the Ten for or against the idea of Palestinian autonomy provided for in the second phase of the Camp David agreements? My answer was always that since the basis of that autonomy had not yet been defined, it presupposed new negotiations since, if I have understood things rightly, Egypt, Israel and the United States do not have the same concept of the autonomy to be granted to the West Bank and the Gaza region. Well now, since negotiations will have to take place — although let me stress that I made no proposals — why should the opportunity not be taken to extend the framework of discussion and see how dynamic progress might be made in action for peace in this part of the world? That is all I said. I made no proposals. I tried to obtain answers to my questions to be able to draw up the report for my colleagues in the Ten to which I referred just now.

Any other reports about my visit to these countries are therefore erroneous or do not reflect the precise truth. I have still not submitted my report since it has been held up — as you will readily understand — by events in the Lebanon. But I am still intending to do so, so that the necessary reassessment can take place and to enable measures to be proposed which will inspire greater confidence in this stricken region. Then Europe will have to adopt its own attitude and define its policy to the Middle East.

Finally, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we must adopt a method to ensure the continuity of European policy towards the Middle East.

I agree with those Members who have stated during this debate that it is inconceivable for each President in office to embark upon similar visits to the Middle East. We must find a method which will ensure continuity in the European attitude. What form will it take? I have some ideas on this subject which I shall be submitting to my colleagues, again in the context of political cooperation. I do not know whether my colleagues will accept them but, at all events, I think we have a duty to examine ways of ensuring the necessary continuity. I say this because people in this area — I hope you will bear with me if I speak of this, Mr President — still remember the visit by Mr Thorn when he was President-in-Office, by Mr Van der Klauw and by Lord Carrington. I hope they will also remember my visit but there is no point in effecting identical visits followed by a report which is then shelved. Let me stress again that we must therefore find a method of ensuring greater continuity of the European attitude towards this explosive region.

Tindemans

On the subject of the Lebanon, I would say that when I came back from Israel I stated during my press-conferences in Jerusalem and Belgium that it was vital to prevent the outbreak of a new war in this area either inside Lebanon or on its frontiers. Some journalists were even rather sarcastic and asked me whether I had special information to suggest that a war might break out — even experts and diplomats put that question to me. Again in Versailles, Mr President, on Sunday morning I tried to draw the attention of all the participants to the explosive situation in Lebanon. Nobody was prepared to believe me. But in the afternoon we learnt that two brigades had invaded the country. That was the climate which prevailed. I did my duty. We did everything possible at European level; the political directors met immediately at my request, I travelled to New York on Monday, the ambassadors of the Ten met in New York to examine the situation, the Ten met on Wednesday and published the communiqué about Lebanon with which you are now familiar and which I was able to quote this morning. We now welcome the ceasefire which has entered into force and hope that resolutions 508 and 509 will be implemented so that Lebanon can at long last enjoy its own sovereignty, territorial integrity and the unity which this sorely tried country so richly deserves.

But I do want to put one question: why did Europe and other world forces not make a greater effort to save Lebanon from the tragic situation confronting it today? Communiqués have been published but nothing at all has been done to improve the situation in this poor country.

Turning to the Falklands you are already familiar with the attitude of the Ten: condemnation of the violation of international law, implementation of resolution 502 and pressure on Argentina through economic measures to persuade it to agree to political negotiations. I must repeat the fact that these measures were in no way directed against the people of Argentina or against Latin America and I welcome the latest reports to the effect that a ceasefire has been agreed. I hope this will enable us to find a solution to the problem, that international law will be respected again thus enabling us to pursue a lasting policy of peace.

I also owe you a reply about Turkey. I can only say that the Turkish Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr Turkman, has indicated that the referendum on the new constitution will definitely be held in November. I know no more than this but official notification of the referendum has been given. That is therefore a new element to be added now to our dossier on Turkey. I should like to say a word to Mr Croux while apologizing for not mentioning other Members by name. You are quite right, Mr Croux, that fresh reflection is necessary on the Community, on the aims of the Community and on European union. I agree with you entirely that it is unacceptable for ten Member States to have ten different interpretations of the Treaties. It is unacceptable for the basis of our Community's

structures which have been approved by our parliaments, in other words the text of the Treaties and preambles to them, simply to be disregarded; it is unacceptable for some Member States to remain faithful to the text while others wish to place a new interpretation on it. We must decide what can be done about this.

I listened with close attention to Mr De Goede who spoke about a two-speed Europe. I personally have never advocated such an arrangement. But if the situation continues like this, and I am weighing my words carefully, and if the Member States do not all place the same interpretation on the Treaties, we shall inevitably reach a stage when it will be necessary to consider how progress can be made on the basis of respect for the Treaties. I hope that such a situation will not arise because it might breach the Community in its present form.

In answer to Mrs Spaak I would say this: 'Yes, Madam, you are quite right, we need strong medicine.' In my speech this morning I myself condemned the policy of small steps forward. But the fact is that the Ten do not all want this strong medicine; they do not all have the same ideal or the same objectives. Addressing Mr Croux just now, I explained my view of things and how I interpret the threats hanging over the Community. You are aware of the obligations incumbent on the Council President and I must be extremely cautious; we have another extremely important Council meeting on 20, 21 and 22 June but I very often wonder whether we still have the same conception of the Treaties and of their ultimate objectives. As yet I have no answer to that question.

I feel sure, Madam, that we shall soon inevitably have to face that question. I welcome today's debate on the occasion of the report on the achievements of the Belgian Presidency. The time has come for determined action by all those who believe that the European ideal is the only possible solution for our countries and for our future. We must all place our trust in the Treaties. If that trust can be imparted by this Parliament as the expression of the will of the people, I face the future without anxiety.

(Applause)

President. — I call the Commission.

Mr Thorn, President of the Commission. — *(FR)* Mr President, I shall be very brief because I know that the time set aside for this debate has already elapsed and that my friend, Mr Tindemans, has already made the essential points.

First of all, I should like to answer Mr Beumer about the European Foundation. The Commission is intending to enter in its preliminary draft budget for 1983 an

Thorn

appropriation of 1 million ECU on budget line 676. We believe that this appropriation should be sufficient to cover the operating costs of the Foundation during its first year of activity.

The constituent act granted the Foundation complete independence in establishing its programme and administering its activities. Nevertheless, ladies and gentlemen, that independence in no way precludes the possibility of the Council of the Foundation establishing close cooperation with the European Parliament. We hope that will take place and we shall make the suggestion. The Commission will look favourably on the establishment of closer links between the Foundation and all the Community institutions, for example through a colloquy between your Assembly, between your Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport and the Council of the Foundation. The Commission believes that the ten Members of the Foundation's Council allocated to the Community should be appointed by the Council on a proposal from the Commission and after consulting the European Parliament. The Commission intends to include provision for this procedure in the proposal based on Article 235 which it will be submitting in due course with a view to the conclusion of an agreement between the Community and the Foundation. The constituent act also requires the Foundation to avoid all duplication of Community action in its own activities. The presence on the Council of the Foundation of members appointed by the Community will constitute a guarantee in this respect and permit close coordination between the activities of the Foundation and those of the Community.

Moreover, it is understood that the Foundation will have to accept not only financial control by the Court of Auditors, but also control by the Commission under the provisions of the financial regulation.

Express provision has also been made for appropriate cooperation between the Foundation and the Council of Europe. The Commission understands the concern voiced by Parliament; however, it believes that sufficient guarantees exist to avoid any risk of the Foundation encroaching upon the responsibilities of the Community.

Moreover, the Commission will have no objection if in future the European Foundation accepts responsibility for certain cultural initiatives whose implementation would be impossible at Community level. The Commission is of the opinion that the Foundation could be an important instrument for the dissemination of the idea of Europe among the peoples of the Community.

I now wish to answer Mr Møller's question. The Council regulations on agricultural prices for the year 1982 are based on Article 43 of the Treaty or on provisions deriving therefrom. The Council regulation adopting trade sanctions on Argentina is based on Article 113 of the Treaty. These provisions stipulate

that the Council must act by a qualified majority on a proposal from the Commission and after consulting the European Parliament in the case of Article 43 of the Treaty. These rules were respected when the regulations to which I referred were adopted. The possibility that a Member State may invoke what is termed a right of veto in order to defend a vital interest is mentioned nowhere in the Treaties — I think Mr de la Malène referred to this point just now. The text of the Treaties merely indicates the cases in which unanimity is required and those in which, on the other hand, a simple or qualified majority will be sufficient. That, Mr President, is the juridical situation to which I have nothing to add except to repeat yet again that the Commission is not a party to the Luxembourg disagreement or agreement and is required to respect the Treaty, the whole Treaty and nothing but the Treaty.

Following those two answers, may I now say a word about Mr Hopper's report. This seems to me a good time to assess the results achieved through the exercise of the mandate but I do not want to return yet again to all that has been said during the year and I am afraid that we shall unfortunately have several more opportunities to consider various aspects of the mandate, particularly, as Mr Hopper pointed out, the budgetary problem. I should just like to highlight the most salient features of the rapporteur's remarkable report. At the same time I wish to extend my sincere congratulations and thanks to him.

As regards the purpose of the mandate, the Commission refused to embark upon a purely book-keeping exercise and I am grateful to my compatriot, Mr Estgen, who commiserated with the fate of the Commission in taking up this mandate. The Commission chose the path of development of Community policies to strengthen Community cohesion and help to answer the challenge of the economic crisis.

Ladies and gentlemen, if you have followed the peripeties of this budgetary dispute you will be more convinced than ever that there is only one possible answer to the budgetary question: we need a more effective Community and more effective Community policies for the benefit of all concerned, otherwise we shall find no solution in the medium and long term.

(Applause)

The Commission therefore sought parallel progress on the three aspects of the mandate: structural policy, agricultural policy and budgetary policy. We never felt it appropriate to make progress in one area conditional on progress in the others. You may remember my words to you here some months ago: 'Let us not link the problems or take hostages in our Community.' We must continue our day-to-day work and I think that that is the lesson to be drawn from the events of recent weeks. Difficulties over one dossier should never be allowed to block progress in any other essential area regardless of the national interests at stake.

Thorn

Let us move on to the instruments proposed by the Commission. The Commission chose first of all to propose major options in the main areas of activity: energy, agriculture and industry before going on to more operational proposals. In answer to the remarkable criticism contained in Mr Hopper's report who calls upon the Commission to move 'resolutely on from the stage of general remarks to the presentation of more specific proposals' I would say that the Commission has already made a broad start on the operational part of its action. That answer is also intended for Mr Giavazzi, Mr Delorozoy and Mr Pfennig. Allow me to remind you of a few examples: the development of the NCI to which President Tinde-mans referred just now, our farm price proposals which, ladies and gentlemen, reflect the guidelines of the mandate even if many people apparently do not recognize that fact, our preliminary draft budget for 1983 which is characterized by a substantial development of the structural funds, our proposed directives for the internal market etc. We shall have occasion to return to all these subjects. I would add that the Commission has tried to make progress in all the areas which it considers to be of crucial importance in the fight against the economic crisis and to strengthen the Community's economic structures.

There remains the question of the budget. That was and still is the most difficult problem facing us. Everyone knows that many difficulties still lie ahead. It is true that we have only arrived at a temporary solution and I made this proposal because I realized that the gap could not be bridged and that we were facing a major crisis. It was necessary to gain time. You know that, in agreement with the whole Commission, I submitted various compromise proposals to the Council; the last of them dated 16 May 1982 provided the basis for the solution which the United Kingdom accepted for the year 1982 alone; this possibility was offered by the decision of 30 May should it prove impossible to reach an agreement for the medium term.

This proposal providing *ad hoc* compensation for 1982, calculated on a flat-rate basis, is accompanied by a commitment to pursue efforts to settle the longer term problems by the end of this year. It was on that basis that the agreement of 25 May was reached, enabling us to hope that in a new and, we hope, more calm and collected approach an adequate solution will be found for the longer term; we are in fact looking for a multi-year solution.

We must not seek to hide the fact that the solution found for the United Kingdom problem in subsequent years confronts us with a fundamental problem. This problem relates to the role which you and I wish the Community budget to play. I would remind you that the Commission has always refused to make its policy proposals conditional on budgetary objectives. It cannot therefore subscribe to a logic which would tend to make the Community budget a kind of instrument to balance the financial burdens of the Member States. At

the present juncture not one Member State is free from problems in this area.

Once again, we believe it is imperative for a better budgetary balance to result from the natural play of effective Community policies of the kind which we are endeavouring to define with your assistance. I refer now to the question by Mr Jackson on this subject. He himself recalled Mr Lange's 1979 proposal to introduce a mechanism for financial compensation in the budget. I personally have strong hesitations about going as far as that. The Community budget cannot effect significant transfers of resources. I am afraid that it is not large enough except as far as the smallest Member States are concerned. Moreover, in my view a compensatory mechanism would lessen the feeling of responsibility on the part of the Member States *vis-à-vis* the budgetary consequences of their own policies since those consequences would be corrected in each individual case by the application of such criteria as might be adopted for the purpose. I personally do not believe this to be a sound principle of budgetary management but we could return to the subject later.

The objective of more determined budgetary intervention in certain Member States must be attained, let me repeat this yet again, through the development of policies of joint interest rather than through machinery for automatic re-distribution. Nevertheless, I appreciate the idea contained in the proposal by Mr Lange, of which Mr Jackson reminded us, to base new own resources on budgetary revenue better adopted to the ability of States, regions and even individuals to pay.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, that was my initial reaction to the report by Mr Hopper.

May I add a word to certain representatives of the Mediterranean countries like Mr Papantoniou, who put questions concerning our policy towards those countries. I would point out that we are currently trying to foresee the consequences of a possible further enlargement in the near future and we have recently given a first reply to the memorandum on Portugal. I believe that this reply was favourably received in Athens, as press reports today confirm. It is true to say that the Commission has already begun its Mediterranean action.

In the decision on farm-prices, particularly favourable treatment was given to Mediterranean products. We introduced measures for wine, fruit, vegetables and olive oil in response to requests from the Mediterranean countries. Soon we shall be in a position to propose integrated programmes for the Mediterranean countries. That is my last answer on a specific point. Honourable Members may rest assured that we are respecting the undertakings given by us in this area.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: LADY ELLES

Vice-President

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.¹

5. Question Time

President. — The next item on the agenda is the first part of Question Time (Doc. 1-330/82).

We begin with questions to the Commission.

Question No 1, by Mr Cousté, for whom Mr Paulhan is substituting (H-42/82):

The Commission has announced that priority should be given to intensifying convergence in practical terms rather than to introducing new regulations. Can it explain how it intends to achieve this aim?

Mr Ortoli, Vice-President of the Commission. — (FR) This question brings us back to today's debate on convergence and I would remind you that in making the declaration referred to by Mr Cousté, the Commission indicated that convergence was an essential feature of the EMS since the persistence of the present divergencies was jeopardizing the basis of the system.

We felt that it was possible through existing mechanisms to make substantial progress in a number of areas, firstly, by defining monetary objectives and discussing problems of interest rates in order to seek a measure of compatibility between the different policies.

Secondly, by refraining from using certain instruments of economic and monetary policy which are incompatible with the proper operation of the system.

Thirdly, by establishing the principle of the free movement of capital which is also one way of organizing genuine convergence as the basis of economic policy.

Fourthly, by keeping a much closer watch on the policies pursued and on their results, for example, by establishing a set of comparative indicators and fixing by joint agreement a number of targets; in the event of deviation from these targets discussions would have to take place with a possible obligation on the Commission to make full use of its responsibility to hold consultations and make recommendations. Similarly, the

Council would have to be courageous enough to open a debate when it felt that divergence was setting in within the Community.

Finally, by establishing a procedure for mutual information and surveillance of the balance of payments and external debt situation of the Member States. This group of measures based on active development of contacts through existing councils and committees should enable us to make specific and, after all, binding progress towards closer convergence.

Mr Enright. — On a point of order, Madam President. At the time I tried to make this point, there was and indeed there still is a tremendous amount of chattering going on in the benches opposite. Admittedly some of it seems to be caused by European Democrats talking to Mr Bangemann and so on, but it is not helpful during Question Time.

President. — Mr Enright, I heartily endorse your comments and I hope those to whom they apply will have taken notice of what has been said.

Question No 2, by Mr Nyborg (H-53/82):

On 19 June 1981 the European Parliament debated a report on coastal erosion in the Community; in the course of the debate Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission, stated that in 1982 the Commission would be submitting a proposal concerning coastal protection. How is this work progressing, and when can we expect to see definite proposals?

Mr Richard, Member of the Commission. — At the plenary part-session of 19 June 1981 my colleague, Commissioner Narjes, indicated to Parliament that the Commission was following up its work on ecological mapping with a view to submitting to the Council, at the end of 1982 or the beginning of 1983, a proposal for the progressive creation of a European information system on the state of the environment, which also concerns natural risks and especially coastal erosion. I am happy to tell Parliament that the Commission has set up an inter-service working group to identify the actions to be undertaken at Community level in the field of coastal erosion and to define a strategy for their implementation.

I think Members will agree that this is a difficult, delicate and somewhat complicated matter, involving as it does environmental, economic, regional and indeed social considerations. I think it would therefore be unwise for me to give a specific date on which the Commission's ideas could be expected. I can only say that the Commission is pursuing its work with all due diligence and that we will report as soon as possible.

Mr Nyborg. — (DA) I should like to say to the Commission that I feel the answer we have been given is

¹ Request for early votes: see Minutes.

Nyborg

very vague and incomplete. It is perhaps understandable that a date cannot be set, but it should at least be possible to assure us that the work has been started and to give us some information on what progress has been made. I therefore greatly regret that Mr Narjes is not present. I had supplementary questions to put to him, but I have the feeling that I shall not get an answer to them, at least not today. I shall therefore put my questions in writing.

Mr Richard. — I am sorry if the honourable parliamentary thought the answer was diffuse. It was not meant to be. It was meant to be fairly informative. The inter-service working group consists of representatives of DG V, DG VI, DG XI, DG XII and DG XVI. As I told Parliament, work is being pursued, as I understand it, with due diligence. I am afraid I cannot go very much further than that.

Mrs Ewing. — In connection with the mapping that has been mentioned, will the Commission take into account that in some cases if it were to provide plans for spending money to protect the taking away of land by the sea, it would have the additional bonus of reclaiming an extensive acreage of land? I do not know about other parts of the Community, but in South Uist, for example, to recover land from the sea would mean at the same time that many thousands of acres would be reclaimed for a land-hungry crofting community.

Mr Richard. — I am sure the honourable parliamentarian is right. I can only say that the question I am asked is about coastal erosion and protection rather than land acquisition. On the other hand they are obviously connected in the sense that each involves both sea and land. To that extent I am sure that Commissioner Narjes will be very interested in what the honourable lady has had to say.

Mr Hume. — Could I ask Commissioner Richard once again to remind Commissioner Narjes, who I understand has responsibility for this subject, of the promise he made to me, as rapporteur on this subject, in the debate in June 1981 and to let him know that Parliament is concerned about this matter? I understand, of course, that the Commission's resources in this area are limited, but could the Commissioner ask that interdepartmental committee to examine the question of resources as well?

Mr Richard. — I think I can give an affirmative answer to both questions raised by the honourable gentleman. I will indeed draw Mr Narjes' attention both to the undertaking that he gave to the honourable gentlemen and also to the fact that adequate resources, in the view of the honourable gentleman, should be devoted to this task.

Mr Purvis. — The Commissioner will be aware that this has been going on for exactly a year now. The way these things go, with all these DGs involved, it looks as if it will be a further year before much further progress is made. Is he aware that my constituency, Mid-Scotland and Fife, is gradually being reduced in size and that the castle and cathedral at St Andrews and the old golf course there, the world-famous Old Course at St Andrews, are slowly disappearing? Does he not think that a bit more speed and determination could be brought to bear on this project?

Mr Richard. — I will certainly draw Mr Narjes' attention to the extreme urgency of this position in the honourable gentleman's constituency. None of us would wish to see St Andrews sinking under the sea. I don't think, however that he should be quite so defeatist about the prospect of progress. As I say, I think it is right that the Commission should take some time in order to try and get the right answer to this question. The obvious way in which we should do it is to consult the various directorates-general concerned, which we are doing.

Mr Griffiths. — Does Commissioner Richard have any opinion about the resources which are likely to be made available to deal with problems of coastal erosion and furthermore, could he tell me whether any of this money is likely to be spent on the very serious problems at Whitely Bay, which is not in my constituency?

Mr Richard. — I am asked whether I have any opinion on the resources likely to be made available. My only comment is that I should have thought in general that they will probably be insufficient for the task which is demanded of them by Parliament and the Council.

President. — Question No 3, by Mrs Dury (H-70/82):

On 25 July 1978 the Council agreed to a 5-year experimental programme called FAST, the aim of which was to define long-term objectives and priorities for the Community's research and development policy.

Why did the Commission not consult the European Trade Union Confederation on the formulation of the FAST programme?

Mr Richard, Member of the Commission. — The FAST programme, which was decided on by the Council in July 1978, is a programme of forecasting and assessment in the field of science and technology. This programme results from and is a follow-up to the action programme on forecasting, evaluation and methodology called 'Europe + 30' launched by the Commission in 1974. Within the framework of information

Richard

meetings on Community research policy, the European Trade Union Confederation was informed on the carrying out and the conclusions of the study 'Europe + 30'. Within the framework of the consultation of the Economic and Social Committee in 1978 on the proposal for FAST, the opinion of the trade union movement was also sought.

Now among the three priority research projects in progress, that on work and employment, the time horizon for which is ten years, is evidently of particular interest to trade unions. For this purpose contacts have been made between FAST and on the one side the European Trade Union Institute and on the other the research centres of trade unions in the different member countries. Furthermore, representatives of trade union organizations have participated in certain conferences and working seminars organized within the framework of the FAST programme.

Mrs Dury. — (FR) I welcome Commissioner Richard's answer concerning the FAST programme but I was astonished to note the difference between the conclusions of this programme and the action taken.

In the conclusions and criteria which will determine our choices in the area of research and development, I believe that the image and prestige of the Community are at stake, as well as the independence of Europe and our ability to respond flexibly to the uncertainties of the future. May I ask whether these objectives have been determined after consulting the trade unions or by the Commission alone?

Mr Richard. — I am not absolutely certain that I entirely follow the nuances of the question that Mrs Dury has just asked. The question itself really deals with the extent of consultation with the trade union movement. As far as the Commission is concerned, we are anxious to consult, we are willing to consult and indeed we have consulted. I don't think that there is any great divergence between the objectives of the Commission in relation to FAST and the objectives of trade unions that we have in fact consulted, but if there is a major problem here, well then certainly, as far as the Commission is concerned, we would be anxious to hear about it and to try to put it right.

President. — Question No 4, by Mr Pesmazoglou (H-101/82):

The EEC is aiming to safeguard supplies of minerals essential to its economy. In this context, existing Community reserves should be fully used. Obviously, this matter is of particular interest to Member States that possess such reserves. Can the Commission state what progress has been made in drawing up measures on this matter, what they are

designed to achieve and what special regulations are proposed?

Mr Tugendhat, Vice-President of the Commission. — The Commission is well aware of the problems of security of supply of raw materials for the Community's economy and of the importance of properly exploiting the resources on its own territory. As far back as 1975 it expressed its concern in a communication to the Council. Since then the Commission has developed extensive research programmes designed to reduce its dependence on outside sources. The latest programme for 1982-85 was adopted by the Council on 17 May 1982 for a total amount of 54 million ECU. Commission staff, together with experts from the relevant ministries in the Member States and the industries concerned, have studied the possibility of setting up a scheme to encourage exploration of Community territory by granting loans for prospecting by industry, which would be repayable unless the exploration programme did not lead to commercial production.

As the Commission indicated in its answer to Written Question No 2122/80 by Mr Lalor, it did not think it advisable to take any decision on funding exploration until the debate on Mrs Moreau's report on current and future supplies of mineral and vegetable raw materials in the European Community was concluded. Following the adoption of the relevant resolution by the European Parliament on 9 March 1982 the Commission expects to forward a communication to the Council soon.

Mr Pesmazoglou. — The whole issue is linked with dumping operations by a number of producers, especially in the Far East. Is the Commissioner aware of any specific action taken by the Commission in relation to anti-dumping measures, specifically in connection with the complaints submitted by producers of deadburn and caustic magnesite who have been exporting exclusively to the Community for a long period of years and who are now faced with very serious dumping operations by China and North Korea, for example? Does the Commission intend taking action to combat such dumping operations?

Mr Tugendhat. — I thought I had covered all the possible supplementaries that might have been asked on this question, but I have, I must confess, been taken completely unawares by the honourable Member. I can only say to him that I must look into the matter and ensure that he receives a reply as soon as possible. This is a problem of which I had not previously been aware, and I will convey it to my colleague, Mr Davignon.

Mrs Ewing. — May I take it from the Commissioner's answer there has been no departure today from the assurances given by previous Commissioners that there

Ewing

will be no exploration or boring for uranium in the Orkneys against the wishes of the people of these islands?

Mr Tugendhat. — I do not believe that that assumption flows naturally from what I said a moment ago to Mr Pasmazoglou, but there has been no change in the Commission's position.

President. — Question No 5, by Mr Lalor (H-104/82):

Will the Commission give due reason as to why it has failed to implement the common organization of the market in potatoes, the lack of which continues to seriously threaten this sector of the agricultural market in Ireland?

Mr Dalsager, Member of the Commission. — (DA) The Commission put a proposal on the common organization of the market in potatoes before the Council in 1976. The Council has not been able to reach agreement in the meantime. Some Member States want the market arrangement for potatoes to comprise a large number of provisions which really have nothing to do with it. Other Member States are against an extension of the market arrangements in this way. It is expected that the question will be discussed again in the near future. I might perhaps add that I was a member of the Council for many years, and I discussed the question of market arrangements for potatoes on various occasions without at any time managing to achieve anything resembling unity. Of course, Parliament is fully entitled to put this question, but the Member States have not so far been prepared to implement the arrangements on potatoes which the Commission feels we need and which we have been proposing for many years. However, it has not been possible to get a decision on the matter.

Mr Lalor. — I am surprised and, of course, I need not say disappointed by the non-reply I have received from the Commissioner. The Commissioner has, in fact, said that he has been talking potatoes for a long time but is in a position to come up with nothing. I have to say that that is a most unsatisfactory reply. He did not tell the House that nothing has been done by the Commission since Document 512 of 1976 was approved by this Parliament on 15 September 1976 — six years ago. He did say that he has difficulty in getting a decision from the committee, but he has not gone out of his way to say why the Commission has not been in a position to modify its proposals, as it has done on numerous occasions in the past with regard to other areas of agriculture. Can the Commission not introduce a modified proposal in order to enable the Council to come to some kind of conclusion — a satisfactory one, one hopes — on potato regulations? Furthermore, will the Commission now give an under-

taking that such a modified proposal will be forthcoming and that it will report to this Parliament by, say, next part-session with a timetable for such a modified proposal? Can the Commissioner make any promise of that nature with a view to making progress regarding potatoes?

Mr Dalsager. — (DA) I cannot give any such promise. The truth is that the Member States do not want any organization of the potato market, so we have not got one. The Commission has done all it could over the years. Parliament has done its duty. The Member States have at no time been prepared to adopt measures to regulate the potato market and, while we remain in that situation, we shall be forced to accept that we can do no more, until there is a greater degree of will in the Member States to enter into serious discussions on the proposal which has been on the Council table for many years.

Mr J. D. Taylor. — Is the Commissioner aware of the potential danger to seed-potato producers in both the Netherlands and Northern Ireland, as a result of the recent refusal of the Southern Irish authorities to accept potatoes from Cyprus, in contravention of the Community's Association Agreement with Cyprus? Will the Commissioner investigate this matter urgently and, where necessary, make representations to the Southern Irish authorities to ensure that our Association Agreement with Cyprus is fulfilled?

Mr Dalsager. — (DA) The Commission is aware of all the problems surrounding seed potatoes, new potatoes and ordinary potatoes. Time and again, the Commission has been in a situation in which, because of the absence of a market organization for potatoes, it has been impossible to — shall we say — manage this market in the most effective and satisfactory way. The Commission greatly regrets this. We hope that the Member States will quickly achieve a result in their deliberations, so that it will be possible to achieve a real market organization for potatoes which, of course, are a farm product like all other farm products in this Community.

Mr Clinton. — No doubt the Commissioner is aware that ten years ago the question of a common organization of the market in potatoes was being actively pushed by certain Member States. I would ask the Commissioner, is it right to say that in fact the main opposition to a common organization of the market in potatoes is coming from two Member States who have the European market in potatoes to themselves, and for that reason do not want to see a common organization of the market in potatoes? Would he indicate the Member States that are really opposing a common organization, and would he also tell Mr Taylor that

Clinton

the only solution to his problem is to remove the border?

(Cries of 'Hear, Hear!')

President. — Commissioner Dalsager, I think the last part of the question is irrelevant to the basic question.

(Laughter)

Mr Dalsager. — *(DA)* I do not think I am under any obligation here in Question Time to answer the last question, which has been put by a former President of the Council and who very well knows the answer to the question. Mr Clinton, who was a member of the Council for a long time and who knows all the answers to his questions, should not put me into a position in which I am to say which countries are not prepared to adopt the measures for the regulation of the potato market, which have been on the Council table for so long.

Mr Newton Dunn. — If the Commissioner is unwilling to say which Member States are holding it up, will he at least explain to us what are the principal objections which they have?

Mr Dalsager. — *(DA)* The measures to regulate the potato market were put before Parliament and the Council many years ago. I do not think the time is right to discuss the technical details of a proposal which we should all be familiar with. If there is a wish to discuss this proposal once more in Parliament, the Commission is of course willing to do so, but I do not think that Question Time is the right forum of discussion.

President. — As the author is not present, Question No 6 will be answered in writing.

Question No 7, by Mr Flanagan (H-107/82):

What action can the Commission undertake for the workforce in the North of Ireland in view of the unprecedented loss of 1 150 jobs in the British Enkalon factory in Antrim, the loss of 1 100 jobs at the De Lorean car factory (both in the month of March) and the possible loss of a further 2 500 jobs at the Harland and Wolf shipyard in Belfast?

Mr Giolitti, Member of the Commission. — *(IT)* As Parliament is aware, the Commission is giving the greatest attention to the serious economic and social problems of Northern Ireland, among them those mentioned as examples by the honourable Member. The Commission is dedicating all the means at its disposal to the improvement of this situation, particularly

through contributing to the creation and preservation of jobs, which is after all still the principal objective.

The European Social Fund provides, for Northern Ireland, for intervention rates which have been increased by 10%. Furthermore, at the beginning of 1982 the Commission approved a pilot programme relative to a new type of training and development at Carrickfergus, intending to create new jobs through training and consultation activities in small and medium-sized companies.

In addition to the aid granted from the 'quota' section of the Regional Fund, in 1982 specific actions for regional development were adopted in the framework of the so-called 'non-quota' section. These measures are of great significance for the improvement of economic and social conditions in the frontier zones between Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland. Also in preparation is a so-called 'integrated operation' in favour of Belfast. In this context, in November of 1981, the Commission proposed to the Council a specific measure in favour of this region. This measure as well should have a positive effect on employment.

The European Investment Bank, for its part, is acting in Northern Ireland through the granting of loans, particularly for the financing of investments that have positive effects on the employment situation.

Similarly, the New Community Instrument, with its endowment of a billion ECU, permits the granting of loans in favour of projects for productive investments by small and medium-sized undertakings in that region. Furthermore, a whole series of measures was adopted by the Guidance Section of the Agricultural Fund in favour of Northern Ireland.

It should also be remembered that, in the application of the so-called 'supplementary measures' in favour of the United Kingdom, adopted on 27 October 1980, a part of the financial contribution was earmarked for the funding of programmes in Northern Ireland.

Finally, I should mention that the Commission, besides the 'aid for readaptation' provided for in the ECSC Treaty, has no other possibilities for direct aid to workers who have been dismissed.

Mr J. D. Taylor. — Could the Commissioner say when the Commission will be in a position to respond to Parliament's request of June last year that the Commission should examine the effect of Community membership on Northern Ireland and how the Community could further assist Northern Ireland?

Mr Giolitti. — *(IT)* I believed I had already answered that question. I furnished a list of the measures that the Commission has not only proposed, but also set in

Giolitti

operation for Northern Ireland. The list could be more detailed, but the time at my disposal obliged me to summarize the information I gave Parliament in response to the last question raised by the honourable Member.

Mrs Boot. — (NL) As there is a list of the measures taken by the Commission, I should like to ask the Commissioner what decision was actually taken in the Council to enable the measures that have been taken this year, because the Fund regulation expired on 1 January and we have not received a replacement proposal from you yet.

Mr Giolitti. — (IT) I must say that I don't understand which Fund you are referring to. If you are referring to the Regional Fund, then the Commission, as you know, has presented proposals for the modification of the regulation governing the Fund itself.

These proposals as well certainly favour Northern Ireland, because they provide for a concentration of resources, distributed in quotas, in the most disadvantaged regions, among which Northern Ireland is also included.

The Commission's proposals are now before the Council. Parliament has discussed this matter recently, giving the proposals themselves its full support.

Mr Hume. — Could I say to the Commissioner that there is widespread appreciation within Northern Ireland of the Commission's sympathy and interest in the problems, as instanced not only by the actions that you have outlined but also by the fact that so many Commissioners have taken time to come and visit Northern Ireland and see the problem at first hand themselves. Would the Commissioner agree with me that the Commission's job would be a great deal easier if the government authorities in Northern Ireland itself had a regional development programme for tackling the basic and serious economic problems of that region?

Mr Giolitti. — (IT) I am grateful to the honourable Member for mentioning the visits made by members of the Commission. I myself have been to Northern Ireland more than once but, in addition to the physical presence of various Commissioners in Northern Ireland, there are also the interventions and funds proposed by the Commission and approved by the Council.

Certainly, a more intensive effort can be made, which is what we intend to do, but all the measures and interventions of which I have spoken have been agreed — as laid down in the regulations governing the operation of the financial instruments — among the Community institutions and, in particular, between the Commission and its departments and the relevant

government authorities, not only at central level but also at the level of the regions. I believe that this type of collaboration can continue successfully.

President. — I think it was clear from the answer the Commissioner gave to Mrs Boot that he did not quite understand the question and the way she put it. I would therefore ask her put her question again referring to the Fund on which she wished to put a question.

Mrs Boot. — (NL) I shall try to put it as clearly as possible. The Commissioner says that we have a whole list of measures taken this year. I would like to know what Council decision has formed the basis for the measures that have been taken this year, because the Fund regulation expired on 1 January of this year and, to my knowledge, there has not been an extension for this year.

Mr Giolitti. — (IT) There has evidently been a misunderstanding. The Regional Fund will not be discontinued. It is the regulation for the Fund which is subject to revision. The Commission has submitted the pertinent modifications to the Council. Until the Council has made a decision, the preceding regulation remains in force. Therefore, the Regional Fund carries on its entire activity on the basis of the regulation which has not yet been modified, since — I repeat — only the Commission's proposals as yet exist. For now, the absence of a decision by the Council on this matter has no influence on the regular functioning of the Fund.

Mr McCartin. — Bearing in mind the crushing unemployment and economic problems that Northern Ireland has at this moment and at the same time that that region has had over a period of years the best package of regional aids and incentives that was available in all Europe, will the Commission undertake to do a study of how assistance from the European Community has been integrated with assistance already there to ascertain to what extent assistance given by the Community is replacing rather than additional to the incentives and assistances that were there before?

Mr Giolitti. — (IT) The Commission regularly provides information concerning the functioning of the various financial instruments in its annual reports on the different funds, reports which are also presented to Parliament. These reports contain items of information which are geographically differentiated in relation to the various regions where different instruments are used, particularly in regard to the Regional Fund. Special attention is given to particularly disadvantaged regions among which, as I said, Ireland is included, in view of the seriousness of the problems there.

Mr Seligman. — On a point of order, Madame President. This is the second time that the Commissioner

Seligman

for energy has not been present for Question Time, and I wonder whether the President would consider grouping questions by subject and being sure that the relevant Commissioner is present.

In the meantime, could I withdraw my question until he is present because the supplementaries really lose any point?

President. — You may of course withdraw your question at any time, Mr Seligman, and I will call Commissioner Tugendhat who wishes to make a comment on this.

Mr Tugendhat, Vice-President of the Commission. — I know the feelings of the House, when Commissioners are unavoidably absent, but I am afraid that at the moment Mr Davignon is in China and it would have been impossible for him to have returned for Question Time.

(Laughter)

President. — Thank you very much, Commissioner, for that explanation. I am sure Mr Seligman will agree that it would be an excessive amount of Community funds.

(Laughter)

We will put this question on to next time and hope that possibly the relevant Commissioner will be here.

Question No 9, by Mr Purvis (H-860/81)

What Community action is being taken to provide work permits and social-security support for Polish nationals stranded in Member States because of imposition of martial law in Poland?

Mr Richard, Member of the Commission. — The Commission understands the difficulties which may be faced by Polish nationals stranded in Member States because of the imposition of martial law in their country. Providing social security benefits and issuing work permits, however, are matters entirely for the authorities of the Member States concerned. Their national legislation applies. The Treaty of Rome, indeed, contains no provisions on which Community action in this area could be founded. The Commission is glad to see however that some Member States — France, the Federal Republic of Germany and Belgium — have already taken special measures in favour of Polish refugees following the imposition of martial law in Poland.

Mr Purvis. — The Commissioner is right that there is no particular basis for Community action by the Com-

mission but I feel that in view of the pathetic state of many of these people — some I have come across are literally destitute and now wondering what on earth they are going to do — would it not be just nice gesture on the part of the Commission to bring it up at a meeting with the Member States to see if they could not concert action so that work permits and social security could be provided to these (effectively) refugees while they are stranded in the Community? It would hardly cost that much and would be a very welcome gesture, I would have thought, by all the citizens of the Community.

Mr Richard. — The short answer to the honourable gentleman's question is yes. I think it would be worth bringing it to the attention of Member States and I am sure, indeed, that the fact that this question has been asked and the fact that I am answering it in this way will indeed bring it to their attention.

President. — Since they deal with the same subject, I call Question No 10, which was tabled by Mr Pranchère but has been taken over by Mr Martin (H-8/82):

Can the Commission state whether the UK's net contribution to the Community budget in 1980 and 1981 will be smaller than provided for by the agreement of 30 May? Is the Commission resolved to ask the Council to remedy this situation and, if so, what remedies does it propose?

and Question No 17, by Mr Clinton (H-112/82):

Having regard to Annexe II to Council Regulation 2 744 of 27 October 1980, on what basis did the Commission estimate that the net UK contribution to the Community budget would be 1 784 million EUA for 1980 and 2 140 million EUA for 1981? When were these estimates made? What was the actual net UK contribution in respect of these years? What is the difference between the estimated and actual contribution in respect of each year, and what are the reasons for the difference, if any, in each case?

Mr Tugendhat, Vice-President of the Commission. — For the reasons explained in the reply to Written Question No 1427/81 by Mr Schieler the net contribution of the United Kingdom in 1980 and 1981 will be lower than the figures of May 30 1980. According to the most recent estimates the difference is around 270 million ECU for 1980 and some 720 million ECU for 1981. The text adopted by the Council on 30 May 1980 contains specific provisions for dealing with an increase in the British net contribution but not for a decrease. On 25 May 1982, after these questions were tabled, of course, the Ministers for Foreign Affairs agreed that corrections to be made for 1980 and 1981 in the light of the actual figures would be taken into account when negotiating the subsequent solution.

Mr Martin. — (*FR*) Can the Commission give details of its proposals for the distribution between the Member States of the compensation to the United Kingdom in respect of its budgetary contribution amounting to 850 million ECU in 1982, and how does the Council view these proposals?

Mr Tugendhat. — At this stage I cannot do that because these matters are still being considered. The outlines of the agreement on May 25 are, of course, clear but the precise details have yet to be worked out and I hope that we are able to bring the negotiations to a successful conclusion at the council which will take place next week.

Miss Quin. — As I read Mr Pranchère's question, it seemed to me that the idea behind it was that it would somehow be shocking if the United Kingdom were to pay less as a contribution to the Community budget than had been envisaged. Does the Commissioner not agree with me that Britain, as a State with a lower average level of prosperity in the EEC, should be in a position to benefit from, rather than be penalized by, the Common Market budget? Perhaps the socialist principle 'from each according to his means, to each according to his needs' should be applied to EEC budgetary questions.

(*Laughter*)

Mr Tugendhat. — The Commission has throughout, I think, made clear that it believes that the way to tackle the Community's budgetary problems is by developing a fuller and more complete range of Community policies in order that the flows of funds from those policies may reflect more closely the needs not just of the Member States but of the Community as a whole and, of course, of individuals and regions within the Community. It is the way in which this matter has been looked at in exclusively national terms — on all sides of the argument, I hasten to add, and indeed in many quarters of this House — which has created the difficulties. If we could think of developing the Community further, it might be possible to deal with this sort of problem a great deal more easily.

Mr Rogalla. — (*DE*) The Vice-President's last answer makes it easier for me to so formulate the question that it goes beyond the purely British aspect. Apart from national considerations there are other than financial considerations in the evaluation of the Community budget.

My question to the Commission is therefore as follows: have they yet considered the pros and cons of EEC membership for each Member State unconnected with the budget, is there any study in progress or has any relevant specialist institute in Europe been entrusted with such a study in which in addition to

budgetary aspects all other political and economic aspects, advantages and disadvantages for each Member State, arising out of Community membership, have been examined?

Mr Tugendhat. — It is a pleasure to answer a question from Mr Rogalla, whom I used to know well in a different capacity. I am glad, too, that he has drawn attention to the fact that the benefits of Community membership cannot, of course, be measured purely in budgetary terms. Indeed, the budget is a small part of the whole picture, and important as it is, it needs to be understood that it is a small part. I can assure him that the wider issues to which he has drawn attention are very much on our minds, and indeed I spend a great deal of time travelling round the United Kingdom trying to draw the attention of my compatriots of all parties and of none to the wider issues that are involved and to the wider considerations that ought to be taken into account.

Mr Welsh. — I am sure that everyone would wish to pay tribute to Mr Tugendhat's determined efforts to get that point through to the United Kingdom.

Does the Commission have any idea of what its timetable will be for submitting its proposals to the Council for the follow-up to the settlement that has recently taken place, and would he agree with me that it is of the utmost urgency and importance that these matters are concluded in a satisfactory way as soon as possible?

Mr Tugendhat. — The answer to the first part of the question was specified in the agreement itself — that is to say, November; and the answer to the second part of the question is yes.

President. — Question No 11, by Mr Simmonds (H-136/82):¹

Having regard to Document COM (82) 24 final, Annex 7, page 4, in view of the Commission's interest in the rational use of energy, in the light of recent progress in the development of alternative lighting and heating controls using micro-processors, and wishing to give greater publicity to this recommendation, will the Commission make proposals encouraging the Member States to offer tax incentives for the installation of such equipment and to exclude them from value-added tax?

Mr Tugendhat, Vice-President of the Commission. — The Commission reaffirms the importance that it

¹ Former oral question without debate (0-5/82), converted into a question for Question Time.

Tugendhat

attaches to all measures encouraging the rational use of energy and especially to those mentioned by the honourable Member with respect to new electronic control systems for heating and lighting.

The Commission recalls that in the draft recommendation attached to Doc. COM (82) 24, to which the honourable Member refers and which is at present being considered by the Council, the Commission made proposals for a series of administrative, technical, financial and fiscal measures to encourage investment in URE.

One of these recommendations is that Member States should examine the possibility of using the lowest VAT rate in force in order to encourage consumers to purchase energy-efficient plant and equipment. This proposal is in line with the concerns expressed by the honourable Member.

On VAT, the Commission considers that the application of reduced rates is desirable in certain defined cases. However, the Commission also takes the view that the fundamental concept of VAT as a general tax on consumption is incompatible with the proliferation of sectoral exemptions, which would seriously impair the transparency of the tax structure and could not fail to give rise to demands for their extension to other sectors of the economy which are equally deserving of special attention.

One of the objectives of the common VAT system is, in short, to avoid as far as possible all fiscal discrimination. It follows that an exemption in favour of energy-saving equipment would be necessarily discriminatory and could give rise to delicate technical problems.

This policy on VAT exemption has been stated on several occasions by the Commission, especially in replies to written and oral questions by Mrs Ewing and Mr Price.

Mr Simmonds. — Will the Commissioner accept my apologies and my disassociation from some of the wording of my question? I think it has been translated through the six official languages and back again before it has gone into this text.

(Laughter)

Further, will the Commissioner accept my assurance, that this is the nicest answer and the nicest way of saying no that I have ever had to a question that I have tabled? But will the Commissioner further recognize that taxation is actually a direct disincentive to people to invest in energy-saving devices and therefore other incentives to encourage people to invest in them are in effect being nullified by his answer today?

Mr Tugendhat. — I am grateful to the honourable Member for his kind words. I should also, in answer to

the previous question, have thanked Mr Welsh for his, and I do so gladly now.

I take the point which the honourable Member has made. As the Commissioner responsible for taxation, if not for energy, I would emphasize the point I made before, that VAT is supposed to be a general tax; there are a great many meritorious investments and other schemes deserving of support, and if one tried to operate through derogations from VAT one would make nonsense of the VAT itself. The Commission is, however, aware of the problems to which he drew attention and we have in fact analysed the obstacles that hinder the different Member States in adequately carrying out investments in the field of the rational use of energy. In Doc COM (82) 24 and in the tax recommendation, we propose a series of national measures which, we believe, could help to overcome the difficulties encountered.

I would also like to point out that the Commission will be submitting to the Council in the near future a proposal for a decision authorizing a grant under the general budget of the Community of supplementary incentives for Community loans accorded to four categories of investment in the field specifically mentioned in the question. These are the production of district heat from thermal industrial waste and solid residual fuels, the conversion to coal of combustion installations in industry using fuel-oil, the preparational operations from imported coal, and the use of urban, agricultural and industrial waste. Loans concerning these investment categories could benefit from interest rate bonuses to the order of three financial points though the general financial budget, which is, of course, an additional form of assistance.

Mrs Ewing. — Could I ask the Commissioner if he could for the moment ignore the part of the question about exclusion from VAT and look at the other part which was a suggestion that the Commission would make proposals to encourage Member States to offer tax incentives? Could I also ask him to look, as I did last week, at the windmill situation in Denmark where windmill owners can own an asset which is at the same time plugged into the grid — if as a layman I can use inexact language — to their own advantage so that they can end by doing what everyone wants to do: to use alternative energy? Could those of us with windy places who look with envy on Denmark, ask the Commission whether he has any sympathy for the Danish Government's internal tax incentives so that we might in a treeless land end up with a forest of windmills?

Mr Tugendhat. — I must say that as Question Time progresses I begin to feel that the interpreters might almost be sent home as it appears to be such an exclusively anglophone activity.

(Interruption by Mrs Ewing)

Tugendhat

I think 'anglophone' . . . I mean 'anglophone' are people who speak English which I think is the language we are exchanging our remarks in at the moment.

(Laughter)

But, seriously, I think the points which the honourable Member has raised are certainly deserving of study. The questions of alternative energy in particular — such things as windmills and the sun and so forth — have received an increasing amount of attention in recent years.

It must of course be remembered that their applicability varies very considerably depending on the geography and other physical characteristics of the areas in question and I am not quite sure whether what is applicable to Denmark in these circumstances would necessarily be applicable in the islands from which both of us come. However I will certainly convey her points to my colleagues.

Mr Price. — In his original reply, the Commissioner seemed to acknowledge the value of this kind of system in conserving energy. Can I ask him a question rather nearer his own portfolio as a result, whether the Commission themselves employ computer-controlled systems on their own buildings to conserve energy and reduce costs and, if not, whether they will be taking steps in this direction?

Mr Tugendhat. — I must confess that I do not know precisely how the energy consumption of the Commission buildings is controlled, though I do recall that when we looked into this matter after the energy crisis in the late 1970s we were able at that time to reduce our electricity consumption by 25% and as the honourable Member will discover if he comes into the Commission buildings on Saturdays, even though a number of people work at those times, the heating is turned down, as it is indeed over the rest of the weekend.

President. — As the author is not present, Question No 12 will be answered in writing.

Question No 13, by Mr Radoux (H-56/82):

Subject: Resolutions tabled at Parliament's July 1981 part-session on the improvement of inter-institutional relations and their operation

Will the Commission say what progress has been made on this matter, having regard to the fact that an answer should have been given by 31 December 1981?

Mr Andriessen, Member of the Commission. — *(NL)* I must say that I am rather surprised by this question

because it implies that the Commission has done nothing and has not reacted to what was said in Parliament since it adopted its resolutions.

May I begin by pointing out that the Commission submitted to Parliament in October of last year a report which refers explicitly to the resolutions adopted by the Assembly and announces a number of practical proposals. May I also point out that I myself announced to the Assembly in December 1981 that the Commission would be putting forward a proposal for the improvement and extension of the conciliation procedure in the legislative area, and may I also say that, after this Parliament had adopted the Blumenfeld resolution, the Commission did forward a proposal to you some time ago — I think it was on 27 May — relating to an extension of conciliation with respect to the conclusion of international agreements.

We are somewhat surprised that Parliament has evidently not yet found an opportunity to discuss these proposals.

Mr Radoux. — *(FR)* Thank you, Commissioner, I do not wish to put a supplementary question. But I am no longer surprised now.

President. — Question No 14, by Mr Enright (H-156/82):¹

1. Is the Commission aware of the inadequacy of medical care facilities at European holiday resorts and that this constitutes grave risk to holidaymakers?
2. Is the Commission aware that where there may be many hotels but few and inadequate hospitals and clinics, it is common practice in cases of accident on holiday to repatriate the patient (at their own expense) before giving adequate treatment?
3. Is the Commission aware that there have been emergency cases in which this practice has led to unnecessary loss of life and serious permanent injury?
4. Does the Commission know that harmonized Community social security services are not functioning in practice, and that patients are not always completely covered and may even have to pay much more for medicinal treatment than in their own Member State?
5. Given that the Commission expresses concern about the need for Community action on environmental health and pollution problems at holiday resorts, what action is it proposing to take about the totally inadequate medical

¹ Former oral question without debate (0-22/82), converted into a question for Question Time.

President

care facilities available to European holiday-makers?

Mr Richard, Member of the Commission. — The honourable gentleman's question falls into five parts.

As to parts 1, 2, 3 and 5, I have to tell him that the organization of health services and the establishment of medical care facilities are the responsibility of the national authorities and not the Commission.

As far as part 4 of the question is concerned, Community regulations on social security for migrant workers did not set up a particular scheme harmonizing national legislations on social security but are confined to the coordination of this legislation.

Under the provisions of Community regulations, people such as holidaymakers who are staying on the territory of a Member State may receive benefits in kind, medical treatment, hospital services, drugs and medicines, etc. in cases where there is an urgent need for such services as if they were insured under the social security legislation of the Member State in which they are staying. The sole condition being that they are entitled to the sickness insurance benefits of the Member State in which they are resident, which I hope so far the honourable gentleman will agree is fair enough. They must submit the appropriate certificate, which I am told is Form E 111, to the institution of the place in which they are staying. Now, for this purpose, they should obtain the certificate before their departure from their country of residence. The Commission disseminates this information as widely as possible in the form of press releases, circulated before the holiday season. I am therefore grateful to have the opportunity this afternoon to repeat this procedure.

It is our view that the above mentioned provisions are on the whole properly applied and with reasonably satisfactory results. Where persons requiring medical services find they are paying more than necessary, in the Commission's experience it is usually because they do not go to the establishments or the doctors covered by contracts with the social security institutions.

Mr Enright. — The Commissioner must surely be aware that he will have caused very severe disappointment by his reply to parts 1, 2, 3 and 5 of the question quite simply because the Commission appears able to pontificate on what colour water should be in resorts but not on how much medical provision there should be in a resort for it to be a holiday resort. That is within the competence of the Community. Will the Commissioner therefore please assure us that he will address himself to this problem, use his well-known Welsh ingenuity and come up with a reply which will be convincing to the ordinary members of the Community who judge the Community by this sort of nonsense.

Mr Richard. — I am sorry Mr Enright thinks that this is nonsense. I can only say that I thought his supplementary was somewhat intemperate. No doubt when he has considered the matter, he would like to re-phrase it.

I have to say this to him. It is not a question of sympathy. It is a question of competence. If the Commission does not have competence in a certain matter then there is very little that we can do about it. With great respect, the type of remark that Mr Enright has made this afternoon would not serve to give the Commission competence in the area in which the Member States have not been prepared to give us competence and in which we at the moment do not have it. Having said all that, I am prepared to have a look at it and see if I can find a bit of competence somewhere which may help Mr Enright's constituents.

Sir David Nicolson. — I must ask a supplementary question on this matter. I first raised it in January this year after a most dreadful accident to one of my constituents and following a large number of letters from other sufferers indicating a terrific muddle and inadequacy in facilities when accidents occur in some areas. I have not really felt there has been a positive reply to the questions which I put down. I want to ask the Commission if they are aware that, because of the explosion of cheap air travel and tourist traffic which we experience today, we are facing a new situation and we must recognize this. If our member countries want the benefits of this huge tourist trade, then they must organize themselves adequately in terms of tourist information, insurance and services.

Some of the people who are suffering from accidents do not know how to go about getting repatriated after an accident. It may involve an air ambulance. Well here we are with the holiday season on us again. Must we expect a further series of terrible accident cases and muddles and inadequate facilities? Or is the Commission going to study this subject seriously now and see if some action can be taken soon?

Mr Richard. — I am bound to say I really do not think that will do. As far as the Commission is concerned, we have gone as far as we can within the competence that we have and we are now in the situation where, if somebody goes abroad and he gets — as we say he should do and as everybody else says he should do — the appropriate form before he goes, showing that he is entitled to medical benefits in the country where he resides, then if there is an urgent need for hospital treatment in the country to which he is going, he is entitled to get it.

Now, I am quite prepared to look at this again, but it would be quite wrong of me, frankly, to hold out any great hope for the Parliament or to the honourable gentleman who asked the supplementaries that there is

Richard

any easy way of radically changing the situation. In the Commission's view there is not.

President. — I think we cannot pursue this question any further now.

(Mr Sherlock asked to speak)

Mr Sherlock, I would like to point out that for some time now we have been following the procedure, which seems to have been accepted by all groups in this Parliament, of taking one member of the same nationality of the same group. I have done that as far as your group is concerned. If at any stage later on Members of this Parliament as a whole wish this procedure to be changed, we can of course do so. For the time being this has been accepted as a reasonable way of dealing with Question Time.

Mr Sherlock. — Madam President, on a particular point of order. No one has yet acknowledged that my committee, the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, has embarked upon some measures which could well embrace some of the topics which Sir David Nicolson, the Commissioner and Mr Enright have dealt with so faithfully and so well. I think that the fact that the committee has already taken the decision to appoint a rapporteur is something that the House should be informed of.

President. — Thank you, Mr Sherlock, for that very interesting and very informative point of order.

Question No 15, by Miss Hooper (H-66/82):

The Commission has recently written to Member States expressing the opinion that in certain circumstances customs duty should be charged on goods of third country origin which are purchased by travellers who are making journeys to and from Community countries; in view of the widespread interest in this subject, will the Commission state what developments have taken place in this respect?

Mr Tugendhat, Vice-President of the Commission. — In its letter of 2 February 1982, the Commission asked the Member States to charge, from the 31 March 1982 at the latest, the customs duties and agricultural levies on products imported from third countries, sold in tax-free shops to persons travelling solely within the Community. The obligation to charge such customs duties and levies derives implicitly from the Court of Justice's judgment in the 'butterships' case.

No action having been taken in response to the Commission's request, it initiated infringement procedures against all the Member States. On 28 April the Com-

mission decided to pursue the infringement procedures. The legal opinions are now being drafted.

Miss Hooper. — I should like to thank the Commissioner for his reply, but there does in fact seem to be a great deal of doubt and conjecture about this particular issue. In view of this, may I ask him if the original letter written by Commissioner Narjes to the Member States has actually been published so that people who are interested, which includes not only producers of duty-free goods but travel operators, airport operators as well as the travelling public, can be in no doubt as to the points that the Commissioner was pursuing. Indeed would the Commissioner be prepared to say that the Commission is not in fact going to further interpret the decision to which he refers, which seems to be the cause of many of the problems?

Mr Tugendhat. — I am very grateful to the honourable Member for her supplementary because she is quite right, there does seem to be a certain amount of uncertainty on this score and I am delighted to have a further opportunity, and I emphasize the word further, to try to dispel it. The Commission has no intention whatsoever of further interpreting this judgment.

We were obliged to act as we did because of the decision by the Court; we certainly do not wish to move any further than we have done. I myself have made a number of speeches in the United Kingdom pointing out that the overwhelming bulk of sales in duty-free shops, made up of goods of Community origin — whisky, brandy, gin, for instance — perfume, cigarettes, etc. — all things made in the Community, are quite unaffected by this judgment and I have done everything possible, and I am sure that my colleagues have done the same, to draw the attention of the general public to the fact that duty-free shopping will continue really pretty much unaffected by what has happened. Obviously if you want to buy a Japanese watch or something like Russian caviar, the price may be altered although the profit margins in these shops are so enormous that they could afford to shave them a little. But all the things that are actually produced in the Community are unaffected by it.

I only wish that the press in our own country as well as in others would devote as much attention to the kind of assurance that I am giving now as they have to some of the scare stories that have been put round and I only wish that the operators of the duty-free shops and the people who run the airports and the ports and the ferries and everything else would stop spreading alarm and despondency. We have given every sort of assurance that we can and I am doing so here and I have done so elsewhere and I am sure my colleague has as well. I am grateful to the honourable Member for giving me the opportunity to repeat what I have said before which will, I hope, bring solace to all those people who are going to the holiday resorts which Mr Enright mentioned a few moments ago.

President. — Question No 16, by Mr McCartin (H-111/82):

Land improvement grants of up to 70% of total costs are provided for in Regulation 1820/80. Is the Commission aware that, because of the method used by the Irish authorities in arriving at total costs, the grants actually paid often represent only half the grant level, and can the Commission take any action to rectify the position?

Mr Dalsager, Member of the Commission. — (DA) Article 21 (2) of Council Regulation No 1820/80 on the promotion of agricultural development in the less-favoured areas of Western Ireland states only that support for land improvement pursuant to the Regulation may not exceed 70% of the cost of the measures in question. The detailed administrative provisions are the responsibility of the Member State concerned.

Mr McCartin. — Can the Commission state when they sanctioned this scheme whether the Irish Government in fact indicated to them the particular percentage grant which they would be paying? Would it accept that the costing is two years old, or is it the cost of doing the job at the present time? Does the Commission consider that this scheme is part of one of the instruments by which the European Community wishes to assist in underdeveloped regions, that this scheme is closely identified with the European Community, that the 70% which is being paid is not a percentage but an arbitrary figure fixed two years ago which is bringing a Community scheme into disrepute? Will the Minister consult with the Irish Government about the administration of this scheme and ask for clarification?

Mr Dalsager. — (DA) The position with arrangements of that kind is that the Member States must of course administer under their own responsibility *vis-à-vis* the Communities the rules adopted as Community regulations. I do not know whether the questioner wants us to change the degree to which these rules are administered by the national governments. We are of course doing this to a certain extent, but not radically. If there is anyone who has any complaint regarding the implementation of the regulations in Western Ireland, the Commission will of course look into the matter. I have not previously been aware of any complaints on the administration of these regulations and I have not had an opportunity to ask my department about the matter. If there are such complaints, obviously we shall take them up but, on the other hand, the regulation, in the form in which it was adopted, is an outline regulation under which the Irish government may provide aid which need not necessarily be 70%.

President. — Questions Nos 18 and 19 have been postponed until the next part-session.

Question No 20 by Mr Dalziel (H-126/82):

In view of the dissatisfaction felt by many individual householders in Scotland who have received inadequate compensation which does not fully take account of the severe damage done to their properties and their consequent hardship, will the Commission reconsider prior to the coming winter the manner of determining the amount of Community aid to householders affected by severe winter weather in order to give more satisfactory and just results?

Mr Giolitti, Member of the Commission. — (IT) When on 22 January of this year the Commission decided to grant emergency aid to the amount of 1 250 000 ECUs in favour of the British people seriously affected by bad weather conditions between the end of 1981 and the 1982, it took as a basis, as is its custom, the estimates available immediately after the disaster. Since emergency Community aid essentially constitutes an immediate and gratuitous demonstration of solidarity from the other peoples of the Community towards those stricken by disaster, the Commission cannot reopen the discussion on the considerations which led to this decision.

Mr Dalziel. — That is a slightly unsatisfactory answer. What I actually asked the Commissioner was whether he could see any ways in which they could reconsider how they actually arrive at the total allocation of funds and I would be grateful if the Commissioner could perhaps respond to that particular part of my question.

Mr Giolitti. — (IT) The Commission has already replied that it cannot reconsider the question, because in this case as well we have followed the rules and customs which are usually applied in similar cases.

Mr Beazley. — Might I ask the Commissioner if he is aware that the sums of money that it was possible to distribute in the form of aid during the winter were in fact so small that they caused not only difficulties for the fortunate recipients of that aid but very considerable concern in those other parts of the country, including that which I have the honour to represent, Bedfordshire, which received nothing at all? My question therefore is, is the Commissioner satisfied that this form of distributing aid is really best continued in the form that it was; can more sums of money be made available or can they be distributed more equitably?

Mr Giolitti. — (IT) I do not believe that the conditions on the basis of which this aid was distributed can be considered unfair, and therefore I do not believe that the rules governing the distribution should be reviewed.

Giolitti

As for the total amount of this aid, it is certainly insufficient, especially to the extent that it has to do with particularly serious episodes. There is no doubt that the total amount of resources does not correspond to the needs, as is nearly always the case in circumstances of this nature. I undertake to call the Commission's attention to the question that has now been raised in Parliament, so that the amounts may better correspond to the needs they are to meet.

President. — The first part of Question Time is closed.¹

I think the House would wish me to acknowledge that we have had six Members of the Commission here this evening to answer our questions.

(Applause)

I call Mr Bournias.

Mr Bournias. — *(GR)* Madam President, I ask that Question No 24 by Mr Gondikas should be held over until the next part-session. It relates to an ethical matter and as such we should have an opportunity to discuss it in this House.

President. — Yes, the question will be postponed until the next part-session.

(The sitting was closed at 7.30 p.m.)¹

¹ See Annex of 16. 6. 82.

¹ Agenda for the next sitting: see Minutes.

SITTING OF WEDNESDAY, 16 JUNE 1982

Contents

<i>Mrs Gredal; Mr Griffiths; Mr Moreland; Mr Forth; Mrs Squarcialupi</i>	106	<i>maecker; Mr Karl Fuchs; Mr De Keersmaecker; Mr de Ferranti; Mr De Keersmaecker</i>	141
1. <i>Hunger in the world — Report (Doc. 1-281/82) by Mr Michel and oral questions with debate by Mr Pannella, Mrs Bonino, Mr Vandemeulebroucke, Mr Gendebien and Mr Capanna to the Commission (Doc. 1-257/82) and to the Council (Doc. 1-258/82) and by Mr Fuchs, Mr Cohen, Mrs Dury, Mr Enright and Mrs Focke to the Commission (Doc. 1-260/82)</i>	107	<i>Question No 55, by Mr Deleau: Trade negotiations:</i>	
<i>Mr Michel; Mr De Keersmaecker (Council); Mr Pisani (Commission); Mrs Focke; Mr Vergeer; Mr Christopher Jackson; Mr Ferrero; Mr Poniatowski; Mr Israël; Mr Pannella; Mr Gérard Fuchs; Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti; Mr Pearce; Mr Irmer; Mr Cohen; Mr Narducci; Mr Turner; Mr Gremetz; Mrs Pruvot; Mr Vergès; Mr Pisani; Mr Pannella; Mr Michel; Mr Pannella</i>	108	<i>Mr De Keersmaecker; Mr Deleau; Mr De Keersmaecker; Mr Marshall; Mr De Keersmaecker; Mrs Hoffmann; Mr De Keersmaecker; Mr Habsburg; Mr De Keersmaecker</i>	143
2. <i>Question Time (Doc. 1-330/82) (continuation)</i>		<i>Question No 56, by Mr Remilly: Holding of a joint Council meeting on social affairs and economic affairs:</i>	
<i>Questions to the Council:</i>		<i>Mr De Keersmaecker; Mr Boyes; Mr De Keersmaecker; Mr Pearce</i>	143
<i>Questions No 51, by Mr Seligman; Majority vote in Council; No 66, by Mr Bøgh: Right of veto; and No 69, by Mr Purvis: Voting in the Council of Ministers:</i>		<i>Question No 57, by Mrs Gaiotti de Biase: Community aid to Poland:</i>	
<i>Mr De Keersmaecker (Council); Mr Seligman; Mr De Keersmaecker; Mr Purvis; Mr De Keersmaecker; Mr Radoux; Mr De Keersmaecker; Ms Clwyd; Mr De Keersmaecker; Mr Purvis; Mr De Keersmaecker; Mr Lange; Mr De Keersmaecker; Mr Kirk; Mr De Keersmaecker</i>	139	<i>Mr De Keersmaecker; Mr Marshall; Mrs Kelllett-Bowman; Mr Harris; Mr Balfe; Mrs Gaiotti de Biase; Mr De Keersmaecker; Mr Alavanos; Mr De Keersmaecker</i>	144
<i>Question No 52, by Mr Radoux: Invitation from the International Labour Organization to hold a pan-European meeting:</i>		<i>Question No 58, by Mr Bord: Effect of enlargement on relations between the Community and Israel:</i>	
<i>Mr De Keersmaecker</i>	141	<i>Mr De Keersmaecker; Mr Marshall; Mr De Keersmaecker; Mr Alavanos; Mr De Keersmaecker</i>	146
<i>Question No 53, by Mr Hutton: Delays in decision-taking by the Council:</i>		<i>Question No 59, by Mr Haagerup: The Portuguese Constitution:</i>	
<i>Mr De Keersmaecker; Mr Hutton; Mr De Keersmaecker; Mr Newton Dunn; Mr De Keersmaecker; Mr Eisma; Mr De Keers-</i>		<i>Mr De Keersmaecker; Mr Haagerup; Mr De Keersmaecker; Mrs Ewing; Mr Pearce; Mr Harris; Miss Quin; Mr Israël; Mrs Ewing</i>	146
		<i>Questions to the Foreign Ministers:</i>	
		<i>Question No 77, by Mr Pesmazoglou: Continued Turkish occupation of Cypriot territories:</i>	
		<i>Mr De Keersmaecker (Foreign Ministers); Mr Pesmazoglou; Mr De Keersmaecker; Mr Pearce; Mr De Keersmaecker; Mr Plaskovitis; Mr De Keersmaecker</i>	148
		<i>Question No 78, by Mr Kyrkos: International conference on the Cyprus question:</i>	
		<i>Mr Alavanos; Mr Ephremidis; Mr De Keersmaecker; Mr Kyrkos; Mr De Keersmaecker; Mr Ephremidis; Mr De Keersmaecker</i>	149

<i>Question No 79, by Mr Hutton: Chemical warfare:</i>		3. <i>Science and technology for development — Report (Doc. 1-202/82) by Mrs Rabbethge</i>	
<i>Mr De Keersmaeker; Mr Hutton; Mr De Keersmaeker; Mr Israël; Mr De Keersmaeker; Mr Boyes; Mr De Keersmaeker</i>	149	<i>Mrs Rabbethge</i>	151
<i>Question to the Council:</i>		4. <i>Votes</i>	153
<i>Question No 60, by Mrs Ewing: Common fisheries policy:</i>		<i>Mr Enright; Mr Berkhouwer; Mr Pranchère; Mr Maffre-Baugé</i>	153
<i>Mr De Keersmaeker (Council); Mrs Ewing; Mr Harris; Mr Kirk</i>	150	<i>Annexes</i>	155

IN THE CHAIR: MR NIKOLAOU

Vice-President

(The sitting was opened at 9.00 a.m.)¹

President. — I call Mrs Gredal.

Mrs Gredal. — (DA) I rise on a point of order concerning the report we debated on Monday on relations between the USA and the European Parliament. Because of a technical error on the part of Parliament's administration, the amendments approved by the Political Affairs Committee do not appear in the final edition of the report, and I would therefore ask the President to take steps to ensure that the final edition appears in the version approved by the Political Affairs Committee. It is the explanatory statement which is involved and not the resolution itself. The definitive explanatory statement was sent to the appropriate department of Parliament as early as 28 May, and the changes to be made concern pages 10, 11 and 12 of the report. I would ask you to ensure that these changes are made.

President. — Mrs Gredal, your remarks have been noted, and the Minutes will be corrected accordingly.

I call Mr Griffiths.

Mr Griffiths. — Mr President, during yesterday's proceedings Mr Moreland brought up the question of a motion for a resolution to wind up a debate on an oral question. It says in the Minutes that Mr Moreland spoke but it says nothing at all about the ruling by the President. The President, on the basis of an interpreta-

tion of Rule 42 of the Rules of Procedure given by the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions on 5 May 1981, ruled that there could be no resolution to wind up the oral question with debate because it was included for debate with a report on the agenda of the Parliament for this week. Now that report deals with the nuclear aspects of an energy strategy for the Community whereas the oral question is on contracts to import coal from third countries. Now there is no way that amendments can be put down to the report on the nuclear aspects of energy strategy relating to an oral question concerning the import of coal from third countries. I think the President has placed the House in an impossible position. I would rather we had a new ruling which would allow a motion for a resolution to be tabled to wind up the debate on the oral question.

President. — You are right, Mr Griffiths. No-one can table amendments to the report you mentioned. Your remarks have been noted by the House.¹

Mr Griffiths. — Mr President, I think you have possibly misunderstood what I was saying. The point I was making about yesterday's ruling of the President was that a report on the nuclear aspects of energy was being coupled with a debate on an oral question about coal imports and that it was impossible to put amendments about coal imports to a report on a nuclear-energy strategy for the Community. And that therefore the President ought to allow a resolution to be put to wind up the debate on the oral question. I was seeking a ruling about that particular matter. Otherwise it will be impossible to put down amendments about coal imports to a report on nuclear-energy strategy.

President. — Mr Griffiths, after consulting the Secretariat I must inform you that you should have brought

¹ Approval of minutes — Documents received (announcement): see Minutes.

¹ Topical and urgent debates (announcement) — Speaking time: see Minutes.

President

this matter up when the subject was raised yesterday. The agenda for today has been established in accordance with Rule 56, and we cannot change it. It is, however, proposed that the deadline for tabling amendments be extended to 6 p.m. this evening.

Do you agree to this proposal by the Bureau?

I call Mr Moreland.

Mr Moreland. — Mr President, on a point of clarification: first of all, if I may say so, in relation to your previous comments, I did in fact raise this matter at the beginning of yesterday's sitting. Can we now take it that there is the right, as in fact the Rules suggest, for us to submit a motion for an early vote to wind up the oral question which debate? Can we take it that that is now the situation?

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, in accordance with Rule 87 of the Rules of Procedure, I have received from Mr De Pasquale, Chairman of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning a request for adjournment of the debate on the report (Doc. 1-295/82) by Mr Faure on urban concentration. This report is entered as Item 123 on the agenda for Thursday. I shall consult the House on this request at the start of Thursday's sitting.

I call Mr Moreland.

Mr Moreland. — Mr President, this may be a problem of translation, but it would appear to us, certainly in English, that you are giving contradictory answers to the points raised by Mr Griffiths and myself. As far as I can see, if an oral question with debate is tabled and accepted by the Bureau, as in fact happened, and it has not been changed into an oral question for Question Time or an oral question without debate, then there is the right, under the Rules, to submit a resolution for an early vote. I think that is what Mr Griffiths is getting at, and it is what I was trying to get at yesterday; and we would assume that we have the right to do that.

President. — Mr Moreland, your question concerned the debate on the report by Mr Pintat. As I have already told you, all we can do is to extend the deadline for tabling amendments to 6 p.m.

I call Mr Forth.

Mr Forth. — Mr President, about the announcement you have just made concerning the proposal or request by Mr De Pasquale to postpone dealing with the report from the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning: could you please do us the courtesy of explaining why this is so? I think we are enti-

led to an explanation as to why something on the agenda has apparently been taken off it. Could we please know?

President. — Mr Forth, I simply announced Mr De Pasquale's request. There was no explanation. The matter will be considered on Thursday morning, when Mr Faure's report was originally supposed to be debated.

I call Mrs Squarcialupi.

Mrs Squarcialupi. — (IT) Mr President, would you kindly state the number and title of the report for which an adjournment has been requested, since the simultaneous interpreting would appear to indicate that this adjournment involves a report on which the Committee on the Environment has still to express its opinion

President. — Gladly. It is Doc. 1-295/82 by Mr Faure. There was obviously a mistake in the interpreting.

1. *Hunger in the world*

President. — The next item is the joint debate on the report (Doc. 1-281/82) by Mr Michel, on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation, on hunger in the world, and on the following oral questions:

— by Mr Pannella and others to the Commission (Doc. 1-257/82):

Subject: The Nobel Prize Winners' manifesto and the EEC's contribution to the fight against world hunger

Why has the Commission failed to take action on European Parliament Resolution No 1375/81 on the Nobel Prize Winners' manifesto and the EEC's contribution to the fight against world hunger, forwarded to the Community institutions on 9 October 1981?

Is the Commission aware that what the Commission has been asked and has repeatedly failed to do has nothing to do with the activities rightly described by Commissioner Pisani as absurd or harmful, but concerns an emergency plan and an operational funding project which should have been submitted to the Council 30 and 45 days respectively following the adoption of the resolution? Is it further aware that the European Parliament has never asked it to assume sole responsibility for implementing the emergency plan?

Does the Commission realize that by acting in this manner it has in fact stood in the way of appro-

President

priate interinstitutional action and by preventing a Council decision in the matter, has obstructed the European Parliament's solemn appeal to save at least 5 million lives, this at a time when the highest representatives of the United Nations and the governments of the ten Member States had, acting with the utmost speed, agreed to the European Parliament's requests by declaring, for example, their readiness to contribute to the funding of the emergency plan?

— by Mr Pannella and others to the Council (Doc. 1-258/82):

Subject: The Nobel Prize Winners' manifesto and the EEC's contribution to the fight against world hunger

Does not the Council consider that it should urgently request the Commission to provide it with the financial plans and the emergency aid programmes to combat world hunger which the Commission should have submitted to the Council between 9 and 24 November 1981 following European Parliament Resolution No 1-375/81 on the Nobel Prize Winners' manifesto and starvation?

Does not the President of the Council, who was one of the most influential signatories of the resolution, consider that he should recognize the earnestness of the stance adopted by the European Parliament and all the Members who signed the resolution by taking such steps as may still prevent starvation in 1982, saving the lives of at least 5 million people otherwise condemned to death by hunger, malnutrition and underdevelopment.

— by Mr G. Fuchs and others to the Commission (Doc. 1-260/82):

Subject: Résultats of EEC food aid

Could the Commission give its assessment of the results of the food aid granted by the EEC to date? Would it regard increased efforts along lines identical to those followed in the past as a means of making progress towards its established objectives, particularly if these efforts were to take the form of a plan with 5 000 m ECU to be spent in twelve months? Has any Member State already declared its willingness to pay the special contribution corresponding to such a plan?

If not, can the Commission inform Parliament how it intends to shape the proposals which are essential for the implementation of Community measures likely to bring about a genuine and lasting reduction of hunger and malnutrition? What short, medium and long-term timetable is it proposing to this end?

I call the rapporteur.

Mr Michel, rapporteur. — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I address you today as spokesman for the Committee on Cooperation and Development, and the report which I have the honour of submitting to you this morning is the result of teamwork.

The resolution which is on the table before you today was approved almost unanimously by the members of the Committee: by 13 votes to 1 with 1 abstention.

In order to help me set out as clearly as possible the scope, contents and aims of this report, as well as the follow-up action which it calls for, my group has agreed, Mr President, to grant me 10 minutes speaking time which had been reserved for the members of the group so that they could discuss this report. I should like to thank them for this.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the fight against world hunger is also a fight to overcome exploitation and under-development. As we approach the end of this century, this world of ours faces a multitude of challenges. Nearly a thousand million people who do not get enough to eat, more than a thousand million people who are illiterate, of which 380 million are children who do not attend school out of 750 million who should, a thousand million unemployed, nine tenths of whom receive no employment benefit, whilst, simultaneously, almost 200 million children aged less than 14 years are obliged to go out to work. Almost a billion dollars spent on arms and warfare, whilst actual war is being waged at this moment between Iraq and Iran, the Soviet Union and Afghanistan, Israel and Palestine and the United Kingdom and Argentina.

The industrialized countries spend almost 800 million dollars a year on preparing for war and the developing countries spend a further 200 million dollars, whilst at the same time 25 million men, women and children die each year, victims of malnutrition and ignorance and wiped out in their thousands by epidemics. Ours is a world of intricately interrelated economic systems based on profit, speculation and warfare, a world in which man himself ultimately costs too much to keep alive.

If the world were reduced in scale to the size of a village of one thousand inhabitants, what would it be like? Its population would consist of 60 North Americans, 80 South Americans, 86 Africans, 210 Europeans — from the Atlantic to the Urals, of course — and 564 Asiatics. The inequalities would be flagrant: 60 out of those one thousand inhabitants would receive one half of the total income, 240 persons would not get enough to eat and 700 would be illiterate, and therefore underdeveloped. This is the situation of our world today.

Mr Pisani is in the habit of saying 'The world is capable of providing enough food for everyone, why does it not do so?' I, in turn, shall ask: the people of this world are also capable of living in peace, why do they

Michel

not do so? And I am in the habit of repeating what a wise man, Frank Buckman, said long before me: 'there is enough wealth in the world to satisfy everyone's needs, but there is not enough to satisfy everyone's greed.' This is the present situation of our world, and particularly of our countries *vis à vis* the South. The fact is that we import 55% of our energy requirements, 90% of our raw materials, and 36% of our foodstuffs, whilst we export 40% of our manufactured goods to the countries of the third world. Having noted these facts, however, we are also obliged to note that the present structures based on exploitation continue to widen a little further each day the gap between the North and the South. Faced with a situation of this kind, which is getting worse instead of getting better, after two decades of development, what must we do to make progress, what must we do to change things?

We are faced by four options: each one has its advocates. The first consists in letting the situation worsen even further and in hoping that left-wing inspired revolutions will overthrow the existing regimes, will lead the hungry masses to revolt and will prepare for them a great social upheaval, so that they may then, perhaps, hope that things will change in the future.

There is another possible option. This one also has its votaries, some of whom recommended it at Cancun. This option is to let things carry on as they are, to maintain absolute confidence in the market economy and to say that in the near future private enterprise and the investment that it will give rise to will produce the desired remedies.

The third option, which is recommended by some people, consists in staging spectacular demonstrations, with the support of public opinion and the news media, in order to convince people that it is possible within one year to save five million persons from death.

The fourth option, finally, is the one that we recommend. This is to set out patiently and resolutely on a long journey with the populations of the developing countries to struggle with them on the basis of justice. Solidarity, equity and mutual respect and with a common sense of commitment.

What is in the report that I am presenting to you? First of all, and above all, it contains an analysis of the resolution that we voted on in this House in September 1980. This resolution, with its 57 paragraphs, is attached to my report and it analyses what the various institutions have done, beginning with Community institutions (the Council of Ministers and the Commission), and then the Member States and the European Parliament and the national parliaments, which have all devoted time to these problems.

After this analysis, we go on to summarize a certain number of initiatives which have already been com-

pleted, and firstly the work that we have carried out — I was going to say 'hand-in-hand' — with our partners in Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific. After the debate we held here in September 1980, I suggested that the ACP/EEC Consultative Assembly should address itself to our resolution, should discuss it and should set up a working party, this was subsequently done and the working party consisted of representatives of the ACP countries and of our parliament and together we have just adopted, in Havare (Salisbury), the report that constitutes the fruit of our cooperation. We must next submit it for approval to the Plenary Assembly and, once it has been adopted by the Plenary Assembly, we shall submit it to Parliament. I want to emphasize that this is quite clearly a very important step forward, because our intention was to collaborate in this area with those who are directly involved in finding workable solutions, and in our report we set out common, suitably adopted and convergent proposals. Meantime, four important events have taken place which I shall only summarize here.

First of all, as far as aid is concerned, we have all the obligations we entered into under the terms of Lomé II, concerning the fifth EDF Stabex, SYSMIN, the European Investment Bank investments and also the special emergency aid voted by Parliament on the recommendation of Mr Pisani and adopted by the Council, that is to say, food aid for which we voted the 40 million ECUs already mentioned, over and above the money voted for in the 1981 budget. This means that we can make available supplementary aid amounting to 330 000 tonnes of cereal.

Next, the Commission proposed an action programme against hunger, which has been approved by the Council, first for the benefit of the poorest countries, but also for all countries that want to work towards the aim of establishing a strategy for food production which will be part of an overall development strategy. This action programme includes not only food aid to cope with emergencies, disasters and endemic famine, but also measures that will go hand in hand with the overall development programme under the terms of the strategy I have just mentioned.

Thirdly, this action programme includes specific measures, that is to say projects designed to combat soil erosion, deforestation, desertification and a specific project to eliminate endemic disease.

Finally, the fourth section of this action programme covers measures to strengthen security of food supplies, that is to say, to provide for the building up of reserve stocks and regular contributions from all countries that are in a position to contribute to these reserves. The negotiations for a new agreement on wheat are meant to serve the same end. As you are well aware, there are many reservations in this respect, particularly on the part of the Americans. These are all obstacles which we must attempt to overcome.

Michel

The third important aspect relates to the suggestions put forward by Mr Colombo, that it to say, the preparation of a programme of cooperation involving all those countries that are genuinely interested in finding a solution to this distressing problem. Those concerned by this are the Community itself, the Member States, the member countries of OPEC, and the specialized agencies set up by the United Nations and the World Food Council. It has been suggested that all these potential partners should meet in Rome in order to work out the terms of active and effective coordination work.

Finally, a decision has been taken to reactivate the International Fund for Agricultural Development by providing it with an allocation of 1 350 million dollars, 620 million being provided by the industrialized countries, 450 million by the OPEC countries, 30 million by the developing countries themselves and, the final 250 million being the residue of the fund's, initial budgetary allocation. Originally 3 000 million was requested to reactivate this fund; to date, it has been guaranteed 1 350 million.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to draw your attention to the background to this campaign against hunger in the world. And first of all, I should like to remind you of the Nobel Prize winners' manifesto of 25 June 1981; the aim of this manifesto was approved unanimously by the members of our Committee on Development and Co-operation. We believe that the objectives set out in this manifesto are excellent and that they must be supported, and we are very pleased at the emotional impact the manifesto has had amongst the people of our country. We hope that there will be a follow-up to all of this and we shall say what we think it should be. Then there is the resolution . . .

President. — Mr Michel, I should like to point out to you that you have already exceeded your speaking time.

Mr Michel, rapporteur. — (FR) I still have ten minutes left.

President. — You have already spoken for 16 minutes.

Mr Michel, rapporteur. — (FR) All right then, I shall conclude in five minutes' time.

(Laughter)

First, there is Resolution No 375/81, in which, as you are aware, Parliament asks for 5 thousand million units of account in order to save the lives of five million persons before this year is out. We shall go into the details of this later, but, Mr President, I should like to say that we, for our part, do not think that a

workable answer to these problems can be provided by spectacular demonstrations. Rather than provide food aid, in this case we should intervene actively in development programmes. People need to be taught to plant, to irrigate, to water, to hoe, to harvest, to improve, to select and market food crops; they must also learn crop rotation, and, particularly, they must succeed in creating more suitable market conditions than exist at present.

Finally, I should like to conclude with four questions. The first question is for the Council. Mr President of the Council, you have adopted Resolution No 1/375/81. I should like to ask you what steps, what representations, what action has been taken during the first months of your presidency to induce the partner countries to allocate the five thousand million supplementary units of account which are asked for in this resolution? I should also like to put a question to the Commission. You have launched a supplementary food aid programme of 40 million units of account. We have had budgetary surpluses; we have suggested that part of these budgetary surpluses should be allocated to strengthening this programme. We believe that the 1983 budget is being prepared at this moment. We should like to know, Mr Pisani, what steps you intend to take to see that the strategy that is being developed right now with 14 other countries will be practicable and operational in the near future and how many million units of account you intend to devote to it.

I also have a question for the Member States. They have committed themselves to devoting 0.7% of their gross national product to development aid. They were supposed to achieve this percentage during 1980. They have further committed themselves to granting 0.15% of their GNP for aid to the poorest countries. How do things stand now? We should like to know whether they have committed themselves to respecting a timetable that will make sense of these commitments, and we say that if that is the situation we shall indeed have the five thousand million units of account of which mention is made in pretty well all of these documents.

Now I come to my last question, and this one is for Parliament itself. You showed generosity when you voted in favour of Resolution 375/81 without a debate and by backing a recommendation that it should be taken into consideration with the signatures of 246 members. When, last year, I had to defend chapter 9 of the budget in this House, I asked for an increase of 258 million units of account in the form of commitment, appropriations three-quarters of which you rejected. I should therefore like to know whether Parliament is prepared to be consistent in the attitudes it has adopted and whether a clear and precise answer to these questions may be expected for tomorrow. If the commitments that have been entered into at every level are honoured, we shall not be talking about an emergency programme with five thousand millions for one year, but rather a permanent programme funded with

Michel

an annual budget of five million units of account for the coming decade, which decade could, let us hope, thereby become, thanks to you, and in a way which we are all hoping for, the decade of progress for everyone, hope for the young, not only the young in developing countries but young people everywhere, to whom we shall show that generosity and the determination to act are not empty words and that we intend to implement them.

(Applause)

President. — I should like to inform the House in passing that, following what Mr Griffiths and Mr Moreland said, the time limit for tabling amendments to the Pintat report (Doc. 1-303/82) is extended until 6 p.m.)

I call the Council.

Mr De Keersmaecker, President-in-Office of the Council. — *(FR)* Mr President, Mr Pisani, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the Council and of the Member States I would like first of all to express our warmest gratitude to Parliament and more particularly to certain of its members who have been and who are still playing a key role in seeking a solution to the appalling problem of world hunger by drawing this problem to the attention of the general public and of politicians.

Nearly forty years after the end of the Second World War, and despite the staggering progress which man has made in science and technology, it is intolerable to think that the basic needs of a very large part of the world's population is in such dire need that hunger, suffering, disease and, all too often, death itself are the sad lot of thousands of human beings.

The excellent reports by Mr Ferrero and Mr Michel, whom I congratulate on his introduction, the initiatives and observations of the members of this Parliament — and here I must mention, among many other admirable speeches, those of Messrs Willy Brandt, Pannella, Sablé, Vergeer, Cohen, Poniowski, Warner, Wawrzik, Bersani, Lezzi and Mrs Focke and Mrs Rabbethge — and the work of your parliamentary committee, in particular the Committee on Development and Cooperation, or the work carried out with the ACP-EEC Consultative Assembly, have provided this House with a wealth of information on which to base their ideas and proposals. Thus, as a result of your admirable and constructive resolutions and with the prestigious help of certain speakers such as the Nobel prize winners, you have guided public opinion and encouraged political leaders to further their attempts to combat this appalling problem and find the means of remedying it.

That is why the Council, specially in its meetings involving the ministers responsible for development,

has for the past two years consistently given this problem the utmost priority and has tried to find an effective way of countering this tragic situation both in the immediate future and in the long term. But in view of the enormity of the problem, the measures we decide upon are crucial, since mistakes are paid for in human lives.

The first solution which springs to mind is to send food to countries where famine is rife. This would seem fairly obvious, since the Community has food available resulting from its agricultural production.

And yet, we are aware of our limitations, especially in terms of finance; we are becoming increasingly familiar with the evil effects of such an approach, and today we are also more aware of the unfortunate consequences which this may have as regards dietary habits, the imbalance between towns and rural areas and — though the importance of this should not be overstated — the abuses to which excessively largescale food aid can lead.

Food aid should therefore serve only as an immediate and temporary remedy, and in any case its organization will have to be improved.

On this point, I would remind Parliament that the Council has given its agreement to the first phase of the Community plan to combat hunger which provides for additional food aid of 40 million ECUs for the least developed countries in the context of the new substantial action programme adopted by the developed countries for the least developed countries. Furthermore, the Commission recently announced to the Council that these funds had been effectively and usefully disbursed within a satisfactory period.

However, it is wrong to set out merely to remedy the causes of a problem without tackling its roots. For this reason the Council, acting on the basis of information from the Commission and in the light of the opinions and suggestions put forward by Parliament, has carried out a detailed analysis from which it has concluded that there is little point in making large amounts of money available to combat hunger if the means of using it are not first clearly defined and strictly coordinated. Otherwise, the sacrifices which taxpayers are asked to make could yield poor or even detrimental results; they could lead to misguided or indeed harmful policies towards the countries concerned and could result in developments which may in some cases run counter to the objectives pursued.

The Council has therefore concentrated on the second aspect of the Community plan to combat world hunger. It has examined the nature and conditions of the measures to back up national food strategies and has tried to single out the characteristics whereby countries which could be supported under the strategy can be identified. Lastly, it has examined the arrangements for Community coordination in cooperating to establish food strategies. These seek to achieve greater con-

De Keersmaecker

sistency between the policies of the countries concerned in their struggle against hunger and the measures relating to aid from the Community and the Member States and, possibly, other donors, the aim being to help the countries to apply the strategy which they would themselves have freely chosen to achieve greater self-sufficiency in their food supplies.

Specialist working parties, in which recipient countries occupy a central place, are used to provide information and detailed exchanges of ideas on the objectives of food strategies and the means of implementing them in order to allow the participants to decide on the measures they intend to apply in support of these strategies.

As for the choice of the first countries to be approached with a view to cooperation of this kind, the Council agreed yesterday that the Community should attach particular importance to the ability and willingness of the country concerned to implement an effective food strategy itself. Account should also be taken of the extent of the food shortage and of the presence of the Member States and of the Community as aid donors in the country concerned. On this point the Council, like the Commission, is convinced that a firm political resolve on the part of the developing countries to combat hunger effectively is the main prerequisite for success; without this, the chances of outside help improving these countries' self-sufficiency in food would be slight and could even, in some cases, discourage local food production.

Thus the Commissioner, Mr Pisani, informed the Council yesterday of the talks which he had recently had with the heads of state of Mali, Kenya and Zambia, and of those which he intends to hold in the very near future in other developing countries in order to ensure that the assistance envisaged by the Community and its Member States (if possible also with other countries or organizations) accords with the objectives for combating hunger as defined by the countries affected, and that assistance is closely coordinated with these countries. Therefore, as the Council decided yesterday, the fact that Mali, Kenya and Zambia have been chosen at this stage as the first beneficiaries of the assistance offered by the Community and the Member States in applying their food strategies is due primarily to their clear commitment to such a project. In those countries the prerequisites for success therefore appear to have been already fulfilled. The Council moreover intends to give similar Community backing to third countries in the future on the basis of the same commitments.

The Council thus initiated a new development yesterday, and I would like to emphasize its importance. It shows great promise both as a new means of combating hunger in the world and as a new addition to the various approaches which the Community can adopt in its development policy. The Commission has informed the Council of the time-table for launching

these projects, and it is hoped that it will be possible to begin the initial phases before the end of the year.

As regards the third aspect of the action plan concerning measures in specific fields and regions, the Commission has announced its intention to submit concrete proposals to the Council by the end of the year, but it has already mentioned — and this was also referred to by the rapporteur, Mr Michel — the control of soil erosion and the formation of deserts, the more rational use of wood as an energy source, afforestation, the improvement of agricultural research in tropical regions and the control of endemic diseases affecting livestock.

As a result of these first three sections of the Community action plan, the Commission appears recently to have taken a new initiative — and this to some extent answers one of the questions put by Mr Michel — to grant 184 million ECUs from the supplementary budget for 1982, to combat hunger in the world by means of emergency measures for the benefit mainly of refugees and the homeless, measures in support of the food policies in countries with coherent development policies, measures including a special programme for Central America, and measures in specific fields aimed at protecting the rural environment.

The Council will examine this Commission proposal very carefully; it was made as part of the gradual implementation of an action plan to combat world hunger, the general principles and overall balance of which were approved by the Council in November 1981. The budgetary aspects of this proposal will be examined under the normal budgetary procedure.

(NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, Mr Pisani, the international action in the field of food supply and agriculture, which constitutes the fourth section of the Community action programme to combat hunger, have for years been a matter of the utmost concern to the Council. The Council will deal with this section as it receives information on the basis of which decisions can and must be made. I would like to take this opportunity of explaining what the Community has done at international level to combat world hunger. This is also in part by way of reply in another question put by the rapporteur.

At the Council meeting of June 1981, which preceded the Ottawa summit and the Cancun conference, it was concluded that poverty and hunger, which are still rife in various parts of the developing countries, are intolerable. At Ottawa the major industrialized countries recognized the importance of greater food production in the third world and, above all, of better guarantees of food for all. At Cancun the clear objective was to eliminate hunger as quickly as possible, and long and detailed discussions were held on the means of achieving this and on preparations for a long-term programme to wipe out hunger by the year 2000 both by

De Keersmaecker

means of national efforts and by international action and cooperation.

At Versailles the prospects for global discussions became rather more distinct, and now that the consultative procedure has been completed we are approaching the stage of coordinated action at international level. More specifically, as a result of an important initiative by the Italian Government, the Member States and the Commission took part in a meeting at the end of April in Rome which was devoted to the combating of world hunger and which will be followed in the autumn by another meeting, this time at ministerial level.

Thanks to the Rome meetings the Community is in a position to take an even more active part in combating hunger, since in addition to food aid, which it has for years been granting to countries in need, it will henceforth be active in fields which go beyond actual food aid and which at the same time will make such aid more effective, since its purpose is to eliminate the fundamental causes of this problem.

I would also point out that agricultural and food problems were matters of concern to the Community delegation and of course also of the other delegations at the United Nations conference on the least developed countries held last autumn in Paris. The Community's support for the establishment of a national food strategy in the developing countries is in line with the commitments entered into as part of the new action programme adopted by the Paris conference on the least developed countries. It is obviously not possible to fully evaluate the results of this conference, but there is an undeniable link between poverty and the scourge of famine in the various countries.

The Community believes that in order to solve the problem of world hunger it is essential that efforts to improve the reliability of world food supplies should be continued and intensified. Following the first meeting in Rome, at which questions relating to the safeguarding of food supplies in the world were discussed in detail, the 8th meeting of the World Food Council, shortly to be held in Mexico, assumes very great importance. This meeting will discuss the proposals which were recently put forward by the executive body of that organization and which seek to improve the reliability of food supplies in the poorest developing countries and take steps towards achieving greater stability on the world grain market.

The Community sees these questions as an extremely important part of the North-South dialogue and it wishes to take a constructive part in the activities of the World Food Council. It will also point out that it has always been, and still is, in favour of negotiations for a new grain agreement, and it will likewise make it known that it endorses the objectives which form the basis of the World Food Council's initiatives in this

area. It will also affirm that it is willing to continue to examine this problem.

In addition to the action plan itself and the commitments which it entails throughout the world, the Community has continued its food aid programme in accordance with the new guidelines adopted by the Council. Like the previous programmes, the new food aid programmes for 1982 adopted by the Council on 26 April 1982 involve large quantities — 927 000 t grain, to which must be added the Member States' own programmes, which bring the total to 1 650 000 t grain, 150 000 t skimmed milk powder and 45 000 t butter oil, in accordance with the total contribution provided for by the food aid agreement. It is now up to the Commission to implement these programmes, which are intended primarily for the least developed countries, as effectively as possible. I hardly need to remind you that the institutions hold somewhat differing views on food aid appropriations in the 1982 budget, especially since attempts are now being made to resolve this issue, which is at present being discussed by the institutions. In addition, the Council intends to examine very carefully the study to evaluate food aid as soon as this becomes available, probably in the next few months. This question is now also being examined by the Commission. A study of this kind will undoubtedly be very useful for working out new proposals for assisting the agriculture and food supplies of the developing countries so that we are able in future to ensure better and, above all, more rapid and efficient food aid.

In a comment on the report by Mr Ferrero as part of the activities of the ACP-EEC institutions, Mr Michel points out that the fight against hunger calls for the stimulation of development. I feel that this touches at the heart of the problem and places the fight against hunger in its proper context. Indeed, the Council's discussions on the action plan and the conclusions of the Rome meeting clearly show that the aid offered by the Community and the Member States in measures which are now under way or being prepared provide an acceptable solution, and one which represents a suitable combination of two forms of aid which can always be adapted to different circumstances. Firstly, there is short-term emergency aid to supplement the yearly food aid programmes, and secondly there are longer term measures including support for food strategies in order to provide a better safeguard for the food supplies of the developing countries which wish to apply measures of this kind, thus helping them in their own fight against hunger.

However, this fight can only succeed if the Community and the Member States redouble their efforts to apply all the means at their disposal. Their willingness to do this was expressed in very detailed, precise and concrete terms in the second ACP-EEC Lomé Convention, title 6 of which is devoted entirely to cooperation in agriculture. This contains a whole series of measures in that sector, and one of its conse-

De Keersmaecker

quences is that under Lomé II the Community is now supporting the development of agriculture more than under Lomé I. Under Lomé II a technical centre for cooperation in agriculture and rural development has also been set up. I would also point out here that the Community did all it could to make this centre operational by the time the Convention entered into force, and I deeply regret the delay, which was not in fact caused by the Community.

While I am discussing relations between the ACP States and the Community, I would mention that Article 89 of the Convention clearly states that food aid is a temporary measure. The ultimate objective of the ACP states is to provide for their food requirements on the basis of their own production. Obviously, this affirmation also holds true for developing countries other than those which are signatories of the ACP Convention and which are in the same situation, and it provides even more ample justification for the Community's approach to the combating of hunger. I think, Mr President, that I have thus answered the oral question put to the Council by Mr Pannella, Mrs Bonino, Messrs Vandemeulebroucke, Gendebien and Capanna concerning the manifesto of the Nobel prize winners and the Community's contribution to the fight against hunger and also the questions concerning the reaction to Parliament's resolutions concerning the fight against world hunger and the Community's attitude to North-South relations in that fight. Thus, of course, I have also answered the questions put by the rapporteur, Mr Michel, and have also referred specifically to two of them.

I have not wanted to go into the political, economic, technical, demographic, financial and monetary complications associated with a problem such as this, since you have already dealt with these in detail in your own comments. The real problem facing the Council is one of choice — choice both as concerns the appropriateness of the resources to be deployed and of how to put the taxpayers' money to the best possible use. Such decisions are extremely difficult, as I am sure you all know, but the Council is aware of its great responsibility in this matter. If solidarity with the hundreds of millions of hungry people has any meaning, then it must find expression in practical programmes and action; these should not be merely plans but should be made to work. This, with the Commission's help, is the Council's task. I am convinced that the decisions taken yesterday by the Council prove that the Council's intentions are serious.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MR FRIEDRICH

Vice-President

President. — I call the Commission.

Mr Pisani, Member of the Commission. — *(FR)* On the question of hunger the European Parliament has taken two different attitudes in the past, or rather it has adopted two different approaches. When, on 18 September 1980, it adopted the Ferrero report, it heard the rapporteur maintain that hunger is a permanent evil for mankind, which only a profound change of structures, behaviour, power and knowledge can hope to cure.

When, in September 1981, it adopted by written procedure, and therefore without debate, Resolution No 375 'on the Nobel-Prize-winners' manifesto concerning world hunger', Parliament expressed a desire for immediate action which was more in the nature of an attempt to make up for past omissions than to remedy the situation.

The report presented to us today by Mr Victor Michel on behalf of the Committee on Cooperation and Development returns resolutely to the first approach, which is fundamentalist and structuralist, but which does not altogether reject the idea of emergency action, though only as a supplement.

The Commission, for its part, has very definitely adopted the Ferrero-Michel attitude, with the support of the Council of Ministers. It has deliberately refused to enter into the logic of the other approach because it considers that it is dangerous and, in many respects, superficial and shallow. To treat world hunger as a mere incident and not as an endemic disease is an easy way of salving one's conscience; it's like giving alms on Sunday in order to expunge the errors, the acts of negligence or even the crimes that one has been guilty of on the other days of the week.

The Commission's view is that hunger is one of the permanent scars on the face of humanity and, all things considered, it believes that humanity would make unprecedented progress if, within one generation, by the year 2000 or 2010, we could finally say that we had exorcised the spectre of hunger which, relatively recently, — let us not forget this — only a generation ago, haunted the countryside and the cities of Europe.

The Commission considers that hunger will not be vanquished by temporary expedients, but rather by a process of economic development, which will be slow and difficult, because development is not just building roads, dams, hospitals, schools, irrigation systems and factories: it is all those things, but it is first and foremost the mobilization and the organization of an entire nation which wishes finally to take in hand its economic and social destiny after it has taken its political destiny in hand. Development is not simply transferring technology and technical assistance; it is the acquisition by the poorest countries of the ability to develop techniques suited to their own needs, to train men capable of governing them, of administering their

Pisani

affairs, of managing their economy and of guiding their efforts.

Any approach which does not connect, and even identify, the fight against hunger with indigenous efforts to promote overall development is a sham. The Commission of the European Communities asks Parliament to dissociate itself from such an approach and recommends that it should reject it unambiguously and follow instead the guidance of its rapporteur. By this the Commission means to say that Parliament would be guilty of a political failing if it were to allow itself to be carried away by the fascination for obtaining immediate results from the approach to the problem which an analysis of the facts has suggested it ought to adopt. The Commission has committed itself with determination. This analysis, this programme and the prospects for it are the subject matter of what it has to say to you today.

Firstly, the Commission wanted to collect and absorb the facts of the situation. The picture is not an encouraging one.

The food supply situation, or rather the dependence of the poorest countries on food imports, has worsened over the last 20 years. It will worsen further if no decisive steps are taken to reverse the trend. At present the developing countries import 90 million tonnes of cereal; by the end of the century they will be importing 250 million tonnes.

Apart from the fact that it inevitably involves waste, food aid, in spite of the allocation of counterpart funds, does not solve the main problems of agricultural and rural development, it simply skirts around them. It undermines the systems of consumption and production. It creates dangerous illusions and absolves people from making the necessary effort.

The solution — because there *is* a solution — lies in a rigorous linkage between the internal economic policies of the developing countries, food aid understood as a temporary corrective, and a move to promote overall development, giving special importance to food crop-raising and rural development. The solution also consists in altering international practices and international equilibria, as well as in controlling excessive variations in world prices.

If an effort is not made to look for and find solutions to these problems, the situation of whole continents and regions of the world will become uncontrollable. The developing countries will then be obliged to choose between importing foodstuffs and importing oil. Because they have not attended to the development of their agricultural production and rural improvement they will have to put up with unplanned urban development which will be socially and politically intolerable because technically and financially beyond their capabilities.

But this approach poses another question: can the poor countries of the world escape from their poverty if their populations continue to grow at a rate which is often in excess of 3·5% a year? The answer is clear: they cannot. There is a fatal contradiction in this discrepancy between the rate of population growth and the possible rate of increase of food production, and mankind can only hope to overcome world hunger by dealing with both, by lowering the former and raising the latter. But, here, once again, we must understand what we are talking about. Population growth is the result of the continuation of a basic biological reaction beyond the point when it has ceased to be a vital necessity for the species. Families no longer need to be large in order to perpetuate the species. Nevertheless, they continue to be as prolifically productive of children as in the past. The need to adapt the instinct for survival to the requirements of survival will simply have to be accepted: this is the price of development and satisfying countries' food needs. The entire process of development depends on it.

On the basis of these considerations and observations, the Commission has proposed, and the Council has adopted, a plan to combat hunger which is being gradually set up, accompanied by considerable reflection on food aid, and which the supplementary budget which will shortly be submitted to you will help to make operational.

In accordance with Parliament's wishes, a fundamental study has been carried out, the results of which will be made available to you in July, and the practical conclusions of which will be submitted to you shortly after that. They will help to make food aid more efficient and more orientated towards development. This food aid is intended to cope with emergencies, but it must contribute to its own abolition, for lack of which in the event that it should perpetuate itself, it will probably create new and intolerable relationships of dependency. From this point of view, there arises a problem that we must solve, concerning the flexibility of our administrative and budgetary system and its capacity to redirect funds which at present are allocated for food aid to development. We are similarly faced by, and must solve, the problem of organizing our Common Agricultural Policy around the requirements of our development policy. An initial estimate has been made available to you today. It is worth some study and debate.

Development aid is continuing. For some years now it has been developing positively, and has been orientated rather more towards the problems of agriculture and the rural world, towards project programmes and microprojects, towards the creation of a network of small and medium-sized companies which will constitute the lifeblood of the economic system.

This trend must be broadened, it must be accompanied by other measures and it must be guided, bearing fully in mind that our aim is not the structure we are setting

Pisani

up but the people whom this structure is intended to serve. Food aid, development aid — all those things have been implemented for some time now but apparently without any success, because by an absurd kind of inevitability, we were prisoners of both unsuitable economic policies and of a certain logic of inefficiency.

The aim of the approach based on a food strategy — and we are convinced that this will also be its result — is to overcome both the unsuitable economic policies and the logic of inefficiency.

The notion of a food strategy was considered only yesterday a vague concept, only to be heard mentioned at meetings of international organizations. The dialogue which has been undertaken with the governments of Mali, Kenya and Zambia has helped to define the contents and the methods of the food strategy more precisely. I wish I had the time to recount to you in detail the conversations I have had with the members of the governments of these three countries. Those conversations have helped me, with them, on their behalf, in their countries, to a better understanding of the very idea of which I was the bearer on behalf of the Community.

A food strategy must start with the adoption by governments of rigorous economic policies. This means that they must decide to give farmers, and the vast number of small farmers, even more than commercial undertakings, an incentive to produce foodstuffs by offering to buy them at prices which offer the prospect of a profit, and on that basis we can hope to guide production using the vast number of means open to us.

But if we want to raise farm prices we must for a time pursue a policy of wage adjustment, for lack of which the rise in prices would become an intolerable burden for workers in administration, the army and industry, who are obliged to live in the capital. The government must be given assistance in this process of adjustment. And if, as all the evidence suggests, rising prices result in a corresponding increase in production, we must, on the one hand, see that we have the physical means of storing farm surpluses, in the villages and in the cities, and on the other hand, we must see that money is available to buy up the surplus produce that comes to market. We also need to see that there is a marketing system available, for lack of which the prices would not be maintained.

To do that, the government in question needs budgetary support in order to build, or have built, silos, and to make seasonal loans to finance stocks, and it needs technical and financial support to see that the produce is marketed. If all that is accomplished — and it will be — farmers will have at their disposal more money than they have ever had before. They will be prepared to buy manure, pesticides and tools and to build themselves modest houses in which to live. They will need better equipped villages and paths to transport their

products along. Very soon they will also need the help of competent advisory officers, present on the spot and ready to help them. How could governments hope to cope with the increase in their needs which development itself presupposes without substantial assistance? How could they set up a system of loans to agriculture available to everyone, everywhere without our technical, and perhaps even financial, aid?

Everyone can assess the logic of this approach. It bases overall development on developing the will to produce and it recommends providing support for growth by coping with the needs that growth creates whilst overcoming the obstacles growth comes up against.

Instead of providing aid in the form of food supplies and public works, we are implementing *this* policy in three countries. So food aid as such will disappear, and a structure will be set up in the right place and at the right time amongst a population which has been prepared to make use of it.

The Council of Ministers debated the problem of food strategies at some length yesterday and decided to give its support to the Commission for the implementation of these strategies in Mali, Kenya and Zambia. It said it was prepared to take three new countries into consideration shortly. It invited the Member States to join in the Commission's efforts and to coordinate, through the agency of a Working Party, Community aid and bilateral aid, hoping, in addition, that other donors would join the Community to give support to the Community strategies, a propos of which, we must, however, repeat that they are first and foremost the work of the governments who draw them up and take on responsibility for them.

A food strategy is a form of economic policy using the means for development of production. It is an attentive and flexible accompaniment to this development; it is the transformation of food aid into development aid; it is a pact agreed on between a developing country and other countries which have elected to aid it; a pact which, in return for a country's respecting the aims and disciplines set out in it, will support the country in question in the efforts it needs to make to overcome the difficulties it will inevitably encounter.

A food strategy is a wager that the governments and the farmers of the Third World will have the will-power to overcome hunger, and it is also a commitment to support economic growth. It is the reverse of the traditional approach, which financed public works, accepting passively that they would be useless, and which supplied food aid well aware of the risk that it might have to continue supplying it. The whole business is very difficult. But there is no other way because all the alternatives have failed.

It requires a convergence of wills, it presupposes that the activity of the government which is being aided

Pisani

and of those providing the aid will be closely coordinated.

In the three countries mentioned above economic policies have been decided upon, a contact group has been set up which has the responsibility of defining the agreement and looking after the follow-up, projects have been worked out and reciprocal commitments will shortly be entered into.

Let us note — and this is one of the most fascinating aspects of this business — that no two strategies are the same; they are strictly national ones, but let us note also that they require fewer financial resources than would appear, since they are based on the organization of the productive forces of the nation and not on gifts.

The fact remains that food strategies and the implementation of a plan to combat hunger are both in need of some supplementary means. The proposal we are considering now is that these means should be mobilized under the terms of the supplementary and amending budget for 1982 which has been submitted to you today.

Before giving you a summary of it, I should like to provide justification for it. The merit of Community aid is that it is based on a contract and is programmed. The inconvenience of it is that, because of this very fact, it is relatively rigid. Consequently the flexibility needed to withdraw a part of the funds allocated to programmed projects and allocate them to food strategies cannot be found in the EDF. Now it so happens that it is a matter of urgency that these strategies should be implemented, if only so that the lesson can be drawn from them when the future convention comes to be negotiated. The existence of available funds in the 1982 budget offers the exceptional advantage of making possible the launching of a vital policy. In the draft which has been submitted to you by the Commission and which the budgetary authority will be called upon to debate and take a decision on, it is recommended that 184 million ECU should be allocated to measures coming under the responsibility of the Development Commissioner. The President of the Council of Ministers was prepared to admit this a short while ago, which shows that he has given it sympathetic consideration. 35 million ECU are allocated for support of the activities of the UN High Commission for Refugees, and, more generally, to provide aid to the populations of the Third World which have suffered from disasters or exceptional occurrences: 65 million ECU are allocated to support measures for agrarian reform in the developing countries of Central America. 8 million ECU will be used to develop, broaden and diversify our contribution to the work of the NGO's. 76 million ECUs have been recommended to provide support for a special programme to combat hunger in the world.

Without going into too much detail, I must just enumerate the principles and the main aspects of this

special programme: rational use of firewood, measures to halt the process of desertification, village water engineering, control of endemic cattle diseases, the foundations for a system of research in the field of food crop-raising and support for basic training programmes in rural areas.

You will all have observed in this list of aims the specific operations of the programme to combat hunger in the world. They are being studied attentively. Before the end of the year the Commission will submit to you a paper on these topics. The appropriations asked for here will help to fund some of these studies and to carry out certain self-evident measures which are urgently necessary.

This is not all, however. 35 million ECUs for the support of the food strategies themselves and for the development of food crop policies will be added to the 40 million ECUs that will be devoted to these specific projects. Before concluding, it is appropriate that I should remind Parliament once again of the basic principles and the methods of the policy submitted to Parliament today.

The fundamental principle may be summarized as follows: hunger is an intolerable evil for which the entire international community is responsible and which it must cure mankind of without delay. Hunger is the result of economic disorders, fundamental maladjustments and absurd yet ingrained policies. Only long-term structural measures provide any hope of overcoming it.

The European Community and the Member States, for their parts, commit themselves to contributing in the most determined way to overcoming this scourge. The method adopted will consist of specific projects and food strategies. The means already exist and they must be used more efficiently, before being increased.

The presentation you have just been given will seem all the more relevant as it harmonizes with the logic of your Committee on Development and Cooperation, which has just given its support to the excellent report which Mr Michel has presented to you on its behalf.

Before I conclude, let me, as the Commissioner responsible for development matters, warn you against one temptation — the temptation of approving the Michel report today and approving tomorrow a resolution calling for the urgent mobilization of fantastic sums of money which you will nevertheless not include on your budget, and which no one can guarantee will be put to rational use.

(Applause)

The two approaches to this matter derive from contradictory views; they are inspired by opposed political conceptions; they are the result of political attitudes which are alien to each other. I ask you to adopt today

Pisani

and to abide by the principles and the means of a long-term programme designed to attack the evil at the root, to reform money flows, behaviour, structures and power systems. This is what your Committee and its rapporteur have also proposed. Once you have addressed yourselves to the essential matters, you can then go on to decide on individual, immediate, urgent measures specifically intended to save lives. But let nobody claim that, in so doing, you will have cured mankind of its besetting evil!

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it would have been extremely easy for someone such as myself, for whom the hunger suffered by others is intolerable, to fall in with those who noisily stir up the crowds without suggesting any solution. For someone like me, for whom world hunger is intolerable, it would have been easy to make moving and moralizing speeches, to let myself be carried away by the force of emotional propaganda. I could easily have made myself popular by yielding to the temptation to indulge in inflammatory and exaggerated talk designed to stir up emotion. Not for one moment did I dream of yielding to these temptations, because neither you nor I are here to win votes by stirring up scandal: we are here to find a remedy to an evil which we all find unacceptable. By preparing its programme to combat hunger in the world, by patiently implementing it, by asking for your support in terms of budgetary resources, the Commission is asking you for a fundamental expression of political will, and not for political gestures to suit the mood of the moment.

(Applause)

President. — I call the Socialist Group.

Mrs Focke. — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to thank Mr Michel for his report on behalf of the Socialist Group since it gives us the opportunity one year and nine months after the Ferrero resolution was adopted here by a large majority, to assess and determine what has happened in the interim — or rather what has not happened in the interim — to follow up, to set back in motion, to update our views and once more to mobilize public opinion.

I should like to say right from the outset that the overall assessment is exceptionally negative. What has been done up to now falls far short of the demands and proposals of the European Parliament. I do not except the European Parliament from this criticism, since we have neither included in our budgetary decisions the fund which would have been necessary to implement the Ferrero resolution, nor have we found a common denominator for development, trade and agricultural policies.

But my criticism is first and foremost directed at the Council and at the Member States working in Euro-

pean political cooperation and it is to no avail that the representative of the Council is today stating what an enormous wealth of ideas and suggestions have been amassed. We want to see acts and I am forced to conclude when contrasting what was expected with what has happened, that food aid has not been reformed and has been insufficiently supplied with funds. As before, ridiculous sums are made available in our budget for emergency aid. No firm deadlines have been set for reaching the 0.7% objective and the International Fund for Agricultural Development — IFAD — has not been sufficiently funded. No outcome has been reached in the global negotiations at the United Nations, the energy chain has not been set up . . . and so on and so forth. To sum up between September 1980 and Cancun and now with Versailles only infinitesimal progress has been made.

I must also direct this criticism at the Commission. Mr Pisani, you have just made a very good speech, and shown us the right direction. It is certainly not by chance that under the influence of this debate we have organized today, you have informed us that in the supplementary 1982 budget further funds will be made available for combating world hunger. But even in the Commission work has been proceeding at a snail's pace. The Commission's preliminary draft budget includes insufficient funds for this purpose. Within the Commission none of the required restructuring which we asked for nine months ago in order to fulfil the task of combating world hunger more fully has been carried out, we are still waiting for almost all the reports, analyses and proposals for reform which were requested in the Ferrero resolution one year and nine months ago. I refer particularly to the reports on food aid and the effects of the Common Agricultural Policy on international trade in farm produce. What you call your action plan — last autumn's mini-report which is still the basis for your future work — does not deserve any such title. We are still waiting from the Commission for a short, medium and long term plan which would bring into play all the potential and instruments at the European Community's disposal to combat world hunger.

Only three positive things have happened, firstly, rural development in the developing countries has managed to be pegged higher in the programmes and projects — 40% now go to this sector within the framework of the European Development Fund. Ladies and gentlemen, I am willing to recognize this. This means, however, over five years for 62 countries no more than 1.2 thousand million ECUs — if we keep to the Lomé framework until 1985. Secondly, the potential for using products for food aid which do not originate in the European Community has somewhat improved. However, I must ask where has this actually taken place up to now? Thirdly, there are at last some food strategies being implemented — ladies and gentlemen, yesterday at the Council of Development Ministers food strategies were decided for three countries, one year and nine months after the Ferrero resolution and

Focke

long after the international community has agreed on the importance of this way of improving the world food situation. I am forced to state that this is a very meagre result from such a vast amount of work.

Given the lack of action by the European Community in a worsened food situation, we are once more focusing our attention in the Michel resolution on the most important points, those which already appear in the Ferrero resolution: a time schedule with deadlines for achieving the 0.7% objective, specific proposals from the European Community for combating world hunger at United Nations level for global negotiations on the implementation of the Brandt plan — particularly for the emergency programme and with respect to automatic financing — for a raw materials agreement, buffer stocks, storage projects, for the reform of food aid in close cooperation with rural development and food strategies for very many other countries than the first three I have referred to, for an incontrovertible correlation between Community development, trade and agricultural policies and of course for higher than average rates of increase in the Community budget for development and corresponding funds to be included in exceptional budgets.

At world level we would seem in Versailles to have pushed the door a little wider open. There is even to be found in the Communiqué a statement that specifically orientated impetus should be given to food programmes. Are these simply words? What we demand here today is that once and for all something serious should be done about this problem. What does specific impetus involve? It involves providing money and know-how in order to promote self help. Let us once and for all stop dodging the issue by saying that it is apparently not possible to invest so quickly. We have never even really tried to offer more. I call upon the Members of the Commission and of Governments in the Council and working within European political cooperation to give ten times more than they are doing today to the non-governmental organizations and then you will see how quickly and how well they can invest that money. Give more money for food strategies and then you will see how many more countries will offer funds to this end and how greatly the readiness to develop food strategies will increase. Make a commitment that what is now spent on food aid, which hopefully one day will be less necessary because rural production in the countries themselves will have been greatly stimulated, will continue to be provided as financial support from the Community. Then you will see how quickly rural development can be set in motion.

Much too little is being done and it is taking far too long. I too am filled with impatience and anger when I look upon the ineffectualness of the last year and nine months. I too am being overcome by a desire to do something spectacular much as a sit-in or walk in at the next European Council together with Marco Pannella who I cannot see here for the moment but who

loves taking such actions. I can understand that at times this seems to be the only way out in a world in which otherwise nothing would budge one iota — at least not towards serious appropriate action which meets our present knowledge of the need for development cooperation in the world and which does not smack of paternalistic charity but fosters true development.

Mr President, as usual the final item in the Michel resolution calls for it to be forwarded to the Council and the Commission. I strongly urge you to deal with this matter differently and in your capacity as President to seek out the Council in person and armed with our resolution to make the same case as we have made before world public opinion by today's debate. There is some urgency if we do not wish to lose the race against death.

(Applause)

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

Mr Vergeer. — *(NL)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to join in thanking and congratulating our rapporteur, Mr Michel, on the excellent report which he has presented to us today. This report takes as its point of departure paragraph 56 of the Ferrero resolution of September 1980, which quite clearly states that the Committee on Development and Cooperation and other responsible committees must examine what demands have or have not been made and ensure that reports on these must be submitted to Parliament at specific times.

This request is now being followed up, and my Group feels that we cannot be content merely to take note of the measures worked out by the Council and the Commission since September 1980. It is our duty to express a political opinion on these. Millions of lives are at stake. My group — and I want to make this quite clear — wishes to assess the Council's and Commission's policy realistically. We refuse, Mr President, to create the illusion that Parliament is in a position to see to it that the problems of poverty and world hunger can be solved in the short term. We believe it our duty to do our utmost to ensure that the Council and Commission act on the decisions reached by Parliament on this matter. And I must be perfectly frank — my Group is disappointed about this. I echo the questions put by the rapporteur — what has the Council in fact achieved? Of course, I am grateful to the President-in-Office of the Council for his detailed report. but he should not be annoyed when I say that I have the feeling that if we hold a similar debate this time next year, the Council President then in office will not have all that many changes to make to this morning's address. Mr President, the problem should be studied and coordination is necessary, but we have reached a

point when action is called for. We all know that since the Ferrero resolution was adopted in September 1980 the food supply situation has deteriorated and there is absolutely no question of any improvement.

In September 1980 Parliament gave a clear indication of the causes of this appalling situation in a detailed report comprising four main chapters: combating hunger in the framework of new relations between industry and the developing countries; the development of agriculture and of rural areas in the developing countries; food aid and the Community; and finally, international trade in agricultural produce and foodstuffs. Today's rapporteur deserves credit for having dealt with this European programme, which was presented to Parliament in September 1980, as a central topic of the present report.

Mr President, it is as well also to point out that the assessment of the results of the September 1980 resolution, which was conscientiously carried out by the Committee on Development and Cooperation, coincides with the conclusions we reached with our African partners in our mixed working party 'World Hunger' of the Joint ACP-EEC Committee.

The EPP Group is willing to support the motion for a resolution but feels that this problem must be dealt with at the next Council meeting. It is essential that Parliament, the Council and the Commission should adopt a joint approach in the fight against poverty and hunger in the world and that the motion should be given the priority it deserves. We are faced with three major political options in today's debate: either we leave things as they are, and that means that we resign ourselves to the economic status quo in which the strong profit at the expense of the weak, that we no longer need to discuss the progress of the North-South dialogue, and that efforts to achieve a new and fair distribution of the fruits of the earth remain frustrated. Or, secondly, we could launch a spectacular programme about which we have heard a great deal recently — shaking public opinion out of its apathy, appealing to the media for their cooperation and the releasing of large amounts of money. Or, thirdly — and this is the proposal put forward by the rapporteur and repeated by the Commissioner — we could commit ourselves to long-term joint action against hunger; although a long-term approach, it is also realistic. Mr President, this last option would be an important step which would require immense effort at every level. This path, although it could at times prove difficult, is the one which my Group most unequivocally favours above all other more dramatic approaches. We are in favour of a purposeful and consistent policy.

I can assure Parliament, and also the Council and the Commission, that the Group of the European People's Party is prepared not only now but also in the future to cooperate with others towards achieving a consistent policy and to make a constructive contribution to the combating of this appalling problem.

President. — I call the European Democratic Group.

Mr C. Jackson. — Mr President, on behalf of my group I also wish to thank Mr Michel for the excellent and thorough report in front of us. It is indeed a worthy successor to previous important reports on the same subject and my group is pleased to give its support, subject to a few amendments.

The report rightly lists many things to be done. In some areas progress has been too slow and in some areas administration has not been adequate. However, my group strongly supports the general philosophy and approach recently outlined by the Commission and particularly by Commissioner Pisani. He was, in my view, right to respond as he did to the register motion calling for the expenditure of 5 billion ECU, particularly when he said that only lengthy analysis, research, definition and organization can make the rich countries' contributions to combating hunger in the world effective and useful. Mr Pannella has achieved a triumph in stirring people's hearts, and I salute him for this. But I believe on reflection that our Parliament will agree that the Commission's more measured response will be of greater long-term help to the poor and hungry of the world.

I was pleased that in this speech the Commissioner mentioned population. If we look at our past debates, consideration of the problem of hunger by this Parliament has been curiously one-sided. Twenty years ago there were 350 million people, it is estimated, suffering from malnutrition in the world. Today that figure is more like 500 million. To borrow a phrase beloved of American economists, we have concentrated too much on the supply side of food and too little on the demand side by people. Clearly, population is increasing in the world at a rate which outstrips our ability to supply food, and the result of this can only be misery. So it is time that the Community, whose absence from the list of donors for population planning is notable, took another look at the subject, as we have recommended in our Amendment No 151. You know, for every 10 people in developing countries today there will be 15 in less than 20 years time. There will be 4.5 billion people in the developing countries alone, the same as the world's total population today.

Let me take one extreme example. In Kenya population growth today is about 4% per annum. 4% sounds a small enough figure, but it means that Kenya's population today — some 16 million people — will have grown to 32 million, i.e. doubled, by the end of this century. Now such rates of population growth carry the seeds of total tragedy. The effects of such increases are that some countries are already using marginal land for crops. For them a larger population will make self-sufficiency wellnigh impossible. Increasing numbers of people has led to over-grazing and over-cultivation leading to soil erosion. Deforestation to provide land and fuel, for wood is the world's main fuel, is

C. Jackson

going to provide a serious ecological problem; and, of course, more people means greater shortage of water. The years of dedicated effort since the early 1950s, the shiploads of food, the millions of dollars — in one sense they have all failed to cure the problem of hunger, and one key reason is population growth.

So I ask the Commission to study seriously what the Community can do to help those countries with rapid population increases that wish to reduce their rate of increase. I would like to see the Community provide a centre for research and information on population planning backed by cash to help developing countries put population planning into effect. Can we not bring to bear on the population problem some of the research and analysis of which the Commissioner rightly spoke in other directions? May we not find that funds and effort directed to reducing the surge of population may do more for human welfare and happiness than simply voting more food aid, food aid which in any case proves inadequate?

Mr President, even this morning we have had a call for more food aid, but I believe that this House and the Commission should take note of the increasing reservations expressed by experts about food aid. I know that the Commission has a major study in hand and I look forward to the results. In a report to Congress in 1979 the US-Government called for fundamental changes in the way project aid was administered and managed. In 1980 the Canadian umbrella organization for charities, the Council for International Cooperation, recommended to Parliament that 'except in cases of emergency, food aid should be abolished'.

Now these recommendations follow a long history of difficulties with food aid. It seems that it has several disadvantages. It acts almost like a dependence-creating drug depressing local farming and taking people away from the local markets. I find it depressing to record the view of a World Bank official who asked whether supplementary feedings for children as part of an educational programme and of the development process provide the answer to the nutrition problem for children. He continued, and I quote: 'One would like to say yes, but extensive literature and experience on the subject tell us the answer is no.' I am beginning to wonder whether we shouldn't reserve food aid for emergencies alone. The corollary to this is that food strategies are the most promising way forward that I have heard. They must be advanced with all speed, but such strategies will require — and I know the Commission realizes this — more coordination and more effective analysis than hitherto.

I think that the most serious criticism we can make of all aid efforts of our own or others round the world is that in the past, desperate to provide as much cash and food as possible to those in need, we have forgotten to make use of the greatest tool for the advancement of civilization. I refer to the scientific method, where painstaking analysis of results leads progressively to

greater understanding and to more effective inputs. The figures show our failure. We must be prepared to devote more of our aid effort to such analysis, which alone can ensure that our efforts not only help to the utmost but avoid harm.

Mr President, finally I would emphasize just one point in the Michel report. In paragraph 10 we ask for more consistent support of voluntary organizations. I was grateful last year when the Committee on Development and Cooperation and this House gave support to a Conservative amendment in the budget providing considerable extra funds for voluntary organizations. They can get to the grass-roots in countries with an effectiveness denied to government organizations. I hope this paragraph will be given priority and emphasis.

In these remarks I have tried to look more to the future than to the past so comprehensively and well dealt with by Mr Michel. A relatively new Commissioner and a very new Director-General are bringing significant changes to that part of the Commission that deals with development matters. We shall continue to monitor their progress but we wish them well, for in the fight against hunger we are indeed all on the same side. And I hope the future will see the Commission, the Parliament and the Council working together more effectively than in the past to make an even more effective contribution to relieving hunger in the world which is by any standards one of the greatest issues facing our time.

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the House I welcome to the official gallery a number of visitors, including five Nobel Prize winners and the mayors of several European cities.

(Applause)

Parliament is delighted that such a lot of interest is being shown in today's debate on this very important topic. I extend a very warm welcome to our visitors.

I call the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Ferrero. — *(IT)* Mr President, other speakers have already mentioned this but I still feel that it is important not to forget that more or less one and a half years have passed since Parliament held its first major debate on hunger and more than two years since we started work on this issue, which is not just distressing but also and above all, become increasingly more serious.

Combating hunger is today one of the basic proving grounds for the Community's ability to contribute not just in words but in deeds to creating a new relationship between the North and the South of the planet.

Ferrero

What has happened over this period of time? I think we must state quite clearly that little has been achieved. Naturally, we have met and are meeting with difficulties. We know that the real solutions are long-term ones. We are against brief and spectacular bursts of energy. That is why in September 1980 we made working, specific and in some respects 'minimalist' proposals, but the Council did not even follow us along those minimum lines. Over all these months the Commission has not been able to bring about real change and Parliament itself has adopted conflicting attitudes, particularly, as has been mentioned here, during the last two budget debates.

This is what we must draw attention to. It is true, Mr Pisani, that when combating hunger things have to be done well and properly.

However, they must also be done with the necessary speed. In some respects we have been found wanting as a Community — we have been wasting time. Of course, Mr Pisani, hunger is a scourge. It is the sickness of mankind, but it is similarly true that up to now the cure has been far from sufficient. Today we have learned of the steps taken by the Council, however hesitant and limited they are. We have particularly lent a friendly ear to the proposals put forward by Commissioner Pisani, but we have to say straight away that it does not seem to us that there is as yet — not just of good intentions but also of the effects they may have — any sign of the change required to produce a qualitative leap in the whole Community development policy.

In any case Mr Pisani, I feel that we will have to return to these proposals in the next few months in order to check on their implementation and efficacy. It would be a ridiculous pretence to try to examine them now in the few minutes we have available. I should instead like now to stress a different aspect of the problem. Over the last few months, in my opinion, a great deal of confusion has been engendered. We have seen, during the discussions over the past few months, the emergence of an inflexible, in my opinion dangerous opposition of views where there are definitely differing approaches but where under specific circumstances they may be basically complementary. The two opposing viewpoints would seem to be, on the one hand, those who are 'blinded by immediacy' and would like to see sensational and spectacular solutions, and, on the other hand, those who are working in depth, assiduously and with a view to the long term. The objection to these long term approaches are that structural intervention runs the risk of becoming an alibi for postponing action or, in some cases, not doing anything constructive at all.

I should like to reiterate that in my opinion this is a sterile opposition of views and I also think that it is misleading. Does anyone really disagree with what was at the heart of the 1980 report — and which is once more the focus of policy in the Michel report —

that only development can really combat hunger? Who cannot see the limitations of a policy of assistance based on generosity but which holds in it the dangerous seeds of dependence? At one and the same time, however, who is not aware of the need to hurry things through? This is not just necessary for what are, so to speak, humanitarian reasons: it is a political requirement inasmuch the scandal of starvation is shot through with conflicts which can have explosive consequences for us all. First and foremost the fight against hunger is nowadays becoming a symbol of political determination, of choosing sides. In other words, we cannot escape this crisis by making cut-backs, which, over and above being selfish, are short-sighted. We can, on the contrary, find a way out by establishing a new relationship with those peoples which for a long and specific period of history were, I think we can say, despoiled, in order to provide a basis for the growth and development of the industrialized world.

Mr President, I have much appreciated the clarity, energy and courage of Mr Pisani. I share the basic political inspiration behind his opinions. However, I must forcefully reject the view that in the fight against hunger and underdevelopment, the 'timescale' is decisive. I should also like to say that the correlation between objectives and financial resources is just as decisive. What prevents us, Mr Pisani, from starting straight-away or rather what has prevented us from having started some time ago, some months ago, to do what needs to be done — albeit with the staggered approach which you are referring to here today? We have been talking about food strategies for years now. How many is the Community now supporting, apart from the three which are now being spawned? Food aid? We all agree that it is needed, even though we all also agree that it ought to be totally reworked proposals are forthcoming, as Mrs Focke well knows. But things have more or less continued as before. How many triangular transactions has the Commission furthered over the last few months? How many multiannual agreements has it aided? How has it linked food aid to programmes for agricultural and rural development projects?

I do not think that our real choice is between doing things quickly and badly, or doing things properly and in the long term. I think we should take care lest this type of logic should gain the ascendancy, that is a logic of a two-speed system. If we adopted one speed for emergencies and another for real change, then all we would succeed in doing is never dealing with emergencies and never achieving real change. What we ought to do — in my opinion — is not to be examining objectives and plans which are already in existence but to be setting in motion immediately and responding to both immediate needs and requirements for structural change.

This is where the real difficulty lies, and I feel sure that Mr Pisani is perfectly aware of this. However, this

Ferrero

is the sphere in which our political action and European initiatives should operate.

This is why I do not believe in party powerplay, in passing the buck of responsibility from those who adopt a serious and 'structural' approach and the 'utopian' demagogues. This is similarly why I do not see, in spite of Mr Pisani's warning, any contradiction between these two — on the contrary I see them as complementary approaches (even though I do not agree with the figure given, approximately five billion dollars) between the Michel resolution and the motion for urgency which I and others signed and which I feel, in spite of the procedural difficulties this would raise, could be merged with the text we are voting on this afternoon.

There is in my opinion another topic to which we ought to draw attention, even if this is not so immediately obvious. It nonetheless exists and is the problem or dilemma which is now becoming apparent of having to choose between what one might call 'external' and 'internal' solutions. Let me explain. The North-South dialogue has ground to a halt and there is a temptation to do without it and to seek — I am naturally oversimplifying here — political solutions, solutions which are basically internal, such as policies on prices, storage, training etc. These are all extremely important matters which ought to be encouraged and supported. But we should take care lest we lose sight of the broad scope of the problem! We must be careful lest we lose sight of the fact that there will be no real means of combating hunger and solving the food crisis without reforming the international economic order.

Does this mean that we have to wait for a sort of 'world socialism' in order to tackle this problem? Absolutely not. We must get our ideas straight and realize that there are no short-cuts. The alternative to dependence, exploitation and hunger is not isolation, the alternative is to change the world market and to change international economic and monetary relations.

Another thing, Mr Pisani, where have we got to in the reform of the Common Agricultural Policy? This is definitely something which is needed within Europe, but it is also a precondition for combating hunger and establishing new relations with the Third World.

Above all, Mr Pisani, how far have we got with the European initiative towards restarting the North-South dialogue and advancing global negotiations? I feel sure you will agree that on this subject our disappointment is more than well-founded.

Basically we must never lose sight of the fact that backwardness and hunger are the outcome of a whole range of internal political options and international circumstances . . .

President. — You have greatly exceeded your speaking time. I must ask you to conclude.

Mr Ferrero. — *(IT)* . . . As I was saying, therefore, the combat against hunger ought to be pursued internally, through policies which make due allowance for agriculture, within the framework of balanced expansion, and externally through international cooperation and a change in the mechanisms which give rise to exploitation, dependence, poverty and hunger.

This is our challenge and this is the path mapped out two years ago by Parliament and today reiterated in the Michel report — a report whose significance and in many respects exemplary nature I should like to stress.

It is our hope that Parliament, over and above its albeit very real divisions, and whilst guarding against the risk of simply denying all opposition, will once more be able, as in September 1980, to express a joint political determination which is both strong, well-defined and united, since this is the essential weapon in our struggle against hunger and underdevelopment.

(Applause from the Left)

President. — You have greatly exceeded your speaking time. I must ask you to conclude.

IN THE CHAIR: MR LALOR

Vice-President

President. — I call the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Poniowski. — *(FR)* Ladies and gentlemen, today's debate highlights the responsibilities shouldered by a minority of people belonging to a minority of States — some of which we are. The stakes are too high for this issue to be brought down to a simple contrast of two approaches, on the one hand should we encourage organized, methodical and in-depth long-term measures or take urgent short-term steps?

There is no point in our fooling ourselves, even were the United States and the Soviet Union, which do very little in the field of aid, to unite their efforts with those of Europe, we would still be a long way from solving either the long-term or the immediate problems. The true needs are boundless. In all fairness Mr Michel has clearly outlined, in his excellent report submitted on behalf of Parliament's Committee on Development and Cooperation, the broad guidelines of a set of intelligent and effective measures. I should like to thank him for the top-class views he has put forward today. We should also give Mr Pannella credit for the stubbornness with which he is attempting to focus

Poniatowski

attention, with the aid of the Nobel Peace Prizewinners, of our national parliaments and of European public opinion on the crucial issue with which we are now faced.

We are constantly torn between efficiency and generosity. Efficiency bears the stamp of logic, realism and stands the test of time. Generosity ignores all these things and calls for urgent action. In fact, we are not here faced with a choice but with a twin-pronged approach. Ordinary people, governments, non-governmental organizations and a multitude of measures must be brought forward both on the one hand to draw attention to the problem but also, it is true, in order to act. The plan to combat world hunger requires, as Mr Michel's report which following in the footsteps of Mr Ferrero's report so brilliantly underscores long-term measures to shape the future: prohibiting desertification, household energy savings, village water systems, the storage of farm produce, research applied to the existing terrain and crops, food crop growing and above all population control, and I should like in particular to stress this issue which has not been sufficiently alluded to.

This will be the main subject of my speech today.

We ought fully to realize that if things continue as they are now doing, at the end of this century our planet will be even more overpopulated in relation to its resources. This means therefore that it will be even poorer and more ill-fed. Pollution will be higher and a portion of our natural resources gone for ever. We all know the figures: world population has doubled since 1940 and will double again in the coming 40 years. At the end of this century, these four and a half thousand million inhabitants will grow to six thousand two hundred million and more than likely to eight and a half thousand million around 2020/2025. It is not so much the size of the population as the speed of its growth which causes the problems. Of the regions involved, Africa is experiencing the fastest increase. It has gone from 175 million inhabitants in 1940 to 500 million this year. It will almost certainly total approximately 900 million at the end of the century and 1 300 million in 2020. It is the part of the world which is at the moment experiencing the highest population growth, almost 3% on average and 3.9% in Kenya. Some countries, such as Nigeria, will treble their population between now and the year 2020, i.e. in a very short space of time 50 years at the outside.

If very stringent measures are not implemented in order to change the current trend, at the beginning of the third millenium and in spite of limited progress, there will be more than four thousand million human beings who are meagrely or ill-fed, one and a half thousand million of whom will be near starvation. Contrary to popular belief, Africa is the most threatened continent. Africa, almost all of which is linked to the Community through the Lomé conventions is a continent whose plight we cannot ignore.

Whereas real progress has been made over the last five or six years in South America and in Asia, where India, Pakistan and Bangladesh have managed to increase their farm production, in Africa on the contrary the food situation is steadily worsening. The rate of growth of agricultural production fell in the Seventies below the population growth rate in almost all African states. Per capita food production dropped by 7% in the Sixties, 15% in the Seventies and is likely to continue to fall in the Eighties. Exports have fallen off and the share of the African continent in world trade has decreased for a large number of basic products. Meanwhile, cereal imports doubled in the Seventies and will probably treble between now and the middle of the Eighties.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, most of what we have to do can be found in Mr Michel's report. These are the foundations of the edifice, but we will certainly have to go further than this because the figures I have given you show that the problem is so vast that North and South must truly consult each other on a major scale in order to solve these difficulties. Reference is often made to the nuclear or atomic hazard. Well, the hazard we are now faced with, that of the population explosion, if it is not properly treated with food and farm resources compensating population growth, has far wider-reaching implications. Mr President, I should like to thank you for having allowed me to speak for a few moments longer than my speaking time.

(Applause)

President. — I call the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

Mr Israël. — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we are once more gathered here to celebrate a political communion. We are holding a major debate on hunger in the world. You will, I hope, not take it amiss if I do not join wholeheartedly in this ceremony and if I try to be a little more down to earth. Firstly, I should like to praise the steps taken by leading European personalities, whose determination is making it possible to further the struggle against hunger in the world. I am thinking in particular of the Nobel Peace Prize holders, the mayors of France and Italy and all the political figures who have taken part in Operation Survival 1982.

The measures before us are split right down the middle. On the one hand, there are those who would immediately like to push the aid required, because the need for urgency is so strikingly clear and the calls for help so drastic, and then there are those who, with their great technical expertise, feel that all we do ought to be planned and organized. I should like to say — to some extent as a criticism aimed at those who think that this should all be planned and organ-

Israël

ized, that far too often companies and even sometimes governments use their funds in order to stimulate the production of competitive crops to be sold on the world market with adverse effects on the satisfaction of the food requirements of the people in developing countries. Very often, Mr President, entirely commercial considerations appear to mask the absolute priority which must be given to food and subsistence crops. I should like to add that the task of developing agriculture is not being pursued with the requisite energy. Many of the existing structures function badly, and it is distressing to observe that the Technical Centre for Agriculture and Rural Cooperation, set up under Lomé II, has never really got off the ground. It would definitely be of interest to think about setting up a European Foundation combining all the national foundations of the same type, of a non-profitmaking nature, which would act as a coordinating body and make sure that best use was made of land, as our distinguished colleague Michel Debré has already suggested in the Ferrero report. However, this move towards developing agriculture will be slow. Self-sufficiency in food supplies of developing countries is and remains a long-term objective. In this case, should we go back to the generous approach of our motion for urgency? Should we reject any chance of further expansion of European agriculture when this is the means by which we can help the Third World? In other words, and without wishing to go to the extreme of pursuing a policy of farm surpluses, ought we not to stress the importance of continuing the expansion of our agriculture?

It is not possible at one and the same time in a burst of generosity and humanitarianism to desire an energetic food aid policy and then, during budget or farm spending debates, to reduce our food production or prohibit farm surpluses. Certain people may raise the objection that some products are impossible to market since they go against particular eating habits or even religious taboos. In my opinion, this type of argument is unrealistic. Most of our European surpluses can be consumed by Third World populations, whose eating habits, even those dictated by religion, are not irrevocably fixed.

The policy of aid to the Third World is the natural corollary to the Common Agricultural Policy. And I should like to reiterate quite forcefully here today that food aid should not be decided on criteria related to the type of regime of the country concerned. In this connection, it should be remembered that the Michel report has perhaps the slight shortcoming of not imposing sufficient constraints. Some Member States still have to commit themselves to observing, from 1985 onwards, the United Nations resolution establishing government development aid at 0.7% of GDP. This is the aim of one of the amendments we have tabled. In addition, Europe ought not be alone in making these efforts. The United States, Japan and the Soviet Union ought also to take part in boosting the struggle against world hunger. Is it not somewhat sur-

prising that, whilst Community aid represents 0.46% of the gross internal product, that of the United States represents only 0.27%, of Japan 0.32% and as Mr Michel rightly pointed out, that of the Soviet Union 0.03%. But first and foremost, Mr President, the struggle against world hunger is a means of furthering the right to live, which is the basic right of all human beings, and from which all the other human rights to which the European Community is attached take their source.

The right to live, that is the real issue we are debating here today.

(Applause)

President. — I call the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members.

Mr Pannella. — (IT) Mr President, one of our colleagues — Mr Israël — has just said that this debate is like celebrating a mass or a rite. I agree wholeheartedly with him, Mr President. However, the mass in question is a requiem — the more people try to deny this the truer it becomes — and a ceremony for laying to rest not only those who are willing to die, but also the moribund, whom we pretend not to see.

Mrs Focke and Mr Ferrero have already, for the most part, expressed my thoughts on the inconclusive and irrelevant nature of the Community's action, and its sheer inadequacy — through the joint responsibility of the Council and the Commission. They are trying to hoodwink people by saying that, whereas Parliament reasons with its heart and offers lofty ideals, the Commission and the Council are bodies which *act*, and with the full knowledge and awareness of what they are doing, since they have the know-how and it is their responsibility to do the actual work. But I feel that this claim reveals their intellectual arrogance, which is the very thing which deprives them of the ability to observe, criticize and take action.

The point is that we do not have here Pascal's 'reasons of the heart' set against Descartes' reasons of nature, be they mathematical or more or less abstract in a Cartesian way. We *are* dealing with facts here. What we are celebrating here, Mr Pisani, is an old and nauseating rite. Only masters of rhetoric and their adepts would maintain anything else! For a time — and a long time, too — individuals and whole societies were exterminated for the sake of grand plans for society and men, as a result of the savage zeal of revolutionaries or conservatives whose arrogant pride, betraying none of the virtues of Lucifer, led only to degeneracy and destruction. This is the tragedy of our history, whenever religious or political fanaticism has made people say: for the sake of our dream for society, we do not care about those who will have to pay here and

Pannella

now with their extermination, just so long as this model of development is built! This was true of the Volga-Don projects in the 1930s, is true of Draconian tax policies and the illusions of centralized power which, right or left, have always been part of some kind of class struggle, doomed to failure in the end.

Since you have already spoken for 26 minutes, Mr Pisani, I get the feeling that you are more keen on monologues than dialogue. But we in this Parliament, with the reports by Mr Ferrero, by Mrs Focke on the ACP-EEC meeting, and now, today, by Mr Michel, have been spelling it out since July 1979. What we have been saying, over and over again, has enabled you to come here today with your four proposals for action which, in reality, can be found in our documents dating from two years ago. It is not up to us to congratulate ourselves on the fact that you have finally grasped the point! It is our task to ask you what guarantees you can give us that these policies will be rapidly implemented!

The fact is that the European Parliament has pinpointed the heart of the structural problem: the 0.7% of GNP for public development aid. You have absolutely no right, Mr Pisani, to say to the 77 Nobel Prize winners or the national parliaments, or — for example — the Italian Christian Democrats or the Socialist Party, or Mr Vergès or Mr Poniatowski, that we have allowed ourselves the luxury of being generous with your money, which it is your task to spend.

Nor does the intellectual arrogance which grips the Commission entitle you, Mr Pisani, to be unaware of the fact that not a single word of Mr Brandt's report on the North-South dialogue has been included in the Community's document on concrete action! Just think of it, Mr Pisani, not one single word: there is not any hint of a guideline which would affect — on the one hand — the arms trade, and, on the other, the setting up of extraordinary funds to finance a structural action programme which is out of the ordinary, but by no means spectacular, Mr Vergès! There is only one spectacle and that is the awesome sight of the huge cemeteries needed for the 30 million dead, for those people, who, being neither Spanish nor Italian, are not privileged enough to have a Mr Bernanos or a Mr Pisani! They do not even have that honour.

We believe that a policy worthy of the name must also take into account the very real problems of the legal basis for action and the demands put by the 77 Nobel Prize winners. To speak of a new international order or global agreements in the absence of these factors is merely to mouth empty and meaningless words.

All that I wanted to say, Mr President, is that we are trying to achieve what is feasible, even if it means only advancing by 1 mm a day in the right direction. A certain individual has had the effrontery to come here and preach realism at us in the name of feasibility — feasibility which we have created and on which all his

ideas are based. But the realism which he is preaching at us has filled cemeteries throughout the world.

I trust that this Parliament, united today as it has been in the past, can respond appropriately. Unfortunately, those who hold power in the Community today do not want us to be united. There are those who are hoping, Mr Pisani, Mr President of the Council, that Parliament will be divided this evening between the 12 supporters of the Nobel Prize winners with their Utopian ideals and the strong-minded advocates of creative realism! But no! This idea is an illusion! There is only one argument, whether used by Mr Ferrero, Mr Michel, Mr Brandt or by us and the speeches given by Mrs Focke and Mr Poniatowski have demonstrated this. I should just like to add that I may well not have understood Mr Jackson's speech, who spoke on behalf of a group which is nearly always present here. Today however, fate decreed that he would be a solitary figure. Did you realize, Mr Jackson, that there wasn't even one other conservative to listen to what you had to say?

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Fuchs.

Mr G. Fuchs. — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, Mr Michel's excellent report and the oral questions connected with it are the subject of today's debate, a subject which is both dramatic and scandalous.

It is dramatic because, even in the midst of the bloody conflicts which are being waged throughout the world at this very moment, we cannot ignore another kind of violence, which is even more fundamental and unacceptable, in that it abandons millions of human beings to a state where they do not have enough to eat. How can we possibly forget that tens of millions of men and women are going to starve to death again this year? It is scandalous that such a situation exists. While this is happening to them, we in our part of the world are holding ponderous debates on the best way of curbing our agricultural surpluses. While the prowess of our technology is allowing us to conquer space, the atom, and other technical complexities of life, other people are being abandoned to starvation.

Has this state of affairs been brought about deliberately? I do not believe so. In the course of my career, I have met very few people in authority who felt that hunger and war were part and parcel of their political aims or strategies. Nevertheless, war and hunger confront us on all sides.

Has this been brought about by indifference? Certainly, this is a more obvious explanation. We know only too well that those who enjoy prosperity and peace — even relative prosperity and peace — have

Fuchs

never evinced much interest in the problems of others, or much desire to help solve such problems. It is only too true that indifference often serves to shield selfish interests. I should like to pay tribute to Marco Pannella for his attempts to penetrate this indifference and to combat this egoism which is the basic cause of hunger in the world.

That does not mean to say that Mr Pannella is either the first or the only person to have engaged in such a combat. We are obliged to acknowledge that, far from receding with the years, malnutrition and hunger are on the increase. In the course of the last decade, food production per inhabitant has gone down by more than 1% per year in Africa. Purchases of cereals by developing countries have doubled in volume and quadrupled in price. The number of populations afflicted by hunger has increased. It is therefore essential for us now to go beyond a denunciation of the effects of hunger — to which Mr Pannella confined his speech — and inquire into the real reasons why hunger exists.

Some people attribute malnutrition and hunger to the various climatic disasters which regularly strike the poorest countries in the world. Drought in the Sahel and floods in Bangladesh are examples. Others emphasize — and we have heard some of them this morning — the huge population increases of these countries with the direct and indirect — such as ecological — impact this has on the countries concerned.

None of these factors can, of course, be denied, but I should like to point out, particularly to Mr Jackson and Mr Poniatowski, that we now know that the birth rate can be controlled only after there has been a rise in the standard of living, not before. For my part, I should like to stress what I feel to be the main reason for this state of affairs, namely the colonization which was practised in the past and the unequal exchange which continues to operate today. Can ever enough blame be put on the colonists of yesterday and the multinational firms of today, who, between them, have driven peasants off their land so that the notorious export crops could be grown, crops demanded by our cities? In the past, these have been cotton, coffee, sugar, and ground nuts; today they are manioc or soya. The land of the poor is used for the surpluses of the rich, can we ever say this often enough? And what is the outcome of this trend: a fall in the production of basic foodstuffs, a rural exodus and the growth of unhealthy shanty towns on the outskirts of big cities. Is it necessary to remind you that, even today, 80% of cultivated land on the island of Mauritius is planted with sugar cane and more than 50% of cultivated land in Senegal is planted with ground nuts? Must I remind you that, for the majority of these sub-Saharan African States — who are continually stepping up their food imports — only one or two of these products for export constitute the source of more than 50% of their export earnings? And finally — and I can think of no more revealing example of this outrage — what about

the fact that when there was drought in the Sahel region through-out the long years of 1971 to 1973, and great famine, the nutritional value in proteins and calories of all the ground nuts exported was greater than that of the imported food aid? Does that mean that the income resulting from these exports can at least allow the developing countries to purchase in exchange the subsistence goods which their populations need? Unfortunately, this is not the case.

For years, the purchasing power of these countries for basic products has been going down. This unequal exchange is the last and the most certain purveyor of misery in a number of third world countries. Political empires and direct colonization may well have disappeared, but the strait jacket of economic relations remains, allowing the industrialized nations to impose — by means of the markets which they dominate — the trading terms which are most favourable to them and which enable them to reject agreements on products which would at least guarantee that the wildest fluctuations could be stabilized. There is no point kidding ourselves, the root cause of hunger is political before anything else.

Does food aid constitute the right response to this situation? It is my opinion — and I want to say this as plainly as I can — that, as it has been practised up to now, the answer is no. Do not misunderstand me, I am talking about the conditions under which food aid is given. There are of course emergency situations such as natural disasters where it is essential to provide food rapidly for people to survive; there are other distressing circumstances, such as those of refugees, where only outside assistance is capable of allowing authorities in a country to cope with the ensuing problems. I must say that, in this particular sphere, the Community's intervention may generally be judged favourably. But when it comes to what is by far the largest portion of food aid — by which I mean that which is geared to remedying chronic want by the redistribution of our surpluses — then this frequently seems extraordinarily pernicious to me, in both its conception and its implementation. The negative impact of this type of aid has been widely acknowledged nowadays. Firstly, by substituting itself for the traditional types of food consumed, new eating habits are gradually created which subsequently prove very hard to reverse. For this reason, a large number of African people, often among the first beneficiaries of our aid, nowadays consume more wheat and rice than millet or sorghum. Western eating habits are assimilated to such an extent that any reverse trend is almost impossible. In Senegal, for instance, attempts to make bread with a mixture of millet and good quality wheat, but darker than the usual bread, have met with total failure. In this way, outlets for traditional cereals are gradually reduced. In the last analysis, food aid halts the own production of these countries and therefore increases the need for itself.

What is more, some of the products which are sent under the auspices of food aid to developing countries

Fuchs

are often highly unsuited to their context. The most vivid example is milk powder. The successful use of this powder, particularly when feeding babies, presupposes the knowledge of basic hygiene rules and the existence of sufficiently pure water. But these conditions, as we well know, are only too rarely fulfilled. In Africa, 80% of rural populations only have access to insufficiently pure water and there are a great number of slums in Latin America or in Asia whose water quality is also nothing to boast about. In this particular case, the result is an increase in infant mortality, even though such mortality is already high enough, and I must confess that I was very surprised to hear Mr Jackson saying what he did just a short while ago, since only a few weeks ago he proposed the adoption by the Community of a directive to make multinational firms respect the World Health Organization's code.

At a more general level, experience has often shown that food aid contributes to disorganizing and discouraging local production in a country, either because, for political reasons, it is distributed free or at prices lower than the costs of local production, or because it arrives on the market at the wrong time. In any case, this has the ultimate effect of making the country concerned more vulnerable.

Finally, at a more fundamental level, aid changes the attitudes of those who receive it, inducing dependency and debilitating the will of beneficiaries. Some leaders of third world countries are content to go along with this, since, in the short term, it consolidates their position, but others, who are in the majority, fortunately, quite rightly refuse to content themselves with shaking the begging bowl and insist on dignity and respect.

Necessary as food aid is in quite specific circumstances, I cannot say forcefully enough that multiplying it tenfold in order to fight hunger will only aggravate imbalances and increase existing dependency even more. Since I am practically certain that this would only make the situation which we are supposed to be fighting worse, it would be a tragic mistake. If we fight only the effects and not the causes, if we try to separate the campaign against hunger from the world wide struggle for development, if we try to disassociate the problem of hunger from that of North-South relations as a whole, we are only going against our avowed aim. Just as charity has never led to the re-establishment of social justice, so food aid as it is now practised will never be able to abolish hunger.

When I tabled the oral question — together with other Socialist members of the Committee on Cooperation and Development — and which I have just submitted, I did so in the hope that the Commission would echo and back up my analysis and that its plans would have a different purpose in view, that of supporting food strategies which aim at self-sufficiency for the populations concerned. To conclude, I must make my point one more time: developing countries are not asking

for charity, they are asking for justice! Except in emergencies, it is not help which must be given them, but our cooperation in meeting the objectives which they themselves have defined. The war against hunger will only be won on these terms.

President. — I call Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti.

Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti. — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I trust that you will allow me first of all to congratulate Mr Michel on his report, in which he has summed up the problems facing the Council and the Commission, and allow me from that basis to move on to three essential considerations which, in my own view, involve quite fundamental decisions. First, the Bucharest conference on planned parenthood, so as to make sure that we do not speak of, or rather accuse, third world countries without taking account of the proposals they themselves made at that conference.

And then there was a second important conference, the one held in Paris and Cancun, in which the developing countries cast light on a number of specific decisions to be made relating to a number of problems. But the fact remains that despite the efforts made so far by international authorities to cope with this situation — which is accepted as morally indefensible — the results achieved so far remain very modest and at a far lower level than the efforts which the situation objectively requires.

The European Parliament has already spoken out about the problem of hunger in the world in its resolution of September 1980, addressed to the Community authorities — Council and Commission — but not only to them; almost two years later we find ourselves obliged to propose the same action with renewed urgency following the deaths of another million human beings as a result of starvation, malnutrition and disease.

For its own part, at the recent conference held in Ireland the European Peoples Party gave some prominence to the question of hunger in the world and emphasized that alongside other political problems of equal importance a way had to be found to launching an overall development strategy for the third world with coordinated measures, cooperation in finance and the final details left to the requirements of the inhabitants of the countries concerned. All this has to be carried out against a background where power blocks lose their significance and international dialogue is encouraged so that there is a dovetailing of the programmes we all wish to see carried out.

We also made clear the need to launch a policy for development and peace by striking a new balance between expenditure on arms and investment in production and infrastructure and social spending. Nobody

Cassanmagnago Cerretti

would deny these countries the right to immediate aid in food supplies or other indirect aid, nor that such aid could be improved in terms of both quantity and quality, but we remain convinced that those principally concerned with development must be those for whom the aid is intended and that that is the only way in which we can gradually bring about the independent development of those countries, by stimulating initiative, responsibility and self-government. In this respect we are in complete agreement with what Mr Pisani has said.

That is to say that we do not wish quite simply to transfer to them planning methods and systems which would be difficult to implant in an ethnic and socio-cultural context different from our own, just as it would be a mistake to offer general aid which runs the risk of being changed into a dangerous way of forcing agreement and consequently a road to catastrophe.

Any aid to development must be accompanied by a cultural policy to guide towards research and self sufficiency the psychological and creative potential of its destinées — a potential which, alas, at present finds its expression only in terms of Darwinian survival. In other cases, where international aid has already proved to have beneficial socio-economic effect, we must promote job training to ensure that whatever is made available in terms of goods and services, of production and social structures, is kept, adapted and maintained, and that we do not — as we saw with Mrs Focke — see things which have been built lying idle with no-one to run them.

Amongst the financial and technical cooperation programmes, microprojects are measures of undoubted value which are easy to manage. The interest of people participating in such projects becomes clearer each time. The 32 ACP states have understood the advantages for this kind of project which enables the priority needs of small communities to be met rapidly. Reference is made to this in the latest report by the Commission to the ACP-EEC Council of Ministers published a few days ago, and to the satisfaction expressed about the 55 annual programmes which cover the 2 000 microprojects completed between 1976 and 1980.

For our own part, we should like to see a significant increase in the financial resources available, some tangible support for the initiative shown by non-governmental organizations, which have already performed a notable role and are confident that they will achieve further good results. The truth is that the fight against the scourge of hunger in the world must be given aid urgently, generously and massively against a background of universal and specific human solidarity; that aid must be supplied through more flexible budget methods which give priority to human values and which do away with this infamous 1% barrier: that is the only way we shall bring about a development

policy which brings all the countries of the world together in a new relationship.

As you said, Mr Pisani, we need a tangible policy which brings in the world's young people and women, with sacrifices which every one of us must be, and is willing to make on condition that they can be shown a plan and a real hope for the future. I am convinced that the governments and the citizens of the world will be prepared to follow the example of the Community institutions and give their surpluses for a future of justice and to bind the citizens of Europe in true solidarity with the citizens of the world.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Pearce.

Mr Pearce. — Mr President, may first of all thank the Commissioner for his excellent contribution to our debate and also the President-in-Office of the Council though I did notice that he omitted me and members of our group from the list of people whom he thanked for their contribution to the ongoing work of the Parliament concerning hunger in the world.

May I say that I support Mr Michel's report. I think it is an excellent report and I hope it goes through. It is quite right, Mr President, to remind the world of the grave and frightening problem that we face concerning starvation in the world, not only for the humanitarian reasons that are obvious, but because we in Western countries have reasons of self-interest at stake as well. Access to raw materials, access to export markets, strategic considerations should all draw our minds onto the problem of maintaining stability and peace in the world and of the contribution that feeding people properly can make to that aim. I also support what Mr Jackson said, particularly his warnings about the need to concentrate on population control. For Mr Pannella's benefit, I was listening to Mr Jackson's speech from over there. Mr Pannella might in future look around a little more carefully before he tries to claim who is in the Chamber and who is not.

The real battle today is between the measured practical thought-out approach of the Commission, as supported by Mr Michel, which will achieve real results in the future, and the demagoguery, the gesture politics and indeed the irresponsibility of the Pannella approach which will achieve nothing. Mr Pannella complains about a monologue from Mr Pisani. We have had in three years in this Parliament a continuous monologue from Mr Pannella, obstructing the work of Parliament and retarding the work of Parliament in considering proper actions in the Community. . . .

(Applause)

. . . Including actions in the world of development and cooperation, and Parliament owes no thanks to that Member for what he done to our work.

Pearce

The sound of Mr Pannella's voice or, indeed, his ironic applause will not feed one hungry mouth, nor will the ill-thought-out emotional and publicity-seeking programme which he is proposing. The measured approach of the Commission, as we have heard this morning, supported by Council, supported by Mr Michel, will do some good; will help to relieve starvation and malnutrition in the world. And for that reason I hope that the voice of this House is solidly behind Mr Michel and is opposed to the views that Mr Pannella has tried to introduce in a motion that may or may not be debated tomorrow.

President. — I call Mr Irmer.

Mr Irmer. — (*DE*) Mr President, the hallmarks of this morning's debate were disappointment, recrimination, impatience and anger — and I fully understand why. Nearly two years have elapsed since we debated Mr Ferrero's report and in that time, hardly anything has been achieved.

Today we have been treated to hopeful refrains from Mr De Keersmaecker and Mr Pisani, who claim that everything is going to get better. I get the message, but I don't believe it, to paraphrase the words of a great poet. If we are going to analyse how improvements can be made, we ought to have a practical example before us. I am referring to the Community's food aid, which was subjected to thorough analysis by the European Court of Auditors a short while ago. Their conclusion was that the European Community's food aid policy had failed. This was not because not enough money had been made available. It had failed for much more deep-rooted reasons. The main reason was that the food aid policy had not been incorporated into food strategies and into a general Community development policy. If we had had such a policy, it would also have contributed to a basic improvement in our relations with these destitute countries.

Now Mr Pisani is telling us — and I believe him — that it has been recognized that this was the wrong path to take. In future, food aid should be given solely to meet the requirements of European surplus production, but should be given to places where it is really needed. Suitable products should be delivered to the right place and at the right time so that the food strategies which Mr Pisani has in mind can be promoted. Isn't that just wonderful!

The Court of Auditors also pointed out, however, that the way in which decisions are taken inside the Community is not properly organized. I have yet to hear anyone offer any ways of improving this. I fear that all our other plans will inevitably come to grief if we do not tackle this problem soon.

A framework directive should now be issued and discussions to this end are now in course. Once again, the

Council is insisting that the principle of unanimity should be applied for crucial decisions, Mr De Keersmaecker. It is this principle of unanimity, that has prevented responsible decisions from being reached in the past, often because only one single Member State was against. Nevertheless, even the framework directive has provision for a so-called administrative committee which would be able to block decisions or at least to hold them up for a considerable time.

These committees are not even Council bodies, but bodies organized by the Member States through which national egoism can be exercised to excess. This wretched situation — and it will not change unless we do something about it here — stems from the fact that we have not yet managed to regard food aid — just like the whole of development policy — as a true Community policy. If we carry on allowing each Member State to act in accordance with its national requirements, preventing the Commission from implementing its well thought-out programme, this situation is not going to improve. And if that is so, we are going to find ourselves here in two years time, beginning this debate all over again!

To conclude, I would say that there is no shortage of good will or responsible proposals and programmes, and, above all, there is no shortage of money. In the last few years, quite sufficient money has been doled out for these purposes. But what is lacking is the political decisiveness to conceive of aid to development — and with it, food aid — as a Community policy.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am asking you all to do your utmost to achieve this aim.

(*Applause*)

President. — I call Mr Cohen.

Mr Cohen. — (*NL*) Mr President, Parliament is keeping to its word; it must do this since hunger is still with us. We began the great debate on world hunger nearly two years ago. We adopted the Ferrero report and today, nearly two years later, we are faced with the same problem. We now have the Michel report before us, and on behalf of my Group I would like to thank Mr Michel for his efforts. It is a very competent report, and we have not tabled any amendments to it. We shall be accepting it, but of course it is nonetheless sad that we now have to return to the same problems. I fear that in two years' time we shall have to discuss these problems again, since they are unlikely to have been solved by then.

Commissioner Pisani has said this morning that a new 'food strategy' element is to be introduced into the Community policy, and we are of course grateful to him for this. But we prefer to wait for the results before passing an opinion on the prospects for this

Cohen

new policy. I was incidentally rather surprised, disappointed and even a little depressed to hear a hint of neomalthusianism in Mr Pisani's speech.

Mr Poniatowski, Mr Pisani . . .

. . . they must be surprised to find themselves together.

This neomalthusianism, which is in fact a pretext for saying that the situation is so dire that we cannot do anything about it and that we do not have the resources to carry out the policy required, belongs in the 19th century and has no place in our present age.

We have the technology and resources to ensure that the world's population can be fed. The question is whether we apply the technology and the policy to turn our ideas into reality. I was even more surprised, disappointed and depressed by the speech by the President-in-Office of the Council. I had the feeling that the President had received the document, which had been competently drafted by one of his officials, for the first time this morning. He read it with difficulty and seemed surprised at everything he had to tell us about all the proposals, studies and investigations which were to be carried out and which would soon improve the world situation. It was an uninspired report. Apparently Mr De Keersmaecker — and my criticisms are directed at him, even though he is not listening — has not yet found the proper strength of conscience or attitude to address us with whole-hearted conviction in this debate on hunger.

The Community is primarily responsible for the ACP states. Whether we wanted this or not — and some Member States wanted it more than others — is immaterial. The fact is that we are first and foremost responsible for them, and when discussing world hunger we naturally think first and foremost of the African countries. The Caribbean and Pacific islands do belong to this group, but hunger is primarily an African problem.

Through the implementing agreement of section 4 of Yaoundé I, Yaoundé II, Lomé I and Lomé II, we have been occupied with Africa for more than 25 years — 25 years, and nothing has really changed. Africa is a poverty-stricken continent, especially in the rural areas, a continent in which internal savings stagnate and which therefore relies more than others on outside help. Africa is a continent in which the level of farm prices is a crucial factor in economic policy and in which the problem of general education and the level of development are even more vital than technical services and infrastructures.

After more than 30 years of development aid to that continent and more than 25 years of the Community's efforts directed towards Africa, it remains an internationally acknowledged scandal. Africa contains 20 of the 31 countries considered by the United Nations as being the world's least developed States. It makes little

difference to such countries that declarations are made like the one issued at the Versailles summit, which referred to the need for a policy of active cooperation with developing countries to increase their import capacity. Such countries also benefit little from declarations like that of the NATO summit, which spoke of the development of the Third World to avoid tensions in potential spots outside the zone covered by NATO.

Mr President, I do not deny the importance of these declarations, but neither Mali, nor Niger, nor Tanzania derive any benefit from them. These countries are concerned with 'bread and butter issues' and in the situation in which they find themselves no blame can be attached to them. It is high time that the Community realized that there is little to show for 25 years of effort and that Africa's food imports are increasing rather than decreasing. The almost sacred importance which the Community is accustomed to attach to Lomé is becoming less and less credible.

Africa is poor and needs help. It is no quirk of fate that money has been found to open up mines in Brazil but not in Africa. It is a sign of the times. Nor is there any point in shedding crocodile tears over this. What we must do is adapt our development policy to Africa's real needs. If we continue to finance large projects, we shall in many cases be doing no more than building cathedrals in the desert. What we must do — and Mr Pisani has already mentioned this — is gradually change from project to programme aid for Africa, devote more attention to small-scale projects, and try, together with non-governmental organizations, to increase Africa's agricultural capacity. This could all be achieved in the fairly short term. It is not necessary to wait for actual approval of food strategies.

We can immediately begin to use the money available in the budget and that resulting from the Lomé Convention in a different way. Already now — and this is again a short-term idea — we can enter into negotiations on Lomé III with the firm conviction and resolve that this policy should in the next few years be placed on a different footing. That is what we should do. But because Parliament as such cannot do this, and because we need the policy-making institutions, especially the Commission and Council, I appeal once again to both institutions to act quickly in giving a new policy of this kind a fixed form. What Parliament can do is to mobilize public opinion. We must do this, especially at a time like the present, when the economic crisis makes it all too easy for us to ignore the needs of the third world and of other countries and concentrate only on the difficulties we are facing here in the Community. For us to be able to continue our efforts successfully, there must be tangible results. Little has been achieved so far, but perhaps the new food strategies will provide some kind of relief. Also, of course, food aid should be geared more to what can be achieved in the future by the food strategies. We cannot continue to regard food supplies merely as a consequence of our own farm surpluses, as we have done

Cohen

repeatedly and almost exclusively in the past. And despite the fact that there is a sizeable agricultural lobby in this House, the Socialist Group will not hesitate to stress this point again and again. Parliament has initiated a number of new measures, but they are not enough in themselves. Parliament must also bear the consequences of its measures. It has happened that certain groups, when it was time to vote on the budget and when the continuation of the funds for a new development policy was at stake, have refrained from any action. Parliament, as well as the Council and the Commission, should practise what it preaches.

But apart from what we can do within the Community — and we should give this priority — we should also consider the international environment in which the Community finds itself and which it can influence. I am thinking of all the decisions which have already been mentioned and which I would like to list briefly: the 0.7% and the 0.15% for the least developed countries, the conclusion of raw materials agreements, sugar — and here I include isoglucose — what are in fact the Community's intentions on this?, grain, buffer stocks, the North-South dialogue, the consequences of the Cancun conference, and the reactions to the resolutions of the Paris conference on the least developed countries. All these are decisions which cannot only be carried out within the Community but which the Community must discuss in an international context. The Community must act from the standpoint of also having responsibilities outside the Lomé Convention, and it must accept these. The Socialist Group will continue to insist on all these points.

IN THE CHAIR: MR VANDEWIELE

Vice-President

President. — I call Mr Narducci.

Mr Narducci. — *(IT)* When we debate a subject like hunger in the world, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we choose almost instinctively the path of emotional assault, with such tragic figures on hunger and such a clear link between defence expenditure and underdevelopment and between the arms race and the widening gap between the northern and southern hemispheres.

We are all well aware of the facts and figures of the situation; they have been referred to several times not for the purpose of sterile recriminations but as a means of continuing the methodical and impassioned work the main lines of which this Parliament has already indicated and which Mr Michel's report here today has further developed and refurbished.

If we were here today merely for the pleasure of debating, then we would have no lack of things to talk about, the more so since we receive constant reminders be they from the moderate commitment of the West or the total absence of the communist bloc from any development policy. But merely to debate the question of hunger will not save a single life. It is our responsibility and our duty to add to the means and the efficiency of aid from the Community and from its Member States. But I would add that such emergency operations must be implemented systematically with medium and long-term projects whose aim is to eradicate the problem of hunger. A great many paths have already been indicated, and I have no wish to repeat myself, so I shall do no more than stress that our food aid policies and indeed the emergency aid itself must be reconsidered with a view to integrating them into programmes and agricultural and rural development schemes aimed at improving agricultural output and security of food supply.

In brief, I believe that what we have to do is abandon our ideological diatribes and refocus this debate on the agricultural sector of the Third World: the sacrificial lamb of our cooperation policy. Recent evidence from Africans has reminded us of the harsh realities of rural life which continue in too many developing countries: the absence of organized commercial channels, the inadequacy of storage facilities and means of communication to circulate food products, blocked prices paid to agricultural producers, claimed to be in defence of urban consumers, inadequate technical resources slowing down agricultural development, the absence of services to popularize the results of agricultural research which prevents the selection of the crop varieties best suited to local conditions. Crops must be improved, pests must be treated. Lastly, there is no agricultural credit suitable for the needs of the peasant and able to shelter him from usury.

And with all these negative factors — which we must deal with urgently in our plans — there is one essential cultural factor: too little has been done in the field of alternative training which takes into consideration the realities of rural life and the requirements of agriculture and encourages real education and awareness of the fundamental values of local society. In our European programmes a great effort must still be made to give more weight to that hitherto ignored cultural factor which nonetheless constitutes one of the keys to real development.

Lastly, I must once again stress the special rôle which is waiting for non-governmental organizations. These organizations must be given more say in the planning and implementing of strategical food security programmes, because their experience is irreplaceable. Their needs for co-financing are enormous: the whole of the EEC budget nowadays would scarcely meet half their requirements. Since Giovanni Bersani managed to have the principle of co-financing adopted in Europe in 1976, major progress has been made and a

Narducci

fruitful system of cooperation has been established. We must not fail to take precise account of such trends in the 1983 budget.

Once again our words in this chamber, our proposals, will find their real test in the budget. That is a duty which falls to the Commission, and a duty which falls to the Council of Ministers.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Turner.

Mr Turner. — Mr President, as you will recall, over 7 000 churchgoers in Suffolk and Harwich in England signed a petition to the European Parliament in 1980 on food aid. That compares with only 2 000 who signed a petition on seals this year. I think that shows the relative importance of the two subjects.

I have a proposal to make. It is not mine; it is that of the Archbishop of Canterbury which he made in London on 3 June. He made it modestly, of course, as you would expect, but it is a very imaginative and novel proposal. It is that the multinationals should themselves undertake a programme of food aid. How often in this Parliament, when we are debating difficult questions relating to multinationals, have we not heard them say that they wish to take an initiative themselves?

Now I believe this is exactly what they can do if they take up the Archbishop's proposal. They may have doubts and others may have doubts, but the source of this proposal is so august and so politically neutral that it should put all doubts to rest.

I believe that the multinationals should seize this opportunity. They have the practical expertise, they have an extensive overview of the Third World, they have a most thorough local knowledge in the Third World, they have worldwide infrastructure and local infrastructure in the poor countries. They are in a most excellent position to take up his proposal. Of course, there may be distrust of the multinationals in the United Nations and here — there often is — but locally they are very often the most respected institution in a poor country and could give practical help to the local inhabitants.

They may say: 'Well, where will all this lead?' They may be cautious. I do not know where it will lead, but I would say that if they want to take an initiative, this is the one they should take. They cannot take an initiative as imaginative as this without courage and daring, and I would ask them to do so.

President. — I call Mr Gremetz.

Mr Gremetz. — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, hunger in the world is a serious problem to which no one can remain indifferent. In past centuries it has hit populations in large numbers; Europe experienced death-dealing want and famine at a period when the world economy was mainly agricultural, and man had little control over nature. Today scientific and technical progress has been made in all spheres, including agronomy, the crop and agrarian methods which provide the means necessary to satisfy vast needs.

And nonetheless hunger exists. Worse, it is increasing. Thus the number of persons suffering from hunger has been estimated at 400 million. The World Bank considers that about 1 000 million persons living in developing regions do not have adequate nourishment. Behind the figures and the words, there are, as my friend Danielle De March said at the ACP/EEC Consultative Assembly, the faces of children deprived of smiles and joy; there are mothers who will never see their daughters grow into adults; there is the massacre of intelligence and human creativity.

Such a situation is intolerable at the dawn of the 21st century, when there is no world shortage of food products. Yes, we must act immediately in response to the call of those who are suffering and dying, we must act to save lives, to fight poverty, misery, hunger.

The countries of the European Community have the resources. Our people are deeply aware of the need. Thus France, as French Communists have long advocated, has assumed its responsibilities in this field. The French government has decided to increase its aid to the least advanced countries to 0.15 % of the GNP by 1985, in accordance with the conclusions of the Paris Conference. That is a practical, positive decision which should inspire other governments.

In the same spirit I welcome the wide condemnation of the use of food as a weapon voiced by the ACP/EEC Consultative Assembly. The European Community, however, is slow in responding to the expectations of the developing countries. It is limiting its food aid. It is excluding countries such as Vietnam. It is stalling as long as it can on the conclusion of long-term agreements for the sale of agricultural products. It is reducing its own production although the FAO forecasts a world food deficit at the end of the century and a considerable increase in the price of food products on world markets.

For our part we are in favour of a substantial increase in the food aid of the Community and of the Member States. If it is negotiated with the recipient States and populations, if it forms part of food self-sufficiency strategies, food aid can be a powerful means of conquering hunger and contributing to development. To act against hunger is in fact undeniably to take emergency action to allay the suffering of men and save lives, to act so that millions of others are not endangered. It is to make progress towards a new world economic and political order. To combat hunger ef-

Gremetz

fectively presupposes that one attacks the underlying causes, the roots of the problem, without trying to shield the economic and political forces which are fighting to maintain an unjust world. Hunger in the developing countries is in fact the result of centuries of exploitation, of colonization, of monopoly of the riches produced by imperialism.

Hunger is the inability of dozens of young nations to feed their people without aid because their productive systems have been geared to the export of basic products, because their food economies have been destroyed, because some large companies make huge profits in exporting and trading in the raw materials.

Hunger is the result of the subservience of the economies of dozens of countries solely to world market laws.

Hunger and its aggravation is the result of the crisis, the result of economies strangled between the rise in interest rates, the inflated prices for manufactured products and the collapse in the prices for basic products.

Hunger is the crisis to which capitalism is incapable of finding solutions and of which it makes the poorest, as in Europe, bear the consequences.

As requested by the developing countries themselves, France is taking steps to replace these relationships of domination by cooperation based on mutual advantage and interest between equal partners. This is the meaning of the proposals made at Cancun by the President of the French Republic in support of global negotiations within the framework of the UN to deal with all these issues. The opposition of the United States and several Community countries is unfortunately holding up the opening of such negotiations.

For our part we have decided to continue our efforts to remove these obstacles, convinced as we are that hunger will not be conquered if an end is not put to the pillage of natural resources, and the economic and political domination inherited from another era. The past is weighty and the forces wishing to maintain it are powerful, but nobody can stifle the rising aspirations for greater justice in relations with developing countries; this is the purpose of the global negotiations, the joint fund and the product agreements offering producer countries a profitable price for their products.

In working towards these objectives our country is not just facing its moral and human responsibilities. Indeed by promoting trade, by working towards a form of cooperation reflecting the needs and choices of these countries, by allowing them to truly develop, we are helping ourselves. The extent of the growing awareness of the convergence of interests between developing countries and peoples and industrialized countries is promising. The limits and inadequacies of

the mechanisms set up by the Community witness once again the urgency of finding solutions at world level in the framework of the United Nations. The failure of the Stabex has just provided fresh proof of this.

On the contrary ACP-EEC cooperation would become truly meaningful if it formed part of active and positive Community action involving global negotiations and product agreements.

Allow me therefore, in conclusion, Mr President, to reaffirm the conviction of the French Communist Party that the struggle against hunger in the world is an integral part of the struggle to establish a new world economic order and is inseparable from the struggle for greater justice and liberty in our country. The struggle against hunger in the world, at the end of the 20th century, is a choice which crops up in all political decisions, it is the choice of justice and solidarity.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mrs Pruvot.

Mrs Pruvot. — *(FR)* The mobilization of a credit of 40 million ECU for immediate food aid will save 8 million persons from hunger and death during one year. Bravo! We can but welcome the EEC's programme to combat world hunger which was submitted to us today.

The first condition for the effectiveness of this programme is that each country have a true agro-food plan adapted to its needs and its resources, thereby making it possible to arrive at individual or collective food self-sufficiency in liaison with other countries of the region. We must insist on the importance of true national food strategies and the urgency of implementing them.

The second condition for the effectiveness of the programme drawn up by the Commission is the rapidity with which it is executed. If there is one sphere in which speed is vital it is that of life. Thus all of us here have an obligation to get results rapidly. We have already lost too much time: let us give the hunger victims the physical means of using the economic instruments and structures which we will help them to set up.

This fundamental approach which consists in creating and developing structures on the spot, will make it possible to arrive at consumption and production methods adapted to the inhabitants. We are placing great hope in the so-called 'thematic' measures: fight against desert expansion, economy of domestic energy, village hydraulics, fight against endemic cattle diseases, improvement of transport and storage conditions, etc.; these are the things that will contribute to protecting the natural patrimony of the developing

Pruvot

countries and will improve the conditions for utilizing them.

Having said that, Parliament's suggestion to mobilize immediately a sum of 500 000 dollars to be used to combat the high mortality rates by means of a survival programme which will attack the primary causes of this mortality, is not, whatever the Commissioner may say, in contradiction with his analysis. We are of course aware that only in-depth action can definitively overcome the scourge of hunger and contribute to a true process of development. This is why I would like to thank Mr Michel for his excellent report and tell him that my group will vote in favour of his motion for a resolution with the conviction of thereby doing something useful.

But we are thinking of the living, those that are still living. Commissioner, it is not displaying a taste for spectacular measures, or demagoguery, but rather assistance to persons in danger, to do everything to bring to an end as quickly as possible the pain caused by this secular disease which, if we had faced our responsibility much earlier, would not have assumed such catastrophic proportions.

Our awareness of the gravity and urgency of the measures to be taken, combined with our will to see these impoverished countries become privileged and important partners of Europe, are what determine our political will today.

President of the Council, Commissioner, don't you think that the Council and the Commission should collaborate better with the European Parliament? Don't you think that it would be a good idea to involve it more in the reflection which precedes your decision-making? Mrs Focke said just now that you progressed with the speed of a snail. The truth of this is such that one may wonder, Commissioner, how many persons will remain to be saved when, at the end of your reflections, the Community will finally be ready to take action.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Vergès.

Mr Vergès. — *(FR)* Mr President, today's debate is positive to the extent that it manifests the European Parliament's will to pursue and discuss permanent measures to combat world hunger. Following the Ferrero report, the Michel report is an obvious contribution to this objective. However, as we said in the course of the debate on the Ferrero report, the formulation of the report risks giving rise to confusion. Hundreds of millions of human beings are suffering from malnutrition and undernourishment in the world, tens of millions die each year and amongst them a considerable proportion of children. This is the prob-

lem posed bluntly and it calls for exceptional measures of far greater proportions than the effort made to date. Having said this, we find it unfair to contrast the need for these new extensive measures, on condition obviously that they are realistic and effective, with the other decisive need for a long-term strategy designed to achieve the food security of countries which are at present constantly threatened by famine. What is important is to do far more both today and tomorrow. Simultaneously there is the problem of fighting underdevelopment, of which hunger is just one of the consequences.

At this point, the question assumes world proportions. We are speaking of the situation in the countries of Latin America, Africa and Asia which were colonized for centuries, which remain dependent and which represent almost 80% of humanity. These countries are caught in the spiral of contradictions arising from the present world crisis and their own contradictions: fall in raw materials prices and increase in the prices of industrial products, inflation unleashed by the international monetary disorder, oil bills, increasing indebtedness, galloping demographic growth, outdated land structures, rural exodus, increasing spread of the desert, anarchic urbanization, unemployment, particularly of young people, deplorable sanitary conditions, catastrophic food deficit. We are witnessing a combination of all these factors which is causing the crisis to accelerate, affecting entire continents and hundreds of thousands of human beings.

The situation is deteriorating and the gap between industrialized countries and underdeveloped countries is widening. Thus it is a problem which urgently requires structural measures at all levels, whether they be global negotiations on North-South relations, raw material, mining and agricultural agreements etc. It is within such a framework that it will be possible to define a policy of food security for these countries threatened both by hunger and by the food weapon wielded by certain developed countries. At the same time there is the problem of the over-arming of these countries and the obvious link between the problems of the fight against underdevelopment and the fight for peace.

The initiatives of the European Parliament, the new Commission proposals are, in our view, and seen in this light, positive to the extent that they reflect a trend in public opinion which, faced with the drama of the third world, is presently finding expression in the manifesto of the Nobel price winners, the position taken by important personalities, members of Parliament, churchmen, political parties, trade unions and associations. This is the beginning of an immense movement which will be decisive in making progress towards solving the problem, whatever the diversity, confusion, ambiguity and sometimes the real differences in the movement. What is emerging is a new solidarity in response to the necessities of the present situation.

Vergès

But we must have no illusions. Substantial interests are involved. How can one call into question, in twenty years, what has existed for almost five centuries of colonization and dependence at all levels? We are witnessing the end of an epoch. The world is oscillating between peace and war, between civilization and barbarity, but where is the civilization, where is the barbarity in this drama in which hundreds of millions of human beings are involved? We must progress towards respect for their right to live, which is the first of all human rights. This presupposes what we call a 'new world economic order' and, in conclusion, Mr President, I would like to say that I regard this as being inseparable from a new world social order. However, this new social order in the industrialized countries, as well as in the undeveloped countries, also presupposes a new cultural order, that is in the final analysis, a new 'international mental order'.

(Applause)

President. — I call the Commission.

Mr Pisani, Member of the Commission. — (FR) Mr President, I am the last to speak and since my only purpose is to reply to the previous speakers, to whom I have listened attentively, I shall be brief. The more so since the speech I gave earlier on behalf of the Commission enabled me to consider the heart of the problem and the position adopted by the Commission with a view to resolving it.

I would however like to give you some further information on a number of points. In particular I should like to say that the analysis given just now by Mr Gérard Fuchs on food aid, its risks and the immediate need for us to proceed with it, is entirely in agreement with the Commission's analysis. And, since I speak of food aid, I would like to tell Mrs Katharina Focke and one or two other speakers who mentioned the subject that a study has indeed been made of this problem and that, as I said earlier, on 15 July Parliament will be presented with a report of an enquiry into the effects of food aid and into the criticisms which can be levelled at the administration of that aid. Parliament and Council will be able to use that report as a basis for deliberations. The Commissions will use it as a basis for concrete proposals to redefine food aid, and that in about November and in any event before the end of the year. I think it is sometimes a little unfair that we should be reproached for making reports when we have been asked for reports and for making analyses when analyses are needed. I wonder what action can mean to a man of politics unless there are words to act upon. Do we, in order to be men of politics worthy of that name, have to go down into the street, or should we first try to analyse the problems and find a solution to them? It is my honour to work with this Parliament on the basis of documents I have drawn up with my colleagues, which I put to the Commission and which

the Commission puts to the Council. That is what political action is. Parliament and Council will therefore be presented with an analysis and our proposals.

I should like to refer again to the problem of demography, which was mentioned by Mr Jackson, by Mr Poniatowski and finally by Mr Cohen. Mr Cohen, I do not believe that I deserve to be reproached for malthusianism. I did not say that demographic growth had to be stopped in a drastic and deliberate way. What I said, and I repeat it now, is that two facts of life, which would normally have followed on one from another, exist side by side. Tradition and biological need meant that in former times there was an absolute need to produce ten children in order for three of them to survive and for the family to continue. With modern medicine eight out of ten children survive; sometimes nine, never less than seven, and under those circumstances the family's survival and the work required of the family no longer depend on having ten children. Families could be quite successful with four or five, but they have not yet adapted their biological rhythm to the health realities of the present day. And I think that an effort to educate, an effort to inform might, without any obligation, without any intention to extinguish life, but with a view simply to organizing life around the new realities, persuade mankind to reduce this growth which, attaining as it does in some countries 4% of the total population and 8% of the urban population, presents us with practically insoluble problems. I believe simply that demography is one aspect, and just one aspect, not the only aspect of the problem. And I believe that we must in any case approach it with infinite care, because there are questions of tradition and questions of conscience. But I believe, to sum up, that the problem deserves to be raised.

(Applause from certain quarters)

I am grateful to those members who have tackled the question of development in cultural terms. I would like to say that, although today's proposals are not in essence intended for that aspect, we do consider that, as I said last year at the ACP/EEC Consultative Assembly, the cultural dimension is of great importance, it is essential and in a way it is the ultimate goal of our efforts, because on the day that that culture, which is part and parcel of a nation's existence, forms part of its everyday reality, that nation will have escaped from the jaws of hunger and will be able to devote itself to development.

I believe that this, the Schaal report which was adopted by the Consultative Assembly, could prove the starting point for a most fruitful debate by the European Parliament. Indeed, it is against the background of that debate that I raise the question of research, which was mentioned by one or two of you. It is of primordial importance, and I say, I repeat that research cannot find a satisfactory solution in the transfer of technology. The transfer of technology is a

Pisani

temporary, provisional solution. It is like food aid: the objective must be to make it unnecessary. The fact is that if you transfer technology you transfer national problems, national ways of thinking, you transfer solutions which may be valid here and not valid there. If the transfer of technology is necessary its medium-term aim must be to lead to the establishment of research centres, research networks and research schemes which take up the realities of these countries and their peoples and attempt to solve the problems which are posed by everyday reality.

I would now like to consider the question of the rate at which we implement our strategies. First, I should like to repeat that the food strategies we are concerned with are those called for by the European Parliament. A number of proposals have been formulated within international institutions but I must say in all honesty that my own responsibility for implementing them has shown me that they still need to be given some content. Our work over the last few months, based on a virtually self-evident truth and at the very least our driving motive, has been to define the approach to what could be a food strategy, for three countries, and first of all amongst ourselves in terms of research. Do you believe that it is an *a priori* truth that the starting point for such a strategy is the release of productive economic forces? Do you think it reasonable to say without analysis that such productive forces have been paralyzed by a certain number of economic policies? Do you believe that it can be said *a priori* that to release such forces will produce such or such an effect and do you believe that we have clear means of ensuring that once released those forces do not collide with immovable objects or become entangled in bureaucracy or doubt.

Do you think it all easy when we are in Brussels — or indeed anywhere else, the FAO in Rome or the United Nations in New York — to imagine what food strategy should be, when we can see that every national strategy is different from its neighbours, and different from anything else anywhere else in the world, not just because the natural factors are different, not just because production capacity is different, not just because the tribal and social structures are different but because the political motivation and the political capacity of governments are different. Do you believe that somebody sitting in Brussels with a document a few pages long can decide what there is to be done when it takes hours and hours of negotiations with governments to try and get them to produce their own capacity and their own motivation? Believe me, the few months we have asked for to draw up food strategy are not too long.

What we are doing with these three countries — which, by the end of the year, will no doubt be six, is embarking on a great adventure, and adventure which, as I was saying just now, will do away with the inevitability of failure to which we have become accustomed. Let me explain. We have become accustomed to fail-

ure becoming inevitable. Is it not a fact with food aid, and the determination to increase food aid, if we say that each day we will give a little more for these countries to eat — are we not admitting that they will inevitably fail to produce whilst we know that they can do so?

The building works described just now by, I think, Mr Cohen, which will become deserted cathedrals in a desert, do you not think that accepting that these works will not be 100% useful and that no one will take them over because nobody local has been trained to do so — do you not believe that that is the inevitability of failure? Do you not think, on the other hand, that if we set off the process which shakes down the economic forces with a view to mastering them and handing that control over to the people themselves, do you not believe that that should be the fruit of research and determination on which a little time has been spent?

The principal point of my speech, however, I address to Bruno Ferrero. How, after being a rapporteur yourself, Mr Ferrero, dare you to say what you just said? How could you do it? . . .

(Interruption by Mr Pannella)

President. — Mr Pannella, if you please. You have not even asked for me to call you. I will allow your interruption to be included in the record of proceedings.

I call the Commission.

Mr Pisani, Member of the Commission. — *(FR)* If it wasn't so easy to do it I would have been quite pleased with myself for getting Mr Pannella angry . . .

I should like to address myself to Mr Ferrero. After that I shall address Mr Michel.

Mr Ferrero, there is a difference between the two approaches. Because food aid, by which we make means immediately available merely gives more power to the tendency for these countries not to produce for themselves; because food aid distributed immediately overwhelms the market for basic food products to the extent of triggering a rise in prices which wipes out all the benefit achieved by our aid and because it would lead us, the European Economic Community, to believe that we can always produce more, without reflecting on the danger which that represents to production systems within developing countries.

What I am not saying, what I have never said — indeed I have said the opposite — is that we must rule out emergency aid altogether. The Community has the management of emergency aid and would like to have more funds available for that aid: what I do say is that there is a contradiction and a danger in raising emer-

Pisani

agency aid, which is necessary, to the same level as the basic structural effort required from us to establish thriving economies. When this House has strongly endorsed the need to give absolute priority to strategies, that is to say to the independent production capacity of agricultural developments, then, as temporary and corrective measures, insofar as those strategies are not jeopardized, emergency aid becomes possible and becomes necessary. It is an auxiliary effort, albeit urgent, albeit indispensable, and though everything may incite us to give, it is of only secondary importance compared with the key policy represented by agricultural production in developing countries.

Now, Mr Chairman — and I trust that Parliament will forgive my fervour, I would like to turn to Mr Michel and tell him in answer to the question which he raised just now that I have already replied in the clearest of terms that the Commission has proposed, the Council is considering and Parliament will debate allocating 184 million EUA to the fight against these situations which we are claiming to be dealing with. 40 million EUA last year and 184 million this year is some improvement. Whether it will be either possible or necessary to give more next year remains to be seen. My own personal belief is that if we reverse the trend of failure and start to show some success, which I believe possible, then needs will increase and we shall be able to tell European opinion and our political masters that the money they make available or which we ask them to make available will be useful, since in the last analysis it will be used to increase the food production of the developing countries themselves, in other words to achieve the development which we have been seeking for so long.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — *(FR)* Mr President, there are certain rules of the game which are there in our Rules of Procedure and in the treaties. I do not want to waste time by dragging up the treaties but I am keen to say that according to the treaties and our Rules of Procedure — and this is quite right — the institutions, by which I mean the Commission and the Council, speak in this Chamber whenever they see fit to do so. If the proceedings in this Parliament are going to be organized, and in accordance with parliamentary precedent, when a big group like the Socialists is given — I think I am right — a total of 17 minutes during a major debate and the Christian Democrats get 16 minutes, then you really have to ask the Commission and the Council, when you are organizing the debate, how much time they are going to need when they come to speak. When this question was put the day before yesterday, the answer we got was more or less that by way of something of a change from the way things have been done in the past, the Commission intended to wear as

it were its own hat and the rapporteur's and to speak twice . . .

President. — You are giving another speech, Mr Pannella! Write to the Bureau. I will not allow you to continue. You are not in Italy now . . .

(Mr Pannella attempted to continue but his microphone was switched off)

Mr Pannella, you are perfectly entitled to ask the Chair a question. If I allow you to speak — and I knew this was coming — it is only so that I can tell you to submit your question in writing to the Bureau so that you get a ruling because, frankly, I am very grateful to Mr Pisani of the Commission. On behalf of the entire House I wish to tell him that we are very grateful for the fact that on behalf of the Commission he has accorded such an importance to what we have to say here that he has been kind enough to come and tell us what the Commission intends to do.

Now you are making a fuss, Mr Pannella, because the Commission has too much to say. I have never heard of such a thing. Usually ministers are criticized because they do not say enough or because they keep quiet or because they are not willing to say anything. And now you are kicking up a fuss! We have heard enough of what you have to say in the corridors, Mr Pannella. You have not stopped talking all day. It really is too much, Mr Pannella!

I call the rapporteur.

Mr Michel, rapporteur. — *(FR)* Mr President, first of all I should like to thank the President of the Council and the Commissioner, Mr Pisani, for their answers to some of my questions. However there is one point I would like to come back to.

I stated that if the Member States honored their commitments — 0.7% of GNP in public aid to the developing countries and 0.15% in special aid to the least developed countries — and ensured the financing of the international agricultural development fund as they have promised, one would arrive at a figure of 500 000 million ECU in the coming years. I should like to know if the Commission and the Council have considered this factor because it proves that commitments have been made along the lines desired by many and as all those who are carrying on the campaign wish. Personally therefore I am opposed to the creation of new funds if countries do not assume their responsibilities in those which already exist and which should function.

The Commissioner paid particular attention to the demographic problem raised in my report. His reply on the subject of the birth rate must be examined closely but I should like to add that at present, accord-

Michel

ing to information from FAO reports, the proportion of arable land not cultivated is $\frac{4}{5}$ in Latin America, $\frac{3}{4}$ in Africa and half in North America compared with Europe where all arable land is cultivated. Consequently there is a need for far more numerous development programmes than those being set up at present. There is also the problem of financing them, their framework and the sharing of responsibilities with those who, in the final analysis, must take the decisions. Because we cannot decide for others, particularly not for those whom we want to aid and assist, otherwise we are returning to paternalism. And this is what I personally refuse to do.

(Applause)

President. — Does the Commission wish to reply again?

(Interruption by Mr Pannella)

For heaven's sake, Mr Pannella, must you always be so courteous?

(Laughter)

What do you want to say now?

Mr Pannella. — *(FR)* Mr President, I want to comment on what you said just now, in a very unpleasant manner, to the effect that we are not in Italy. I really think, Mr President, that we could invite you there to teach you something about parliamentary manners.

(Applause)

President. — I withdraw what I said, Mr Pannella. I like Italy very much. I have been there almost every year for the last thirty years. Now that we have come to the end of this excellent debate on this fine report, I suggest that we do not take the point any farther.

The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

(The sitting was suspended at 1 p.m. and resumed at 3.05 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR: MR ESTGEN

Vice-President

2. Question Time

President. — The next item is the second part of Question Time (Doc. 1-330/82).¹

We begin with the questions to the Council.

Since they deal with related subjects, I call Question No 51, by Mr Seligman (H-847/81):

What types of decisions by the Council can at present be made by qualified majority vote, and what steps does the Council want to take to widen the range of such decisions?

Question No 66, by Mr Bøgh (H-172/82):

Will the Council confirm that each of the ten Member States has the right to impose a veto on decisions involving national vital interests, and that each of the ten countries decides for itself whether and when it considers a matter to be vital?

and Question No 69, by Mr Purvis (H-187/82):

Following the procedures adopted for approving the farm prices on 18 May 1982, what is the current convention regarding voting in the Council of Ministers, and has the Council now returned to the provisions of the Treaty of Rome and discarded completely the so-called Luxembourg Compromise of 1966?

Mr De Keersmaecker, President-in-Office of the Council. — *(NL)* I should like to answer the questions by Mr Purvis, Mr Bøgh and Mr Seligman jointly. The Council had already repeatedly answered this question — according to my list, about twenty times.

I have nothing to add to what I have said before, i.e. that the Council decides in accordance with the provisions of the Treaties. However, according to these Treaties, a decision can be made either with a simple or with a qualified majority. This does not mean that the Council do not continue in their endeavour to achieve convergence of viewpoints before the Council makes its pronouncement. As regards the specific question raised by Mr Seligman, one should distinguish between two sorts of voting by qualified majority. Firstly, there are those cases in which the Council decisions have a direct basis in the Treaties — the so-called 'basic decisions'. The second category of Council decisions are based on previous decisions taken in implementation of the Treaties — the so-called 'secondary decisions'. Obviously, the first type of decisions are determined by the Treaties, and unless the Treaties are revised the number of cases in

¹ Request to waive the immunity of a Member — Topical and urgent debate (objections): see Minutes.

De Keersmaecker

which a qualified majority is provided for cannot be increased. In the second case, it could be considered increasing the number of cases for which voting by qualified majority is provided for, and the Council takes the view that it is its task to determine in each case, depending on the subject involved, which voting rule should be applied.

IN THE CHAIR: MR KLEPSCH

Vice-President

President. — Our convention has always been that each questioner can put a supplementary question.

Mr Seligman. — I welcome the President's very clear statement on what has recently become a rather sensitive matter. I am glad the Council will consider enlarging the number of second-degree cases which will be decided by qualified majority.

Regarding the first-degree basic cases, I have an enormous list here which have to be decided by unanimity, under the Treaties of course. Now will the Council consider expediting Community progress by removing some of the non-vital categories, by, in fact, revising the Treaties?

Mr De Keersmaecker. — (NL) I can inform the honourable Member that no modifications whatsoever are envisaged, particularly as regards the Treaty.

Mr Purvis. — The President-in-Office of the Council will be aware that this Parliament is somewhat concerned at the large number of Commission proposals that have passed through the Parliament and are waiting for approval at Council level. I wonder if he could give us some idea of just how many there are and if he now plans to prosecute them with greater vigour in the new environment that we have; and in that he will be discussing, I gather, in the Council the Genscher-Colombo proposals in the next few days, what line is he anticipating will come out of that?

Mr De Keersmaecker. — (NL) What Mr Purvis' question boils down to is in fact the same as a question put by Mr Hutton. As I have no wish to answer Mr Hutton's question prematurely I will give an answer to Mr Purvis when I come to deal with Mr Hutton's question.

Mr Radoux. — (FR) Since the principle of majority votes is absolutely fundamental to the Treaty of Rome

and the Accession Treaty of 1972, does the Council feel that the vote on the agricultural prices for 1982/83 represents a return, after 16 years, to institutional orthodoxy and does it feel that the statement by one delegation concerning an abuse of the principle of vital interests, which was made on the occasion of this vote, amounts to admitting that a Member State cannot be the sole judge of its right of veto?

Mr De Keersmaecker. — (FR) I must inform the honourable Member that the Council's vote of 18 May was totally in accordance with the Treaty. As regards the interpretation of the 'Luxembourg Compromise' and all it implies, this will be discussed by the Council on 20 June 1982, i.e. next Sunday.

Mrs Clwyd. — I wonder if the President-in-Office of the Council could tell me whether he agrees with the version put forward by Mrs Cresson, who, of course, was the French Minister of Agriculture who played a key role last month in the defeat of the British within the European Community? She said that the rules of the Luxembourg Compromise remain unaffected by what happened — namely, that a veto can only apply to the issue under discussion. She said we warned the British in advance, in every conceivable way, of what was in store if they carried on with their veto of farm price increases as a form of budget blackmail, but they simply did not believe us. She went on to say: 'On this occasion, I think the British Government goofed.'

Would the President-in-Office of the Council agree with that version?

Mr De Keersmaecker. — (NL) I must give the same answer as I gave to the previous question. I am obviously familiar with Mrs Cresson's interpretation and the reasons she gave in connection with the vote of the French delegation. It was not my job then, nor is it my job today, to pass any judgment. Each delegation can have different reasons for the same act and this is connected with the fact that this Luxembourg Compromise exists and is a bone of contention. Some countries do not accept it and others interpret it in different ways. We all know that this conflict exists and we are all anxious to find a way out. There is no need, therefore, for me to go into the vexed question of interpretation on behalf of others. We intend to discuss this question in the Council next Sunday, but I must make it quite clear that, as President of the Council of 18 May, I abided completely by the rules provided for in the Treaty.

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

Mr Purvis. — Although I accept that the preamble to my supplementary covered what is coming up in a subsequent question, the actual question referred to the

Purvis

meeting that is starting on Sunday to consider the Genscher-Colombo proposals. What is the current convention in line with the Genscher-Colombo proposals that you are going to discuss, and notably paragraph 223? Where are we at now and where do you expect to come out?

President. — Mr Purvis, I cannot allow this question since you asked to speak on a point of order and this was why I gave you the floor.

Mr Purvis. — Mr President, in fact it was a point of order because you disallowed the original question on the basis of the preamble but not on the substantive question, which does relate to my Question No 69, as to the current convention.

President. — If the President of the Council is prepared to answer the question, I will allow it.

Mr De Keersmaecker. — (NL) The answer is in fact very simple. The questions which have been brought up are to be dealt with on 20 June. I cannot, however, predict the outcome of these talks but the questioner can obviously enquire after next week's meeting.

Mr Lange. — (DE) As regards this document which was signed in 1966 in Luxembourg and to which I have referred, can this document really be called a compromise? Can we really claim that it contains provisions for a veto? Can we really talk of a veto in the terms of the Treaty, and is it really right to consider the Luxembourg document as a component of the Community?

Mr De Keersmaecker. — (NL) As I am sure Mr Lange is already aware, the so-called 'Luxembourg Compromise' is also known as 'an agreement to disagree'. It contains a series of paragraphs each stating different viewpoints. It is an attempt to find a way out of these difficulties and the Council intends to discuss this question on Saturday.

Mr Kirk. — (DA) Mr President of the Council, will you confirm that there will always be a limit to the power of veto in the practice which has developed in the Council since they agreed or failed to agree on the Luxembourg Compromise, and that this limit was passed in the specific case of the agricultural price-fixing, in that nine Member States clearly had vital interests in reaching a solution, whereas there was one country which thought it had vital interests in preventing a decision being reached, and that the vital interests of nine Member States should take priority over a vital interest which one Member State insists on?

Mr De Keersmaecker. — (NL) One could obviously also put it the other way round and say that the vital interests of nine countries should not suffer because of the vital interests of one individual country. The Council says that when the vital interests of one country are at variance with the vital interests of other countries, these two vital interests cancel each other out and we simply follow the Treaty. I would repeat that this is a very controversial matter and the Council is trying to find a way out. My job at that time was to apply the rules. I have nothing to add.

President. — I allowed so many supplementary questions since this was a matter of general interest. We hope that the discussions on Sunday will lead to a positive outcome.

I call Question No 52, by Mr Radoux (H-82/82):

At their latest meeting of 6 April 1982, the Ministers of Social Affairs and Employment declined an invitation from the International Labour Organization to take part in a pan-European meeting, the reason adduced being events in Turkey and Poland. Would the Council clearly explain this and any other reason for its refusal?

Mr De Keersmaecker, President-in-Office of the Council. — (NL) To date the member countries of the European region have received no invitation from the ILO to take part in a regional conference. Consequently no decision whatsoever has needed to be taken on the matter.

President. — I call Question No 53, by Mr Hutton (H-92/82):

How many proposals by the Commission, on which Parliament had proposed amendments in giving its Opinion, were awaiting a decision by the Council at the latest convenient date; and what new measures does the Council propose to take to eliminate this backlog, in the interests of the Community and its citizens?

Mr De Keersmaecker, President-in-Office of the Council. — (NL) The Commission regularly draws up a list of proposals pending before the Council on which the European Parliament has given its Opinion. For its part, after each part-session, the General Secretariat of the European Parliament draws up lists of the Opinions the latter has given, whether or not they contain suggested amendments to the Commission proposals. The Council is aware that, in certain instances, there may be a considerable lapse of time between submission of the Commission proposal and the delivery of the European Parliament's Opinion on the one hand, and the adoption of the Council decision on the other. Work on some of these proposals is continuing within the Council, but the complex and technical nature of

De Keersmaecker

these proposals would explain why this work has not yet been completed.

Mr Hutton. — Would the President-in-Office of the Council deny that at 1 May the figure that I am seeking was 313? Is he aware that every Commission proposal amended by Parliament which is held up by the Council represents a body-blow to this Parliament, because it has got no way of demonstrating the amount of time and effort put by its committees and its part-sessions into formulating and voting on our amendments? Would he further deny that the Council is deliberately crippling the Parliament in its actions, or would he, perhaps, admit that it is now so paralysed by the Luxembourg Compromise that it has practically lost the power to arrive at decisions?

Mr De Keersmaecker. — (NL) I must point out to the honourable Member that this is by no means the explanation since if we look at the figures, we see that there is a very reasonable balance. For example, I can inform you that between 1966 and 1981, i.e. over a period of six years, the Council adopted 3 588 regulations, directives, decisions and other measures on the basis of the 3 788 proposals received from the Commission. This, I think, is a very reasonable balance.

Mr Newton Dunn. — Would the President-in-Office of the Council accept that the failure to pass the more contentious proposals, to which my colleague Mr Hutton has referred, leads to a failure to make the Community work successfully and therefore leads to public disillusion and, ultimately, to the break-up of the Community?

Mr De Keersmaecker. — (NL) No, that is certainly not the case. I am told that there was a mistranslation and the figure 3 588 which I quoted was given as 3 188. This was wrong and this correction makes the balance to which I drew attention in my previous answer even clearer. However, the last supplementary question implied that the Community has ground to a halt because the Council is omitting to deal with the most important proposals. This is by no means the case. Indeed, it would be more accurate to say that there are various reasons why certain matters have not been dealt with or have only been dealt with after a considerable delay. There might be proposals which have become obsolete and there might even be proposals which have not received any attention from this Parliament. On the other hand, there are proposals which are complex and technical that they call for a great deal of preparation and time if they are to be studied thoroughly. This is the real explanation. The backlog, both as regards bulk and time, must be considered in this light.

Mr Eisma. — (NL) Does the President-in-Office realize that the opposite also occurs — i.e. a situation

whereby the Council has not yet received Parliament's Opinions but nevertheless continues with its discussion of these questions, merely postponing the formal decision until it has received Parliament's Opinion. Take for example the Council of Ministers of Social Affairs of 27 May. Subjects such as flexibility as regards retirement age, voluntary part-time work and the outlook in the social sector have already been extensively discussed and decided in the Council, which is the reason underlying my supplementary question — i.e. could not the Council adjust its priorities in such a way that decisions on proposals on which Parliament has issued an Opinion and possibly amended would it take priority and that the Council would wait until it had received Parliament's Opinion before discussing other subjects on which Parliament had not as yet pronounced?

Mr De Keersmaecker. — (NL) I must inform the honourable Member that the Council must in fact always take account of Parliament's Opinion. There are exceptional cases of urgency where the Council goes ahead with its deliberations in view of this urgency, as for example in the case of the arrangements in the wine sector. However, it waits until Parliament's Opinion is available before making the final decision.

Mr K. Fuchs. — (DE) Does not the President of the Council agree that the figures he has just mentioned for the most part referred to individual technical decisions and that the Council unfortunately continues omitting to make the important political decisions in, for example, the transport sector, in spite of the fact that no less than eleven Articles of the Treaty of Rome call for a common transport policy?

Mr De Keersmaecker. — (NL) I should like to point out to Mr Fuchs that no distinction was made in the figures I quoted, i.e. they referred to all the proposals which have been discussed. As regards the problem of transport policy, I can inform you — and I happen to be very competent to speak on this question since I used to be deputy chairman of the relevant Parliamentary Committee, on which I also in my day frequently deplored the absence of a decision on this matter — but the most recent Council of Transport Ministers did indeed reach a decision on this question.

Mr de Ferranti. — Is the President-in-Office aware that we agreed just this afternoon to have an urgency debate on questions concerning the internal market? Whilst we appreciate very much the Belgian Presidency's efforts to get decisions made, could he tell us whether he has been successful in calling a Council this month to try and complete some of the 88 directives that relate to the internal market?

Mr De Keersmaecker. — (NL) This was indeed the original intention but unfortunately, it has not yet

De Keersmaecker

been decided to hold this special Council meeting to deal with the question of the internal market.

President. — Since its author is absent, Question No 54 will receive a written reply.

Question No 55, by Mr Deleau (H-117/82):

With a view to resolving its numerous trade disputes with Japan and the United States in particular, could not the Community take the initiative of calling a high-level meeting on trade with its Japanese and American partners?

Mr De Keersmaecker, President-in-Office of the Council. — (NL) The Council does not think that there is any need for new channels of communication with our two major industrial partners, either on bilateral or multilateral level or even at the highest political level. This does not mean, however, that there is no need for talks. The recent economic summit at Versailles specifically gave the Community an opportunity to stress to its partners the potentially serious consequences of any further disputes for the international trade system and for Western solidarity and the resulting need for de-escalation of these disputes and for each of the major Western partners to shoulder its responsibilities. The Governments should realize the possible consequences for the other partners of national political decisions and should be resolved to act in compliance with the spirit and the letter of international undertakings entered into and, in particular, with the principles and procedures of GATT.

Finally, I would refer you to the report made by Mr Tindemans to your Parliament on the results of the Versailles summit.

Mr Deleau. — (FR) I should like to thank the President of the Council for his answer. There is indeed no lack of channels of communication but since the Council recognizes the need for consultation on this specific point, this was not a negative answer. Is the Community prepared to convene a major meeting on trade matters of this kind with our Japanese and American partners — and when I say partners, I mean above all, competitors. I should be pleased if the Council could undertake to initiate new negotiations with a view to putting an end to the dispute, and I should be grateful for a far more precise answer.

Mr De Keersmaecker. — (NL) Any more precise answer I give must take its place in the context of the general answer I have just given. The dialogue on these issues took place in the context of the Versailles Summit and will be continued at ministerial level at the forthcoming GATT meeting.

Mr Marshall. — Would the President-in-Office of the Council accept that many of us believe that where

Japan is concerned the time for talking is rapidly coming to an end? Would he accept that many of us find Japanese trading practices to be unacceptable as they seem to believe in freedom of trade for their exports and monstrous restrictions upon imports into Japan?

Mr De Keersmaecker. — (NL) If I remember rightly, Mr Tindemans drew up a report on his visit to Japan in which he stated that the Japanese government had shown itself to be prepared to consider this problem directly and that it had already adopted a series of limited measures. We regard these measures as indeed limited, but nevertheless feel that they represent an initial step towards convergence in this area. This attitude on the part of the Japanese Government was also reaffirmed at the Versailles summit.

Mrs Hoffmann. — (FR) What specific measures does the Commission intend to take to contend with the American decision to apply countervailing duties on European steel and hence to protect production and employment in the steel sector in the Member States of the Community?

Mr De Keersmaecker. — (NL) The questioner asked what the Commission intends to do. Obviously, the Council cannot answer this question.

Mr Habsburg. — (DE) I should like to ask the Minister whether or not he agrees that a large part of our problems with Japan stem not so much from abuses on the part of Japan, but simply from the fact that in Japan the State accounts for 19% of the gross domestic product as against 47% in Germany, and that we should not have so much to fear from Japanese competition if our governments were as good at its job as the workers are at theirs?

Mr De Keersmaecker. — (NL) You are asking for me to make a value judgement on behalf of the Council. That is not what I am here for.

President. — I call Question No 56, by Mr Remilly (H-118/82):

Are there any immediate plans to hold a joint Council meeting on Social Affairs and Economic Affairs with special reference to employment problems?

Mr De Keersmaecker, President-in-Office of the Council. — (NL) As I said before on 21 April 1982 in reply to the oral question by Mr Eisma, the success of a Council meeting of the Ministers for Economic Affairs and the Ministers for Social Affairs depends on extremely careful preparation of the meeting. As part of these preparations some useful work was done at

De Keersmaecker

the meeting of the Standing Committee on Employment on 27 April 1982 and that of the Council of 27 May 1982.

Mr Boyes. — As unemployment, particularly amongst our young people, continues to grow no one can forecast the political, social and economic consequences of the problem of long-term unemployment. History tells us that the consequences for individuals, countries and continents can be extremely tragic and yet some governments — for example the one in the United Kingdom, led by the Conservative Party which is worshipping at the feet of the god of monetarism — continue to deliberately create an ever-increasing pool of unemployment.

(Interruption)

I thought you were keeping quiet this afternoon! I thought you were half dead most of you, but perhaps you have been beaten into submission . . .

President. — Mr Boyes, you should put a question and not address the House.

Mr Boyes. — . . . or maybe you are celebrating over this terrible victory in the Falklands.

(Protests from the European Democratic Group)

I am thinking of the 250 . . . British servicemen who have been killed in the South Atlantic.

Will the President-in-Office please tell me what recommendations he will be passing on to his successor in an effort to combat the problem of 15 million people in this Community being unemployed?

Mr De Keersmaecker. — *(NL)* As you know, it was the wish of the Belgian Presidency to organize a jumbo Council. However, this sort of thing calls for thorough and somewhat lengthy preparation and Mr Tindemans explained yesterday in his statement on the Belgian presidency why this jumbo Council did not in fact get off the ground. Mr Boyes has rightly drawn our attention to the dramatic proportions which youth unemployment has attained. It was the intention of the Belgian Presidency to devote particular attention to this question. The preparatory work has already been started and must be followed up. The Belgian Presidency takes the view that the question of youth unemployment must continue to take priority under the Danish Presidency.

One of the things necessary for sound preparation was prior consultation with the two sides of industry with a view to ascertaining what objectives are realistic and to avoid raising unfounded hopes. Inadequate preparation would increase the risk of disillusionment, and for

this reason the Belgian Presidency felt it wise to exercise patience and to ask the Danish Presidency to take this matter over. As I am sure you are also aware, the European Council recently — I think it was in March — took an important decision in Brussels, i.e. it agreed in principle that a policy should be pursued at national level which would provide either a job or a chance of vocational training for every young person coming onto the labour market. This principle must be put into practice in the policy of the Member States, but the decision was in fact reached at European level.

Mr Pearce. — Would the President-in-Office agree — contrary to the spirit of Mr Boyes' supplementary question — that the magnificent victory that Britain has won in the Falkland Islands would encourage us all to see that where there is determination, ability, honesty and a love of freedom we can cure serious problems that affect humanity and that, with that sort of spirit and that attitude, we could cure this terrible problem of unemployment?

President. — I cannot allow this question.

I call Question No 57, by Mrs Gaiotti De Biase (H-124/82):

Is it true that the Primate of Poland, Archbishop Glemp, has asked that instead of delivering finished food products to Poland the Community authorities should supply quantities of maize and soya to be used in private poultry raising, and how does the Council react to what appears to be reasonable and well-founded request that would enable part of the private poultry-raising industry to be saved and increase by a factor of five the nutritional value of Community aid?

Mr De Keersmaecker, President-in-Office of the Council. — *(NL)* The honourable Member's information concerning the request by the Primate of Poland, Archbishop Glemp, is correct. However, while the Community sympathizes with the problems facing the people of Poland, such a request raises a number of technical and financial difficulties, in particular in connection with the decisions taken by the Council in January and February 1982 on the nature of emergency aid for the people of Poland. I would remind you that the Council decided on emergency aid of 10 million ECU for foodstuffs and products, to be channeled through non-governmental organizations. This aid scheme was in fact rapidly implemented by the Commission, in close cooperation with these organizations.

Mr Marshall. — On a point of order under Rule 90, Mr President. On a previous occasion certain remarks from Mr Balfe were expunged from the verbatim report of a meeting of this House. Can we have an assurance that the remarks of Mr Boyes which were

Marshall

unpatriotic and attack the activities of British troops in the Falklands will not be expunged under the direction of you or anybody else?

President. — I can assure you that the questions will be recorded in the Minutes. That applies to your remark too.

Mrs Kellett-Bowman. — Mr President, Rule 90 says quite categorically that a verbatim report of the proceedings of each sitting shall be drawn up in the official languages. Many of us here heard Mr Boyes use the words 'the terrible victory in the Falklands'. Now as the order is that the report should be verbatim, I would respectfully suggest that those unpatriotic words must in fact be included.

President. — As I have already explained, the supplementary question will be reported verbatim.

If all sorts of remarks are contained in a question — in parenthesis, as it were — they are obviously part of the question, even if the questioner has overlooked this fact. As President of the sitting, I expunged these remarks.

I do not want a major procedural debate to develop over the word 'unpatriotic'. The supplementary question will be reported word for word as Mr Boyes put it in the verbatim report of proceedings.

Mr Harris. — Mr President, could we be absolutely clear on this point because when a similar situation arose some time ago when Mr Balfe was in the Chamber the President of Parliament, Mr Dankert, ruled in similar terms as yourself that the Minutes would reflect the deletion of Mr Balfe's remarks. In fact he accused British troops of being murderers. Now I tried to catch the President's attention at that point because I thought that Mr Balfe's disgraceful remarks — as I saw them — should be fully reflected in the records of this House. But when we looked at the official record, the rainbow — in British terms the Hansard of the Parliament — and we found the next day that all reference to Mr Balfe's remarks which, as I say, I regard as absolutely disgraceful, had been expunged. So I think there is a difference, with respect, between the Minutes of Proceedings and the actual official verbatim report of what is said.

Could I please reinforce the pleas made by my colleagues that when the official verbatim report of today's proceedings is printed — hopefully tomorrow — Mr Boyes' remarks will be reported in full so that others, like myself, can bring them to the full attention of the British public.

President. — (DE) The purpose of Question Time is to permit answers to be given to questions and not to

provide an opportunity to discuss other matters under the pretext of a procedural debate. I will look into the question of whether there is a divergence between Mr Dankert's view and my own. If so, we will have to find another decision.

Mr Balfe. — Mr President, my name has now been mentioned three times. The point of order I would like to make is that I took this matter up with President Dankert, since it concerned me and since I wished the matter to be in the record.

He pointed out to me — I do not know under which rule — that the President of the sitting has the right to delete any word that he considers should be struck from the record. It is up to you to decide.

President. — As President of the sitting I can decide what is included in the verbatim report of proceedings.

I call Mrs Gaiotti De Biase for a supplementary question.

Mrs Gaiotti de Biase. — (IT) I should like to say that I am somewhat dissatisfied since it seems to me that the Presidency has not answered my question.

In answer to a previous question of mine to the Commission I was told that it has not been possible to meet the request by Monsignor Glemp because this would turn the aid we are providing to Poland into economic aid. As I see it, however, such requests would not constitute economic aid to the Polish regime but rather aid to the people of Poland aimed at promoting the development of a free economy in that country, as well as being inspired by that type of solidarity which this Parliament has always affirmed.

I hope that the Council of Ministers and the Commission can go back on this decision and get over the financial obstacles which appear to be underlying it. This, I think, would be a very clear demonstration of what the European Parliament means by solidarity with the Poles at a time when the Church itself is going through times which are undoubtedly even more difficult than the period immediately following 13 May. This Parliament should, I think, take an initiative with a view to meeting the request of the Polish Church through non-government channels.

Mr De Keersmaeker. — (NL) I did not say that a definitive decision had been reached on this point. Naturally, it is first and foremost the task of the Commission to evaluate this proposal and to make its own proposals to the Council. There is no getting away from the fact that this goes beyond the terms on which the Council evaluated the aid offered to Poland and that a great deal of new and complicated problems arise. From the point of view of certain Polish bodies,

De Keersmaecker

this would indeed to a certain extent involve economic aid to sectors in difficulties. Without wishing to anticipate the final decision, it should be pointed out that the Council has always regarded the aid to Poland as humanitarian aid.

Mr Alavanos. — (GR) In this morning's session we discussed the Michel report and I do not recall any speaker supporting the idea that supplies or other forms of aid should be used as a weapon or should be subject to political conditions but I'm afraid it seems from the reply of the President-in-Office of the Council that something similar is happening, at least in the case of Poland. I should like to raise this specific issue both in general terms and with particular reference to Poland and ask whether the supplies sent as aid by the Community are subject to political conditions or are being used as a political weapon. The President's answer will be of considerable importance because we shall shortly be called upon to vote on the Michel report.

Mr De Keersmaecker. — (NL) At its meeting on 22 and 23 February, the Council decided in favour of eight million ECU from Community funds being used for swift humanitarian aid for the benefit of those Polish citizens most in need of it. The Council stated that this aid would only be supplied via the Commission to non-governmental bodies providing the requisite guarantees that the aid would indeed be distributed among those in need of it. I cannot see anything in this apart from our intention purely and simply to help those in need as swiftly as possible.

President. — I call Question No 58, by Mr Bord (H-140/82):

What measures does the Council envisage taking in order to solve any difficulties which Israel may encounter, especially in the agricultural field, as a result of the enlargement of the Community to include Spain and Portugal?

Mr De Keersmaecker, President-in-Office of the Council. — (NL) Within the bodies provided for in the Mediterranean agreements, the partner countries, including Israel, have had the opportunity to voice their concerns as regards the possible consequences for them of Community enlargement. The Community has confirmed to them its availability to discuss the matter once solutions are reached in the context of accession negotiations with Spain and Portugal, which is not yet the case as far as the areas of most importance and interest to our Mediterranean partners are concerned. Moreover, the Community intends, in parallel with the accession negotiations, to continue to devote detailed thought to the effect of enlargement on its relations with non-member countries. The Commission should shortly be submitting a communication on the subject to the Council.

Mr Marshall. — May I welcome that comment by the President-in-Office of the Council and underline that this is of major importance to Israel, because the export of Mediterranean produce forms a very substantial part of Israel's trade with the Community and could be substantially at risk once enlargement takes place?

Mr De Keersmaecker. — (NL) This is indeed true. This was more of a statement than a question on your part, but I should nevertheless like to add that we should view this question in a more general context. It is not only Israel which will be faced with problems, but other countries too. Certain North African countries are also wondering what will happen to certain sectors of their economy, such as agriculture, in the event of the accession of Spain and Portugal. They have a perfect right to do so and the European Community has agreed to consult them. However, certain countries are calling for negotiations with the countries which have concluded preferential agreements with the European Community to be held in parallel with the enlargement negotiations. This is not institutionally provided for, but we must take account of Israel's concerns in that area.

Mr Alavanos. — (GR) I am surprised that the President-in-Office of the Council should give assurances to Israel that it will not be exposed to risk and this at a time when a dastardly attack is being launched from Israeli territory against the people of Lebanon and Palestine, an attack condemned by the Council of the EEC itself. In such a situation we must ask why, whereas, in the case of Poland, where there was no military occupation, no invasion by foreign troops, and tens of thousands were not killed, we nevertheless had immediate condemnation, with television crews in the European Parliament, why, I say, do we provide Israel on the other hand with assurances that it will not be at risk as a result of the admission of Portugal and Spain. It seems to me that we should at least have some sense of decency.

Mr De Keersmaecker. — (NL) The questioner has misinterpreted my answer. I did not say that an enlargement treaty could not have consequences for others.

President. — I call Question No 59, by Mr Haagerup (H-143/82):

Does the Council consider that Article 2 of the Portuguese constitution, which provides for the development of a Socialist society, should be deleted before Portugal joins the Community? Furthermore, does the Council consider the continued existence and present political role of the Council of the Revolution to be consonant with a democratic constitution?

Mr De Keersmaecker, President-in-Office of the Council. — (NL) The Council is convinced that Portugal, as a State applying for membership, is conscious of the principles on which the treaties and the obligations arising therefrom are based as well as of the content of the joint declaration on fundamental rights issued by the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission on 5 April 1977 and the declaration of democracy adopted by the European Council on 7 April 1978. It will also be recalled that, when negotiations for Portugal's accession were opened, the Portuguese government spokesman affirmed that Portugal unreservedly shares the ideals of democracy, peace and freedom which are the foundations of the Paris and Rome Treaties.

Mr Haagerup. — (DA) This sounds all well and good and so far there is nothing especially and exclusively directed against Portugal. We all know the tendency to interpret ideas in our own way, but is not one of the fundamental human rights that in a democratic country one should be able to hold views which are at variance with the constitution? I as a Liberal at any rate would like to say that I would be very dubious about a constitution which provided for the development of a socialist society. Is there no procedure which can be followed and which is a little more precise than the procedure mentioned by the President of the Council, in which the basic principle is simply that the applicant countries will go along with the fundamental principles forming the basis of the Community and its institutions?

Mr De Keersmaecker. — (NL) The Council of Ministers of the European Community is not at liberty to pass judgment on the content of the Portuguese constitution, and certainly not a specific point contained in it, i.e. the existence of a Council of the Revolution. It is none of our business whether or not this Council should be abolished. We must see whether the Portuguese government and Portuguese politics can be reconciled with the fundamental principles and rules underlying the European Community, and I think they can.

President. — I call Mrs Ewing on a point of order.

Mrs Ewing. — The House's habit of taking points of order when they are raised means that we have failed to reach my very topical and interesting question on fishing. In view of this, could we not perhaps for once look at the custom that obtains in the British House of Commons, whereby points of order are taken at the end and do not use up the time of those who have put down questions in the hope that they will be reached, particularly when they are as topical as the one I have put down?

May I suggest that in future points of order be raised at the end of Question Time and that if people want

to indulge themselves in internal feuds about matters irrelevant to Question Time, they should do so at the end of Question Time, because the fishermen, I am sure, will not be impressed at not getting an answer to their question. Could you not consult the House as to whether it would not be the wish of this House to hear the result of the fishing question, which was, after all, only taken yesterday?

President. — I will bring this question up with the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions.

Mr Pearce. — This point of order relates directly to Question No 77, the first of the questions to the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation. I believe that is the point that we have now reached on the agenda.

I wish to challenge the admissibility of this question, Mr President. Referring to Rule 44 and its annex, I find that this question contravenes two of the conditions which are required. It is specified in Annex I that such questions should not contain assertions or opinions and that they should be interrogatory in form. Mr President, I believe that the terms of Question No 77 are in breach of both of these prescriptions and I therefore call upon you not to call it. I should not regard it as satisfactory, Mr President, if you were to propose passing this matter to the Bureau or the enlarged Bureau. You are about to call this question, on the face of it, and I think you should refer to the Rules and should, in fact, cause this question not to be called at this moment.

President. — Please bear in mind that we only have half an hour left for Questions to the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation and that we should not waste this half hour discussing the rules of procedure.

Question No 77 was allowed as it stands and consequently will be answered by the Council in this form.

Mr Harris. — Mr President, may I follow up the point made by Mrs Ewing? I realize that I was the one who raised the point of order on an original question. Could you put to the House the possibility that the Council of Ministers should be given permission, perhaps at the end of Question Time, to answer her question on fishing, bearing in mind that this is the first opportunity that this House has had to question the Council of Ministers following the very important meeting which took place yesterday, and in view of the exceptional nature of the circumstances surrounding this question? I wonder therefore if you could consult the House on whether the House would give permission for this question of Mrs Ewing's to be answered either now or perhaps right at the end of Question Time.

Miss Quin. — Mr President, I will be very brief, but it does relate to the conduct of Question Time. I had indicated that I wanted to ask a supplementary question on Question No 58, and at least three hands went up for supplementary questions on Questions No 59. I would ask you to look very attentively round the Chamber to make sure that you do pick up the requests for supplementary questions.

President. — According to the Rules of Procedure, it is the President of the sitting who decides which and how many supplementary questions will be admitted, and I have done this to the best of my abilities.

Mr Israël. — (FR) I am sure you will agree with me that all the members of this Assembly are equal regardless of the position they occupy in the hemicycle. Being very badly placed, Mr President, I have not managed, in spite of my vociferous attempts — I am afraid I have a very weak voice — to attract your attention, but I wanted to put a supplementary question in connection with Question No 59, by Mr Haagerup, in my capacity as Chairman of this Parliament's Working Party on Human Rights. This is a matter of the utmost importance and I deplore the fact that I was not able to speak on this point, particularly as my Political Group has not been heard at all in the supplementary questions. I would ask you, therefore, to take account in future of requests by those who do not have the good fortune of sitting in the front row of the hemicycle.

Mrs Ewing. — Mr President, could you answer Mr Harris's suggestion that you put the possibility to the House of taking the fishing question now or at the end?

President. — I will discuss this question with the Minister and inform you of the outcome at the end of Question Time.

We continue with the questions to the Foreign Ministers.

I call Question No 77, by Mr Pasmazoglou (H-102/82):

Despite the UN resolutions, Turkey continues to occupy Cypriot territories. The tragic consequences of the 1974 invasion for the people of Cyprus are widely known. Recently an invasion in another part of the world rightly provoked a strong reaction from the European Community which accordingly took measures against the country responsible. Do not the Foreign Affairs Ministers consider that for reasons of principle, consistency and credibility a similar stance should be adopted towards Cyprus?

Mr De Keersmaecker, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — (NL) The Member States of the European Community have endeavoured, in the context of European Political Cooperation, to contribute towards a solution to the Cyprus question on the basis of Resolution No 3212, adopted on 1 November by the United Nations General Assembly. They also hope that it may prove possible to solve the problems between the two communities in Cyprus by means of inter-community talks under the aegis of the Secretary General of the United Nations and that we may see significant progress in these talks as soon as possible.

Mr Pasmazoglou. — (GR) The French wording of Article 2 of United Nations Resolution 3212 of 1 November 1974 is as follows:

demande instamment le retrait rapide de la République de Chypre de toutes les forces armées étrangères . . .

In the light of this I should like to ask how the European Community can avoid calling for the immediate implementation of the United Nations Resolutions when that same Community is clearly, reasonably and inevitably committed to the implementation and the safeguarding of proper legal processes as a basic aim and principle of the European Community.

Mr De Keersmaecker. — (NL) One should, I think, consider the text of the UN resolution in its entirety. Secondly, the Council must examine the best possible way of achieving a result. Talks are underway on this question, there is a procedure and it cannot be said that no progress is being made. This is the Council's view.

Mr Pearce. — Does the President-in-Office agree that the principle which is at stake here and which is analogous to the situation in the South Atlantic, which the question refers to, is that the question who should run a particular portion of territory should be determined by the wishes of the people who live there, rather than by the wishes of people who live somewhere else and who make claims for historical geographical reasons to have sovereignty over it?

Mr De Keersmaecker. — (NL) This was a statement rather than a question. In the situation under consideration, we would prefer to see a solution arrived at in the context of inter-community talks between the local populations of Cyprus itself.

Mr Plaskovitis. — (GR) The President-in-Office is not providing any real answers. There is a United Nations resolution which calls for the withdrawal of foreign troops from Cyprus. Is that so or is it not? And if it is so, what is the point of the talks going on

Plaskovitis

between the two communities, at a time when, arbitrarily and in defiance of the ruling of the International Court and the resolutions of the United Nations, part of Cyprus is occupied by a foreign invading force? The President-in-Office has not answered that question.

Mr De Keersmaecker. — (NL) I have never said that the text — which has been quoted — is not correct. I would emphasize, moreover, that we support this text, i.e. this resolution adopted in the context of the United Nations. The procedure chosen is a procedure which must be viewed in the context of the United Nations and I have already informed you of the Council's opinion on this subject.

President. — I call Question No 78, by Mr Kyrkos (H-12/82):

How do the Foreign Ministers of the Ten Member States meeting in political cooperation view the proposal to hold an international conference on the Cyprus question?

Do the Foreign Ministers intend to encourage an initiative of this kind designed to overcome the present deadlock and lead to the implementation of the UN decisions?

Mr Alavanos. — (GR) Mr President, I hope that it was due to an oversight on your part, but when you called Mr Ephremidis another member spoke instead; I think Mr Ephremidis should at least have the opportunity to put the final supplementary question to Mr Pesmazoglou's question.

President. — I am sorry I just mixed up the names of two Members.

Mr Ephremidis. — (GR) Mr President, I know that Mr Plaskovitis did not mean to prevent me speaking, he asked to speak and was allowed to. It was you who prevented me from speaking since, although my name is down for a supplementary question, you did not call me. I should now like to put the supplementary question.

Mr De Keersmaecker, President-in-Office of the Foreign Minister. — (NL) The Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation have not discussed the proposal mentioned by the honourable Member and have consequently not reached any decision on it.

Mr Kyrkos. — (GR) My question concerns the one previously put by Mr Pesmazoglou. The President-in-Office referred us to the intercommunity discussions. They have been going on for eight years. It is

generally acknowledged that they have not produced results. These discussions are conducted under the threat posed by the armed forces of the Turkish invader, the Greek government wants those forces withdrawn, the Cypriot government wants them withdrawn, and the Greek government proposes that an international conference be convened. I am surprised — and this is a point on which a reply should be given by the Greek government — when I hear it said that the Greek government did not raise the issue of an international conference. Whether or not the matter has been raised by Greece, I would again ask if the Community, the Foreign Ministers, are of the opinion that an international meeting could lead to the implementation of the United Nations resolutions before a crisis erupts in Cyprus.

Mr De Keersmaecker. — (NL) If the questioner maintains that the talks in the context of the United Nations are producing no results whatsoever, I could answer him by drawing up a relatively long list of what is in fact happening. These talks are indeed leading to progress. The appropriateness of holding an international conference at this time would at any rate depend on the existence of the guarantee treaty of London of 16 August 1960. I can say no more on this question except that the Council has not discussed the suitability of organizing an international conference and has consequently not come to any decision on the matter.

Mr Ephremidis. — (GR) It is curious that the President-in-Office of the Council should refer so persistently to the intercommunity talks and I should therefore like to put a further question to him. Does he know that these talks dealt with topics which go to the heart of the Cyprus problem, such as the constitutional position and the administration of the state of Cyprus, whereas the problem raised by the question of the two communities is clear. Are the Community and the Council for or against an international conference which, following on the relevant UN resolutions, would help to ensure the withdrawal of the invading forces from Cyprus and to clear the way for intercommunity dialogue? We want to be told clearly whether they are in favour or not and we do not want any talk about peace-keeping forces or about discussions which have been going on for tens of years.

Mr De Keersmaecker. — (NL) Mr President, I am authorized to inform you on the work of the Council and do not intend to overstep the limits this implies.

President. — I call Question No 79, by Mr Hutton (H-91/82):

Have the Foreign Ministers seen and discussed the appalling evidence contained in the 22 March 1982 Report to Congress of the American Secre-

President

tary of State on the use of chemical warfare by the Soviet Union and its agent States in South-East Asia and Afghanistan?

Mr De Keersmaecker, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — (NL) The report mentioned by the honourable Member has not been discussed by the Foreign Ministers of the Ten. However, it should be pointed out that since December 1980, the Ten have supported a draft resolution tabled under No 35144 C at the 35th United Nations General Assembly. This resolution concerns the organization of a study by the United Nations following reports on the use of chemical weapons, at which the Ten feel the utmost concern.

For the implementation of this resolution, a group of experts was set up and submitted a report in 1981 in which it was stated that it was not possible to reach any formal conclusions since it had not been possible to carry out on-the-spot investigations within the time available. Resolution 3996 C, which was adopted in December 1981 by the United Nations General Assembly with the support of the Ten, renews the mandate of the UN group of experts for a period of one year. The group of experts has not yet completed its study. The Ten continue to take the view that the group of experts should be admitted to the areas indicated so that a thorough investigation can be carried out.

Mr Hutton. — May I thank the President-in-Office for his answer which was a little fuller than I had expected. Is he aware that the document to which I refer in my question contains evidence which suggests that much of the warfare is being used as a test of these weapons in the very remote areas, particularly in Laos, and does he not feel that the evidence contained in the document would materially enhance the work that is being done by the group of experts in which the Ten are taking an interest since the troops in Eastern Europe are also equipped with chemical weapons which pose a threat to people the Foreign Ministers represent?

Mr De Keersmaecker. — (NL) I can inform Mr Hutton that the text of this report is in my possession and it is, I think, for the Council to come to some conclusion regarding its authenticity.

Mr Israël. — (FR) Mr President of the Council, I share Mr Hutton's satisfaction at your answer. However, I should nevertheless like to ask you whether it would be possible for you to see to it that the Haig report is studied in this respect and to inform us of your conclusions. For the rest, could you collect information on this delicate issue from Pakistan which is receiving a number of refugees who have been in contact with chemical weapons?

Mr De Keersmaecker. — (FR) Mr Israël, as I have already pointed out, there is a group of experts within the United Nations and we would like this group of experts to be able to do its job effectively, i. e. that it should be able to carry out on-the-spot investigations under conditions which would permit it to get a real picture of the situation, which it is unfortunately unable to do at present.

Mr Boyes. — Could I, before I ask my supplementary, just thank the President-in-Office of the Council for the full answer he gave to my supplementary question on unemployment. I do thank him for that reply.

Mr President, those of us who are campaigning for disarmament and the use of the United Nations to settle disputes condemn totally and unreservedly the use of chemical weapons wherever they prove to have been used.

Will the President agree that the best way of preventing the use of chemical weapons is to ensure that they are not manufactured? And will the President confirm that this is the view of the Foreign Ministers of the Governments of the Ten and, if so, pass this view to all countries in NATO, particularly the United States of America?

Mr De Keersmaecker. — (NL) It so happens that the conference on disarmament is currently underway in the United Nations and I am convinced that this and many other aspects will be brought up.

President. — The President of the Council is prepared, following the wish expressed by this House and Mrs Ewing, to answer the Question by Mrs Ewing for which there was previously insufficient time, on the understanding, however, that no supplementary questions can be allowed.

I call Question No 60, by Mrs Ewing (H-146/82):

In view of the considerable economic disruption caused by the absence of a common fisheries policy and of the European Parliament's repeated demands for a rapid agreement on this burning issue, will the President-in-Office state why such little progress has been made since December 1981?

Mr De Keersmaecker, President-in-Office of the Council. — (NL) I can inform Mrs Ewing that our first meeting on the new Commission proposals for a common fisheries policy was held yesterday. As regards the main points of the policy itself, the Commission proposals were only received the evening before, that is to say, very late. We had to restrict ourselves to a very general debate, following an introduction by the Commission. However, this debate was useful and I can tell

De Keersmaecker

you that a large majority is in favour of reaching a decision in the near future. The Council has therefore taken certain steps with this end in view.

We have, for example, set up a working party at as high a level as possible, which is due to start work on Monday, with a view to resuming the debate with a minimum of delay and, if possible, reaching a decision at a subsequent meeting, which will probably be held on 28 and 29 June. Some important work was also done yesterday on other aspects directly connected with the fisheries policy. For example, we adopted the proposal for a standard system of inspection and discussed the technical aspects of conservations. We also thoroughly examined the four most important proposals for regulations.

This, Mrs Ewing, is how matters stand. I can assure you that this is a very difficult subject but that there is a willingness to make progress among the vast majority of the delegations.

President. — The second part of Question Time is closed.¹

I call Mrs Ewing on a point of order.

Mrs Ewing. — On a point of order, may I ask, Mr President, if the reluctance to have my supplementary question answered comes from the President-in-Office of the Council, or from yourself, Sir? I think this House is entitled to have that question answered.

Is the President-in-Office refusing to answer me or is it your own ruling, Sir? If it is your own ruling, Sir, may I respectfully suggest we leave it to the President-in-Office of the Council?

President. — Mrs Ewing, I announced in good time that I would not allow any supplementary questions.

I call Mr Harris.

Mr Harris. — Mr President, further to that point of order and with great respect, we do very greatly appreciate the move you have made in giving the President-in-Office the facility to answer this most important and most topical of questions. After all the Council met yesterday on a subject which is of vital importance to fishermen throughout the Community.

However, if you remember, when I raised this matter on an earlier point of order, Mr President, I did, with great respect, ask that the matter should be put to the House to decide whether the President-in-Office should answer the question and also, obviously,

implied in that answer supplementary questions. With great respect I wonder if you would put to the House the issue whether we should allot time for supplementary questions to the House, as indeed happened on many other occasions in this House in the past?

President. — If we come to an agreement with the Council, we must keep to it. The time available for Question Time has run out and the next item on the agenda is the report by Mrs Rabbethge. It would be regrettable, I think, if we had to postpone this report until tomorrow because of a procedural debate.

I call Mr Kirk.

Mr Kirk. — (DA) I should also be very pleased to receive an answer to this question, but I noticed that the President of the Council said that the Council had only just received a proposal from the Commission. Would you, on behalf of Parliament, stress to the Council that the European Parliament is entitled to be consulted on the proposals which have just have been submitted before the Council takes a decision?

President. — Naturally, Parliament has the right to discuss these questions before a decision is reached. We will see what happens.

3. Science and technology for development

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-202/82) by Mrs Rabbethge on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation on:

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-271/81 — COM(81) 212 final) for a Council decision adopting a programme of research and development in the field of science and technology for development 1982-1985.

I call the rapporteur.

Mrs Rabbethge, rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Committee on Development and Cooperation welcomes the Commission's intention to step up cooperation in the field of research and development with developing countries, especially since it has been generally acknowledged that agricultural and medical research are of crucial importance in increasing agricultural production in the long term and in promoting basic improvements in the health of populations.

Nevertheless, our Committee was not so impressed with the Commission's proposal that we felt like saying that it was worth waiting for in the end. The Committee expressed a certain degree of irritation, a num-

¹ See Annex II.

Rabbethge

ber of divergent opinions, and fundamentally different interpretations with respect to the content of the proposal.

Why was this so? One reason is that the Commission's document was in some places formulated in a way which was not entirely solicitous, giving rise to apparent contradictions between the avowed aims and purposes of the proposal. The Committee on Development and Cooperation goes along with this criticism. A brief perusal of the Commission's proposal might lead one to conclude that the most crucial issue to be dealt with is the expansion of research institutes within the Community. The point should have been emphasized much more strongly that research needs to be geared to the needs of developing countries rather than to the requirements of industrialized nations.

In another working document of the Commission, however, it is emphasized that the meaning behind the proposal is to devote part of the research potential of Member States to highly technical programmes and projects which will help to solve urgent problems which developing countries are not yet in a position to solve on their own.

At any rate, during the course of our discussions a number of bright ideas emerged and are now reflected in the motion for a resolution. Our definitive approval of the Commission's proposal depends, however, on the Commission's willingness to adopt a number of important amendments and additions as set down in § 44 of the motion for a resolution. It is not only the opinions of my colleagues or those of members of other committees which are reflected in the motion for a resolution, but also the knowledge and opinions of a whole number of European and non-European scientists and experts who are responsible for dealing with these problems. I will mention only a few of the most important points incorporated in the motion for a resolution.

Firstly, the proposal for a programme can only be conceived as part of scientific and technical accompanying measures to aid development.

Provision should be made for a further programme after four years, with further financial measures, as the problems to be tackled cannot possibly be solved in such a short period of time.

Secondly, the relatively small amount earmarked for the proposed programme means that priorities will have to be defined quite clearly.

In the third place, the aims of the research and its content must be established in accordance with the basic needs of developing countries, with top priority being assigned to comprehensive agricultural research, given the precarious food situation in most developing countries.

Fourthly, from the outset, careful planning must govern the participation of the research institutes of developing countries and ensure technical and financial aid for the support and expansion of regional research institutes in developing countries.

Fifthly, developing countries must be guaranteed the right to voice their views as members of any committees set up to implement the programme, and the participation of representatives from relevant expert organizations must also be ensured.

Sixthly, it is vital to promote partnership and cooperative relations between ourselves and the developing countries and to promote the education of scientists from developing countries either here in Europe or in their own countries.

It is essential to store the results of research centrally. Our Committee wishes to emphasize the fact that it is necessary for the research results which are needed and could be used by developing countries to be made available to all of them.

Among the technical projects to be carried out, the following must take priority: improvement of food production — in particular, by increasing protein-rich food production— tropical medicine, land development, alternative sources of energy, exportation of raw materials, desalination, birth control and the use of satellites for meteorological and other purposes.

The implementation of true development in developing countries, based on the participation of large sections of their populations, is a condition which determines the success of any initiatives. Instead of promoting growth in isolated enclaves where modernity has reached, development ought to be broad-based and seek to integrate the masses into the process of achieving growth. Instead of the motto 'first grow, then share', we should have one which says: 'growth through participation of the masses in production'.

Developing countries have need of new technical processes which do not require much capital and which are also energy-saving. Methods of production must be found which will enable families and small communities to satisfy their basic needs themselves to a great extent. What is required is a new form of aid comprising practical and technical alternatives at the same time. The emphasis must be placed on technical processes which can be reproduced in the majority of developing countries even where resources are meagre.

A number of people have criticized the fact that the Commission's proposal lays too much emphasis on the expansion of research institutes in the Community, and hence too much emphasis on basic research. Research in industrialized countries to promote developing countries must of course concentrate on basic research, but, at the same time, it is necessary to coor-

Rabbethge

dinate basic research with fact-finding missions on the place for which it is destined. Known research results must, as a priority, be adapted to conditions specific to development; this necessitates the type of research which, to a great extent, is specifically geared to solving problems and which concentrates more on the needs of developing countries than on the requirements of the industrialized countries. The Commission proposal should therefore comprise two equal parts which will grow together, namely, basic research and fact-finding missions.

Above all, the efforts made by the developing countries themselves are a guarantee that science and technology can actually be put to use by the countries involved. The Committee on Development and Cooperation is particularly interested in the way in which the programme is to be implemented and carried out, because the conditions under which the programme is executed are what counts when assessing the value of the programme for developing countries. Precise rules are needed to govern the decision-making process, the management and monitoring of the programme's implementation, so that the aims of the programme can be achieved with the desired degree of efficiency and flexibility and at the same time can be seen to correspond to the specific needs of the developing countries. What is more, the programme will be meaningless unless research institutes in the developing countries are involved in all the work from the outset and unless the Community gives its support to scientific establishments in the developing countries where the programme is being implemented so that they can expand their own research and development capacities. Unless both types of research are synchronized, the whole project will founder!

If we concentrate on essentials, the proposal submitted by the Commission now before us is a useful attempt to initiate improvements in the deployment of scientific potential for the purposes of development policy. Our target must be to reduce the advantage which the European research institutes enjoy in the field of knowledge in order to show that the Community's development policy is to be viewed not as a form of paternalistic aid but as cooperation between true partners.

So, ladies and gentlemen, with the vote that we are about to take on the Commission's proposal, we will be taking a decisive step and I ask you all to adopt the motion for a resolution submitted by the Committee on Development and Cooperation.

I should now like to say a few words on behalf of my own Group, namely the Christian Democratic Group, Mr President. The use of science and technology for developing countries is assuming enormous significance. For this reason, my Group approves of the report and, above all, of the motion for a resolution contained in it, since the latter reflects not only our opinions but also the justified criticisms of other parti-

cipating committees. From the scientific point of view, of course, we are hardly conquering any new territories with this Commission proposal. It does however constitute a fundamentally new element in European development policy. The cereals shortfall will be 190 million tonnes in the year 1990 — only 8 years away — and by the year 2000 it will be around 395 million tonnes. These shortages can only be made good by increases in production and one way of achieving this is by promoting agricultural research, which is a long-term research project.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, this Parliament of ours has always been well aware of its responsibility towards developing countries. This has been demonstrated amply in the case of emergency and disaster aid and in the debate on hunger in the world. It is such behaviour which to a large extent has been responsible for the good image of this House in the public eye. We should remember that all of us in this House will be held responsible for the situation in 1990 and 2000.

When it comes to our ideas and actions for combatting hunger in the world, we will also be questioned about scientific research. I appeal to you all, and especially to some members of the Socialist Group: please stop this business of abstaining and work with us so that in this way too we can fight against hunger in the world! Give us your approval for the motion for a resolution. I can do no better than to quote the words of Hermann Kahn, the American researcher, who said: 'Tomorrow's world needs us today.'

President. — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

*

* *

4. Votes¹

IN THE CHAIR: MR DANKERT

President

Maffre-Baugé report — before the vote on the motion for a resolution as a whole

President. — I call Mr Enright.

¹ See Annex I.

Mr Enright. — Mr President, in accordance with Rule 88 I should like to ask for a suspension of the sitting for twenty minutes in view of the fact that France and England are locked in mortal combat on the football field.

(Laughter)

Some of us have sacrificed in order to be here, as has been pointed out, and we could come back and listen to the explanations of vote at five minutes to.

(Laughter)

President. — Mr Enright, first of all I think mortal combat is over. Secondly, I think that is not a valid reason to postpone a vote and so I would ask the Assembly not to follow your advice.

I call Mr Berkhouwer.

Mr Berkhouwer. — *(NL)* Parliament would be acting in an undignified manner if it were to suspend the proceedings for twenty minutes for the sake of a football match.

President. — I agree with you, Mr Berkhouwer. I was just wondering whether we should vote on it or not. I suggest that there be no change to the agenda and that we move on to the explanations of vote on the Maffre-Baugé report.

I call Mr Pranchère.

Mr Pranchère. — *(FR)* Mr President, I am told that in the French parliament one can request an adjournment

to consider the position to adopt as a result of the discussions that have taken place. I do not know if the same is true in the case of this Assembly but the French Members of the Communist and Allies Group would like a chance to meet in order to consider the situation as it is at the moment.

President. — For how long, Mr Pranchère?

Mr Pranchère. — *(FR)* Quarter of an hour.

President. — If you ask for an adjournment, Mr Pranchère, I am obliged to put the matter to the vote, which is different from the practice in the French *Assemblée Nationale*. I can put it to the vote only if ten other Members support your request. Do you have ten Members to support you?

I note that there are ten such Members.

(Parliament rejected Mr Pranchère's request)

After the adoption of the resolution

Mr Maffre-Baugé. — *(FR)* Mr President, now that this report has been adopted by Parliament — albeit with one or two changes which frankly surprise me — I wish to thank all those who helped in the work and especially those on the Committee on Agriculture who strove to rescue the fruit and vegetable market from the problems besetting it. Not everything is perfect, but even if we have one or two reservations that does not alter the fact that everyone did his bit. I wanted to make this clear.

(The sitting was closed at 7.25 p.m.)¹

¹ Agenda for next sitting: see Minutes.

ANNEX I

Votes

(The Annex contains the rapporteur's opinion on the various amendments and the explanations of vote. For a detailed account of the voting, see Minutes)

Donnez report (Doc. 1-298/82): adopted

Explanations of vote

Mr Enright. — Whilst I accept that there is a consistency between the previous report produced on this subject and this report, I think it is a consistency which is wholly wrong and which is contradictory to natural justice and natural law. If Mr Pannella wishes to be tried before the courts of his country, then he or any Member of this House has that right and should have that right and it is in no way up to this House to take away from any Member his natural rights. That, in effect, is what we are doing if we pass this report. I think it would be wholly, completely and utterly wrong and we do ourselves a grave disservice in passing it. I therefore shall be voting against it, and I hope that those Members who believe in natural justice will also oppose it.

Mr Megahy. — Yes, Mr President, I was the only member of the Legal Affairs Committee who actually voted against the adoption of this report so I am being quite logical now in supporting this in the House. I support the views that have been put forward by Mr Enright and I would say that I find it quite remarkable that when we are talking about events before the time when Mr Pannella came into this House, one should be using the argument that it is necessary in order to uphold the institutions and the dignity of this House that we should continue to refuse to waive Mr Pannella's immunity. I find that a remarkable argument. The circumstances surrounding this have no connection with the European Parliament. They cannot in any way be said to affect the working of this institutions and it seems to me that we are guilty of gross political interference there. If politically Mr Pannella feels that he ought to face the courts in order to get a chance to have his name cleared, as he puts it, then we ought to afford him that right and we ought not to use this cloak of parliamentary immunity to protect him from this under the guise of protecting the EEC institutions or the dignity of this Parliament. Neither of these is concerned and I would urge Member to vote against this report.

*

* *

Gredal report (Doc. 1-300/82): adopted

The rapporteur was:

— *against* all the amendments.

Explanations of vote

Mrs Lizin. — (FR) Mr President, I shall abstain from voting on the Gredal report because I think it is over-optimistic, although I should like to share that over-optimism and that is why I shall not be voting against the report.

By way of justifying my decision, I should like to mention two factors which are indicative even though they differ in importance. First of all, I do not think optimism is called for in

economic affairs, and especially where the steel industry is concerned. We must hope that mutual understanding will prevail over this unilateral decision contrary to GATT rules. When the Foreign Ministers meet on 21 and 22 June they will have to make this point quite clear and this measure will have to be rescinded.

Secondly, there is the disturbing attitude of American embassies in Europe, especially in Brussels, when it comes to granting visas for the special session on disarmament which is currently being held at the United Nations in New York. A churchman, Canon Gord, and a university professor, Mrs Pierson, are still not able to go to the UN Assembly in New York on the grounds that they are supposed to have had contacts with Communist circles over a period of time. It must be said that democrats in Europe are not keen on the arrival here of this kind of witch hunt, which totally lacks any basis of freedom and democracy.

Mr Kyrkos. — (GR) Mr President, we shall be voting against Mrs Gredal's report and motion for a resolution. Both in this House and from any other platform we consistently support the need for the European Community to acquire its own identity. But this means severing the bonds of dependence on the United States, and ceasing to be a mouthpiece of US policy, which pursues the aim of world domination and thus backs the most reactionary regimes everywhere, encourages an unbridled arms race, instigates or provides cover for crimes against humanity, such as the Israeli attack on the Lebanon, the genocide being committed against the Palestinian people and the Turkish occupation of Cyprus, and is leading the world to the brink of nuclear disaster. Our vision is one of an independent Europe, links of peace and cooperation both with the United States and with the Soviet Union, and support for a new world economic and political order going beyond the military blocs and based on the equal participation of small countries and the Third World in international relations.

Mrs Gredal's report leads us in the opposite direction, and so the Greek Communist Party of the Interior will vote against it.

Mr Ephremidis. — (GR) Mr President, we do not doubt the need for the Community and its Member States to cooperate economically with the USA and with any other country in the world. But we are doubtful about the active role of the Community as such in the development of relations within the Atlantic Alliance, as stated in paragraph 1 of the report.

Furthermore, we doubt the honesty of the report, since the literary turns of phrase on cooperation for security and peace hide the real fact — of which the peoples of the Community have painful experience — that the relations of their countries with the USA are relations of total dependence in which the role of the USA is damaging to their economic interests, as shown by the notorious problem of high interest rates, and dangerous, as shown by the increased stationing by the USA of rockets in Europe, by the theory of limited nuclear war in Europe and by the pressure put on the countries of Europe to keep on increasing their military expenditure.

For these reasons and because the resolution does not place — either because its author does not wish to or because she was not allowed to — the relations of the Community and its Member States with the USA on an equal footing which would genuinely serve the interests of the peoples and of peace, we shall be voting against the motion and the report.

Mrs Baduel Glorioso. — (IT) Mr President, I feel there is some definite meaning in the fact that the chairman of the delegation is not present. You cannot send a delegation from the European Parliament off to the United States with a document which is as vague and as lacking in balance as this one is. The fact is that although there is recognition of the links with the United States and between the European Parliament and the US Congress the equal balance is merely stated and not backed up with arguments in this document which is pretty poor and — I could add — humiliating for Europe, for the reason that this balance should be founded, with due modesty on our side, also on where we differ with the United States. I can mention the economic dispute on the problems in the steel industry which are causing redundancies in Europe. I can mention the dispute over interest

rates which was discussed at Versailles, along with the point which is mentioned, but not explained anywhere in the resolution, concerning agricultural problems and a number of farm products. Matters like these should be properly discussed on a genuinely equal footing between partners.

We are not keen on stirring things up between the United States and Europe. We want to strengthen our ties with the United States and with the US Congress. Let me quickly say, Mr President, that the Kennedy resolution for a freeze on arms and the peace marches are forging a new and powerful bond between the people of the United States and the people of western Europe.

Mrs Van Hemeldonck. — (NL) Mr President, I intend to abstain from voting on this motion for a resolution since it misses the real issues. The preamble rightly stresses the political interdependence of the European Community and the United States, but the recommendations overlook the fact that economic and social matters are also political matters. It shows a deplorable lack of awareness of the social problems and even fails to mention the scandalous cutbacks which the current American Government is making in the social sector, with the result that millions are being made unemployed and further millions losing their rights to social security and an alternative source of income. The resolution disregards the violation by President Reagan of trade union rights as laid down by the International Labour Organization. I would draw your attention here, for example, to the dismissal of striking air-traffic controllers and the denial of the right of workers in certain South-Western States to trade union representation. We in Europe are all too aware of the economic interdependence of the European Community and the United States. American multinationals which used to be established in the Member States indulged in social exploitation for years on end by taking what advantage they could of all the economic and social advantages which Europe affords, and then transferring their activities to low-wage countries, leaving behind them highly-trained workers without jobs and substantial social security debts. These too, Mr President, are political aspects of the relations between the European Community and the United States which this Parliament should discuss.

Mrs Boserup. — (DA) This report insists that it is the aim of the Soviet Union to see a split between the USA and Western Europe. This does not fit in at all well with our wishes for independent positions in political cooperation. It is simply an unthinking parroting of attitudes which are likely to cause friction.

In addition, the report advocates the European Community playing an active rôle in NATO. There is no foundation for this, either in the Treaty or from the political point of view, and, furthermore, the idea involves brushing Ireland aside, since it is not a member of NATO. The resolution has been called a political signal. It is a dangerous signal and I intend to vote against it.

*

* *

Buttafuoco report (Doc. 1-182): adopted

*

* *

Albers report (Doc. 1-211/82): adopted

*

* *

Maffre-Baugé report (Doc. 1-279/82): adopted

The rapporteur was:

- *in favour* of Amendments Nos 29, 30, 35, 37, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50 and 51;
- *against* Amendments Nos 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 38, 40, 41, 53, 55, 58, 59, 60 and 61.

Explanations of vote

Mr Sutra. — (FR) Mr President, it will only take me a moment to say how sorry I am that some of the paragraphs in this report have been hacked about. Be that as it may, the report is still along the right lines, Mr Maffre-Baugé's efforts have been outstanding and the work of the committee has been rewarding. Although there have been one or two votes against the report here in the Chamber, we shall be supporting it.

Unfortunately, in this European Community there are two Europes in our view, and since I have been sitting in this Parliament I have realized how true this is when it comes to the budget. The fruit and vegetables that this report is about have always come off badly in the common agricultural policy. Since the creation of the common market in fruit and vegetables in 1970 and up to 1981 fruit and vegetables have received on average 0.8% of the EAGGF budget, which if you ask me is scandalous. In recent years there has been a system of aid for processed fruit and vegetables. But they still get barely 3.5 or 4% of the EAGGF budget. That is the way things are at the moment, and as a result it is sad that some of the Members here have done a hatchet job on this report and shorn it of all its strength and punch. However, you should never follow a policy of making things worse in a parliament, and that is why — since this report is along the right lines — we shall be voting in favour of it.

Mr Péry. — (FR) Mr President, France and especially its southern regions on the Mediterranean and Atlantic coasts make a fair contribution to Community production by accounting for 19% of the fruit and 25% of the vegetables grown in the EEC. Bolstering the organization of the market is therefore a major objective for the French Government. On 2 June the setting up of a fruit and vegetable office was approved by the French *Conseil des Ministres*. The job of this office will be to implement Community regulations but it will also have one or two new tasks to cope with, such as market trends and transparency, assessment of production potential and regional needs, speedier response to foreign trade and promotion of products. Added improvements to Community legislation are needed in our view and we support the Maffre-Baugé report which moves along these lines. Three points are particularly important.

First of all: a more important role for producer groups. We hope that the Member States will be able to extend the regulations governing producer groups to cover producers who are not organized. Secondly, we need to see an improvement in management procedures which could be preventive in nature, in particular the idea of public purchasing occurring at a stage in the marketing process ahead of the retail stage. And thirdly, we need to strengthen the import arrangements, by extending the system of reference prices to new products and keeping for the moment the import schedule.

When Spain joins the Community the area of farmland, the number of holdings and the number of people working on them will go up by 30%. It is therefore vital to make a start now on improving the common organization of the market in fruit and vegetables.

Mr Vgenopoulos. — Mr President, I regret to say that I too am forced to agree with what my colleagues have previously said because this excellent report — one of the few of such high quality which have been presented to this Parliament — has been amended to such an extent that in very many points it has become unrecognizable. This applies especially to the points which are of particular interest to the Mediterranean countries, such as Community preference and the extension of protection to fruit and vegetables from the Medi-

teranean countries — cucumbers, water melons, strawberries, melons, courgettes and potatoes of all seasons.

I regret that the report has been amended to such an extent that whereas originally we had decided to vote in favour of it, we will now abstain.

Mr Pranchère. — (*FR*) Mr President, in the south of France fruit and vegetable growers have just started taking action to protest against the drop in rates which is mainly the result of the trend in imports. Things cannot go on like this. It is high time we righted the wrongs which Mediterranean farmers in the Community have to suffer. The Maffre-Baugé resolution puts forward a series of proposals which if implemented would provide growers with a guaranteed security and level of income and the development opportunities they need.

I shall not mention again the positive elements which were tabled and adopted by the Committee on Agriculture and then by Parliament. However, we are unreservedly against the Woltjer amendment on enlargement as from 1984, since it involves a serious threat to Mediterranean growers. It is clear that all the provisions of the report would be swept aside if enlargement came about. Given the circumstances, at the end of the debate we intend to ask for an adjournment in order to assess our position. We are sorry to see this amendment which opposes measures that were indispensable and will remain indispensable for Mediterranean producers.

Mr Gautier. — (*DE*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the German Social Democrats intend to vote against this report. The Commission document on the reorganization of the market, which has been submitted to us, was already a compromise which we would have found it difficult to support. With this report it has become virtually impossible to go along with the matter. It amazes me that many of my Christian-Democratic friends in Germany are against the destruction of fruit and vegetables but — when it comes to the crunch — vote in favour of continuing the Community practice of destroying cherries, capsicums, artichokes and green beans. We cannot and will not go along with this. Nor will we go along with increased protectionism on the part of the Community in the fruit and vegetable sector and its wish to introduce, if possible, similar systems as in the milk sector. We German Social Democrats also advocate changes in the system, but along different lines than those advocated by the Christian Democrats.

Mr Cottrell. — Mr President, while indicating that I shall vote against this report, and recognizing as I do the strength, vigour and boundless fertility of the agricultural lobby in this Chamber, I wonder whether you would consider a ruling as to whether those Members who will gain a direct financial benefit from this and other agricultural proposals should actually take part in it? I fully recognize, however, that there is a problem there, because there are so many farmers in the House we might not actually have a quorum to complete the vote.

Mr Vitale. — (*IT*) Mr President, with regard to the Commission proposals and also those put forward by the Committee on Agriculture, we stand by all the reservations which were voiced during the debate on behalf of the Italian Members of the Communist and Allies Group and which initially — as I said before — had prompted us towards abstaining. However, let me now say that we shall be voting in favour, for two basic reasons. The first is that since then the House has adopted some of our amendments which we felt were important. The second reason is that the Woltjer amendment has gone through and this removes one of the things we were worried about, namely that this report might include obstacles to Spain's joining the Community.

These are two good reasons why we should be voting in favour and there is also a third one, and on this point I agree with Mr Sutra. By voting in favour, we are not only voicing our regard for the Maffre-Baugé report but also distancing ourselves from the violent criticisms of the entire Mediterranean policy which many Members from northern Europe,

particularly among the Coservatives, expressed during the debate and justified on rather spurious budgetary grounds. Consequently, we shall be voting in favour of the report.

*

* *

Dalsass report (Doc. 1-184/82): adopted

The rapporteur was:

— *in favour* of Amendments Nos 2, 4 and 5.

Explanations of vote

Mr McCartin. — While I support the recommendations in the Dalsass report because they would make Directives 159 and 161 much more relevant to the conditions in remote areas of the Community, I do not want at the same time to be seen as condoning the delay by the Commission in putting forward the new measures. It should be recognized that 159 and 160 have been most ineffective in poorer, more remote areas of the Community where the structures are bad and development is required. I want also to state that I am unhappy that whilst we have a common agricultural policy, nevertheless structural assistance has not been uniformly provided throughout this Community and in regions where the structures are worst and incomes are lowest, the least aid and assistance is being given. I want the Commission to take a particular look at this situation when drawing up and amending their directive to ensure that the areas of greater need will at least get assistance comparable to areas which are in fact better off.

Mr Clinton. — I have sought an opportunity to give an explanation of vote, not because I disagree with anything that is said in the Dalsass report, but because I have a feeling that the Commission is not sufficiently in touch with what is happening in relation to the operation and effectiveness of these directives in each of the Member States.

The flexibility of a directive can, in certain cases, be a good thing but in the implementation of these directives, it has had, in the main, a detrimental effect. In some Member States the maximum permitted benefits are not being paid at all and even worse than that, costs are not being updated with the result that farmers are getting, in some cases, less than half the available grant. In other Member States where agricultural-support measures represent a very small percentage of the total budget, the maximum benefits are being paid.

I have the feeling that the Commission may not be aware of these important details. I would not like to feel that they are aware but have not been prepared to do anything about them. I feel very strongly also that in severely handicapped areas, grants should be paid as to 100% from Community funds. This is one way to eliminate the difference in levels of support being given to farmers with similar degrees of handicap, and it is also a way, perhaps, for giving supplementary income without robbing people of their dignity and self-respect.

I think it is a great pity, too, that the pension scheme as provided in some Member States for the release of land has not been working really at all. It is too bad that farmers have no alternative but to go on trying to work when they are no longer able to work and it is also a loss of a valuable national resource.

Mr Nielsen. — (DA) From the legal point of view, the crux of this report is that we should approve the Commission's proposal to continue, on a provisional basis, the existing rules governing structural aid and this is something I can go along with. When we come to the various points in the resolution, some of them are clearly excellent — for example,

paragraph 6 on the possibility of young people taking over holdings and paragraph 9 on stricter control on State aids. However, there are also a number of items about which I am sceptical and have reservations. These are those points which are aimed at making the agricultural structural fund an instrument of social and regional policy. I can wholeheartedly sympathize with the idea of the Community taking action as regards social and regional policy in the backward areas too, but, in my view, this action should not take place via the agricultural policy. I therefore have reservations regarding these items. Nevertheless, I go along with the general aim, i.e. to continue until 1983 with the current arrangements which support the development of effective family holdings — and I stress both 'effective' and 'family' — and the modernization of processing plants.

Mr Vgenopoulos. — (GR) Mr President, we are in complete agreement with the Commission's initiative seeking to prolong the three directives on agricultural structures. The discussions on the revision of the common agricultural policy has not taken account of the Community provisions currently in force, and in any case prolonging the validity of the directives on social structures until the end of 1983 will give the Community institutions time to examine the question more thoroughly and to make use of new data. These directives on social structures play a most important part in keeping the farming population on the land, particularly as regards the disadvantaged regions of the Community. Greece only applies Directive 268 of 1975, which concerns the problem regions, and this only as far as compensatory amounts are concerned. On this point, Mr President, I agree with the previous speakers and protest against the fact that the Community reimburses my country for only 25% of the expenditure involved, while Italy and other countries receive 50% of such expenditure. I would agree with the Member who stated that the Community should pay 100% in these problem regions. But in any case, Mr President, since it is necessary to aid the agricultural regions, whether they involve cultivation, stock farming or hill farming, and since, if this is not done, the inhabitants of these regions will abandon their activities there, with all the social repercussions caused by such a rural exodus, we shall vote for the motion for a resolution by the Committee on Agriculture, with which we fully agree.

*

* *

Israël report (Doc. 1-296/82): adopted

The rapporteur was:

- *in favour* of Amendments Nos 1, 2, 3 and 8;
- *against* Amendments Nos 4, 5, 6 and 7.

Explications of vote

Mr Plaskovitis. — (GR) Mr President, the Greek Socialists have frequently had the opportunity of stating that they are firmly opposed to any military action which violates international law and amounts to the destruction of the sovereignty of an independent State.

This statement of ours is still valid for the violation of the independence of Afghanistan. However, this does not mean that we can approve of texts which are fanatical and one-sided, like the Israël report, which more or less asks us to recognize the internal Afghan resistance as the legitimate force representing the people, and this at a time when there has never been any such proposal either for the forces of liberation in El Salvador or for the Palestine Liberation Organization. Reports such as the one before us do a disservice to the efforts to achieve detente and disarmament, which are the only way of providing a definitive solution to the problem of Afghanistan also.

For these reasons the Greek Socialists will vote against the report.

Mr Alavanos. — (*GR*) Mr President, I should like to say the following on the Israël report: I think that the rapporteur is behaving rather like Don Quixote. His misfortune in Pakistan was not enough, since now he comes here and plays the general of the Afghan resistance by suggesting, in paragraph 5 that the Afghan 'resistance movements' should be united.

In our view this report is not reactionary but ridiculous. The only thing I should like to refer to is the attitude of the enlarged Bureau. We find it unacceptable that the enlarged Bureau decided, even though it had not been agreed in advance, to place the report on the agenda together with Mr Tindemans' statement on the six months of the Belgian presidency.

This is an attempt by the enlarged Bureau to distract our attention from the burning issue of the day, namely the events in the Lebanon, and we are bound to condemn it.

We shall, of course, vote against the report.

Mr Segre. — (*IT*) Mr President, the Italian Communists condemned the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in strong terms. We asked for the troops to be withdrawn and we upheld the right of the Afghans to freedom, independence and self-determination. This was, is and will continue to be our position, together with our call for a political solution which will end this serious crisis and guarantee peace, independence and non-interference for Afghanistan and for the whole region.

It is precisely because this motion for a resolution does not concentrate on this need for a political solution, but instead approaches the problem from a different angle, that we cannot go along with it. There seems to be different thinking behind it, based on the idea of linkage which now — we are happy to say — even the Americans seem to be dropping because it is inadequate when it comes to controlling and coping with the serious crises we have at the moment in so many parts of the world, including Afghanistan.

Mr Hänsch. — (*DE*) I would very much have liked to have voted in favour of Mr Israel's report. We join you all in this House in condemning the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan. We realize that the people of Afghanistan are fighting for their freedom, and we are prepared to give them political and humanitarian aid. We also acknowledge the fact that there are many positive things in this report. However — and I am saying this particularly for the benefit of Mr Israël himself — as long as the report contains statements such as those concerning the use of chemical weapons — for which, as you yourself know, there is no concrete evidence — as long as we try to influence the Afghan resistance organization and make suggestions as to what should be done and what should not be done, as long as we agree to support the Afghan resistance as an organization without going into the details of what form this support should take, I cannot go along with the report.

Mr Ripa di Meana. — (*IT*) Mr President, I am sorry that the Socialist amendments met with only limited success. Be that as it may, many of us are aware of the importance of this motion, which endorses the political recognition of the Afghan resistance. This is a tremendously important decision which could give a new direction to international solidarity. It is consistent and in line with all the other useful and timely moves of this Parliament. Let me also say that it is perfectly consistent with the unflagging expressions of political solidarity with the Afghan resistance from Socialist parties and Socialist leaders, such as François Mitterrand. Consequently I wish to inform the House that the Socialist Members in favour of this motion for a resolution include the following: Mr Glinne, Mr van Miert, Mr Ferri, Mr Zagari, Mrs Macciocchi, Mr Didò, Mr Pelikan, Mr Gatto, Mr Orlandi, Mr Lezzi, Mr Ruffolo, Mr Cariglia, Mr Arfé and myself.

*

* *

Haagerup report (Doc. 1-201/82): adopted

Explanation of vote

Mrs Macchiocchi. — (FR) I wish to announce that I shall be abstaining on the Haagerup motion for a resolution. Along with Mrs Veil, Mr Ripa di Meana and others, I tabled the motion which was put to the Political Affairs Committee. Now, after the adoption of the Israël report, I assume that no delegation will be going to Pakistan and that there is therefore no longer any reason for this resolution.

However, there is one problem I must mention. If we take action against Pakistan along the lines we have asked for, it will be the three million refugees who receive aid and protection from Pakistan who suffer the consequences. This means that while we persist with our moral and political condemnation — which is still quite justified — the part of the resolution dealing with retaliatory measures against Pakistan must fall, in my view, because these sanctions mark a disproportionate response and will only aggravate the existing problems which aid for the Afghan refugees has to cope with.

I do not want the Afghan refugees to have to pay for a serious act committed by the Islamabad government and above all I do not want the people who are calling out for aid in Pakistan to suffer the repercussions of a resolution which is wholly justified in moral terms but which should not call for economic sanctions against Pakistan if they are going to affect the poor refugees from Afghanistan.

*ANNEX II**1. Questions to the Commission**Question No 6, by Miss de Valera (H-105/82)*

Subject: Social Fund aid for day nurseries

Can the Commission confirm that it has now been established that the Social Fund can be used to help pay the cost of paying a nursery nurse for the children of women who are attending training courses?

Answer

1. The Commission is glad to be able to confirm the position as set out in the honourable Member's question.
2. Social Fund grants are calculated as a percentage (usually 50%; in the absolute priority regions 55%) of expenditure in respect of the preparation, operation and management of training courses. (Article 3(1) of Council Regulation (EEC) No 2396/71.)
3. No application for Social Fund assistance included child-care facilities as a cost until last year when East Leeds Women's Workshop submitted an application under the Women's Section. The expenditure included the cost of employing a person to be responsible for the care of the children of the women attending the course on the training premises. Following a favourable opinion from the Social Fund Committee, the inclusion of this cost as part of the eligible expenditure for the purpose of determining the amount of the grant was approved by the Commission as part of the second series of Social Fund grants for 1981. This decision has attracted a good deal of attention from persons interested in equal opportunities for women.
4. Child care in isolation would not qualify for Social Fund aid. To be eligible, the facility must form part of a programme which is eligible for Fund assistance and selected for a grant by the Commission in accordance with the criteria prescribed in the guidelines for the management of the Fund.

*

* *

Question No 12, by Mr Collins (H-44/82)

Subject: EEC code of practice relating to payments to workers in South Africa

Is the Commission aware that there are certain British companies who allegedly are in breach of the EEC code of practice relating to payments to workers in South Africa and will it say what action it proposes to take to bring these companies into line?

Answer

1. The Code of Conduct for companies with subsidiaries, branches or representation in South Africa' is the result of concerted action between Member States within the framework of political cooperation. The Commission participates in the work of political cooperation but it has not been instructed to administer the Code.
2. The Commission has been informed that certain Community firms are not fully complying with the Code's provisions on pay, but it is unable to take the kind of action referred to by the honourable Member.

3. The Commission would like the Member States to continue their efforts to ensure the widest possible compliance with the Code's provisions and welcomes the cooperation and encouragement of the European Parliament to that end.

*

* *

Question No 25, by Mrs Hoffmann (H-135/82)

Subject: Use of the European Social Funds to finance the vocational training of girls

Can the Commission state with regard to each Member State how many girls of less than 25 years of age who were unemployed or in search of employment participated in 1981 in vocational training schemes arranged with assistance from the European Social Fund and the types of training and organizations for which finance was provided?

Answer

Training programmes specifically designed to prepare young women under 25 for entry into new types of employment or into professions where women are under-represented receive first priority under the 'young persons' category of intervention of the European Social Fund, and for this reason they are clearly identifiable. In 1981, Social Fund grants amounting to 23.5 million ECU were made towards a series of programmes of this type, submitted by six Member States and concerning a total of over 18 000 young women. This represents an increase of over 40 % compared with the previous year. Most of these programmes were carried out by the public authorities in Member States and involved training for the mechanical, electrical and building trades, as follows:

Belgium: Office national de l'emploi, 100 persons, techno-industrial training¹

German Federal Republic:

- Bundesminister für Arbeit (Ministry of Labour) on behalf of 8 regions, 9 285 persons for techno-industrial training¹
- Bundesanstalt für Arbeit (Federal Employment Department) 6 540 persons for techno-industrial training¹

France: Ministry of Labour. 125 persons for training in building by the coordinating body for centres of apprenticeship.

Netherlands: Ministry of Labour. 365 persons. Techno-industrial training¹ and for building and wood industries.

United Kingdom: Dept. of Employment for Manpower Services Commission (Training Services Division). 665 persons in mechanical and electro-engineering.

Besides these relatively important programmes, there are also a number of non-continuous programmes. For example, the training of telephone fitters, landscape gardeners (town of Bremen, 10 persons) and car mechanics (Bradford College, 15 persons).

If the German Federal Republic was the first country to take a special interest in this type of aid, then other countries are now in turn presenting more substantial programmes. For example, the *Délégation à la formation professionnelle* in France obtained for the year 1982 approval for a programme involving 8 080 persons, while a new programme for 9 000 persons presented by the same body is at present under consideration for the period 1 July 1982 to 30 June 1983.

¹ Techno-industrial training implies access to the following occupations: locksmith, metalworker, toolmaker, mechanic, electrician, lathe-operator, printer.

It should be emphasized that young women under 25 also participate in the many other kinds of training schemes which were grant-aided by the Social Fund in 1981. Many of these were the large-scale youth unemployment programmes for which it is not possible even for the promoters themselves to give precise details about the exact nature of the training or the number of girls taking part. More information about Social Fund operations is however included in the annual reports of the Social Fund.

*

* *

Question No 27, by Mrs Le Roux (H-138/82)

Subject: Dumping of radioactive waste in the Atlantic

In 1981, 9 435 tonnes of radioactive products from the United Kingdom, Belgium, the Netherlands and Switzerland were dumped in the Atlantic 800 kilometers off the coast of Brittany under the supervision of the OECD Nuclear Energy Agency.

Given the progress which has been made in the treatment and stockpiling of waste on land, does the Commission not intend to propose to the Member States regulations restricting and eventually prohibiting the above practices?

Answer

The Commission of the European Communities has not participated in any way in the organization of the dumping in which some of the Member States have participated. These dumpings are supervised by the Nuclear Energy Agency (NEA) of the OECD. They are executed in accordance with the provisions of the London Convention on the prevention of marine pollution by dumping wastes and other matter and in accordance with the recommendations of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) for the application of the Convention.

The Commission has however followed the evaluation of the validity of the site which was performed in 1978 and 1979. This OECD evaluation concluded that:

- the site would be suitable for the receipt of packaged radioactive wastes during the next five years at annual rates comparable to those reached in the past;
- there is a need to develop a site-specific model of the transfers of radionuclides, particularly on short and medium time scales, from the dump area to human populations. Therefore there is clearly a need to continue investigations presently aimed at improving our knowledge of transport processes in the north-east Atlantic.

A programme plan for research and surveillance which has to complete the scientific basis for the evaluation of the dumping site was approved by the NEA in April 1981. An executive group has been set up to implement the programme plan. As far as the competence and responsibility of the Community is concerned I underline that in accordance with Article 37 of the Treaty the Member States have to send to the Commission the general data of any plan for the disposal of radioactive waste in whatever form, so as to enable the Commission to evaluate whether the implementation of such plans is liable to result in the radioactive contamination of the water, soil or airspace of another Member State.

A new recommendation for the application of Article 37 which the Commission approved last February (OJ No L 83 of 29. 3. 1982) indicates what has to be understood by disposal of radioactive waste. It makes clear that the sea dumping of radioactive wastes has to be declared under Article 37.

As indicated by the honourable Member the techniques for surface storage of these types of wastes are well established. However for various reasons certain Member States feel that they need sea dumping for particular types of voluminous low level wastes. As the dumping practice is in line with the provisions of the London Convention and the interna-

tional recommendations and considering that it can be excluded that contamination can result from the dumpings as performed up to now, a Commission intervention over what has been stated previously is not necessary or justified at this moment.

*

* *

Question No 29, by Mr Kyrkos (H-141/82)

Subject: Adverse consequences of accession on Greece's trade balance in agricultural products

At a recent meeting of Communist and Socialist Members in Brussels on 3 and 4 May to discuss the Community régime for Mediterranean products, Greek experts revealed that after one year of membership Greece had a deficit in its balance of trade with the Community in agricultural products.

Considering that Greece is primarily an agricultural country and that this was the first time in its history that it had a trade balance deficit in agricultural products, what does the Commission intend to do to counter the negative consequences of accession on Greece's trade balance in agricultural products?

Answer

It is true that Greece's balance of trade with the other Member States in agricultural and food products was negative in 1981. However, it is not correct to suggest that Greece's balance of trade in these products was negative for the first time in history. Such a result occurred at least in 1973 and 1979.

Greek imports from other Member States increased in 1981, especially in the case of meat and dairy products which accounted for almost 60% of all agricultural and food products from the Community. On the other hand, Greece had a more positive balance of trade in cereals, fruit and vegetables.

In the case of major products, increased imports from other Member States were compensated by a drop in imports from third countries while increased exports to the Community were sometimes compensated by a reduced level of exports to third countries. For the first time since 1976 the trade balance with third countries was positive in 1981.

The Commission regards this trend as a normal consequence of Greece's accession to a huge market which benefits from a better regional distribution of agricultural products, which has also brought benefits to the consumer. The Commission is convinced that Greek agriculture will be able to boost considerably its exports of typical Mediterranean products. It is not the Commission view that special measures directly affecting the Greek balance of trade are called for. The Commission would point out that certain measures have already been applied, for Greece's benefit, in both the areas of market support (cotton, dried grapes, dried figs) and of production and marketing structures (producer groups, citrus fruit improvement plan).

*

* *

Question No 30, by Mr Gawronski (H-144/82)

Subject: Community inquiry into poverty

The Community inquiry which found that there are eight million poor people in Italy caused a considerable stir. Can the Commission indicate to which social categories most poor people belong and what criteria were used to define poverty?

Answer

The poverty programme included three types of action: pilot projects, pilot studies and national reports.

The national reports, which were undertaken by independent experts in each of the Member States, aimed to provide information on the policies implemented in Member States to combat poverty in a variety of sectors: income, housing, education, health, etc. In order to establish a basis for Community comparisons, most of those responsible for the national reports agreed to assemble data on the basis of two alternative definitions of the poverty threshold; which were 40% and 60% of net average income per inhabitant of the country concerned.

The Italian report, which Mr Gawronski is referring to, used a different basis for calculating the number of poor in Italy: a family of two persons whose average monthly expenditure in 1978 was less than LIT 175 000. It is on this basis that the eight million is obtained for Italy, that is to say approximately 15% of the population.

More detailed data may be found in the national reports (a complete set of which has been sent to the Parliament) as well as in Chapter IV of the Commission's final report where the total number of poor is estimated at 30 million for the mid-1970s, based on an intermediate poverty threshold of 50%.

It is important, however, to remember that a poverty threshold is only a relative measure as it relates only to income since other factors also characterize poverty. These are also considered in the national reports and the final Commission report.

*

* *

Question No 32, by Mr Calvez (H-147/82)

Subject: General practitioners

General practitioners, especially in the Netherlands, consider that the judgement handed down by the Court of Justice in the Broekmeulen case (246/80) has given rise to discrimination against national doctors who have followed a specific course of training in general medicine. Is the Commission aware of their concern and does it intend to put forward proposals for a directive in this connection?

Can the Commission inform Parliament what work it has already done concerning the role of general practitioners and the extent of their training?

Answer

The Commission is aware of the reaction, referred to by Mr Calvez, aroused by the judgement of the Court of Justice in the Broekmeulen case (246/80).

It should, however, like to emphasize in this connection that the mutual recognition of diplomas, as laid down by the 'Doctors' Directives of 1975, is based on the harmonization of minimum standards of training. Under this system, a Member State may not impose additional training requirements on migrant doctors, even where this training is required by the Member State in question for the purposes of its national diplomas.

Nevertheless, the Commission is aware of the changes taking place in recent years in the profession of general practitioner. Therefore, after seeking the opinion of the Advisory Committee on Medical Training and the Committee of Senior Officials on Public health,¹

¹ Set up by the Council Decisions of 16 June 1975 (OJ L 167, 30. 6. 1975).

it is at present preparing a proposal for a Directive on general practitioners which will contain provisions designed to improve the latter's training in all Member States.

*

* *

Question No 33, by Mr Prag (H-148/82)

Subject: Postage rates within the European Community

In response to my Written Question No 1512/81,¹ the Council failed — indeed did not attempt — to justify the failure of two Member States, the United Kingdom and Ireland, to apply the Commission's Recommendation of 29 May 1979 that inland postal rates should be applied to letters and postcards in mail between Community countries.

The result is flagrant discrimination between Member States in mail charges despite the fact that postal communication is an important element in freedom of movement for people, goods and capital. Users in the UK and Ireland are particularly affected.

When is the Commission going to do something about it? And what?

Answer

1. On 11 September 1980 the Commission wrote to the Member States, including the United Kingdom and Ireland, reminding them of its Recommendation of 29 May 1979 and asking them to follow it.

In its answer to the Commission the United Kingdom explained why it could not do so. Under the Post Office Act 1969 the Post Office alone is responsible for determining postal rates. The Government has no power to intervene in the matter. The Post Office considers that since it is required to operate on a strictly commercial basis and meet stringent financial commitments it is unable to apply the inland postal rate to mail addressed to the other Member States.

Ireland has not replied to the Commission's letter.

2. The Commission is aware of the psychological effect on Community citizens of having the inland rate apply throughout the Community. It also shares the honourable Member's view that these rates are a key factor in the free movement of services. On the other hand, the Commission is aware too of the financial problems the postal authorities would have in introducing the inland rate. The Commission is nevertheless pursuing its efforts to find a solution which would overcome these difficulties and is looking into the question whether it should not propose specifically Community measures to achieve the purpose the honourable Member has in mind.

*

* *

Question No 34, by Mr Beazley (H-152/82)

Subject: Revision of Regulation No 67/67/EEC

Following on from paragraph 14 of the European Parliament's resolution on the Commission's *Tenth Report on Competition Policy*, will the Commission forward its proposal to revise Regulation No 67/67/EEC in time to enable Parliament to express its opinion before the adoption of the new regulation and, if so, when?

¹ OJ C 92, 13. 4. 1982, p. 11.

Answer

Under Council Regulation 19/65/EEC the Commission will soon be publishing in the Official Journal two draft regulations to replace Regulation 67/67/EEC with effect from 1 January 1983. In publishing these proposals the Commission invites all interested parties to submit their comments. In accordance with its normal practice, the Commission will be sending the draft texts, once they are ready for publication, to the members of the appropriate committee of the European Parliament and to the appropriate division of the Economic and Social Committee for information and discussion.

*

* *

Question No 35, by Mr Christopher Jackson (H-158/82)

Subject: Action on the Lange resolution of 15 November 1979¹

At present virtually all Commission proposals involve direct financial advantage to some Member States and corresponding disadvantage to other Member States. For each Member State in the Council of Ministers the assessment of this balance of advantage usually outweighs the intrinsic merit of a proposal for the Community as a whole, and is a major factor in the current crisis in the Community.

In November 1979 in the Lange report, the European Parliament made proposals to break the pernicious link between Community policy and immediate financial cost or benefit to a Member State, and to promote economic convergence.

Will the Commission give its current view on the Lange proposal for financial equalization and will the Commission, in view of the current crises in the mandate negotiations, agree to put forward as a matter of urgency proposals along the lines called for in the Lange resolution agreed by Parliament in November 1979?

Answer

1. The Commission shares the opinion of Parliament, expressed in its resolution of 15 November 1979, that convergence can come about only from the development of genuinely common policies and from the coordination of the policies pursued by the Member States in the economic and monetary spheres.
2. The Commission also shares the concern expressed in that resolution about the financial imbalances which exist in the budget and the burdens which they place on certain Member States. In the Commission's view the principal cause of these imbalances lies in the pattern of expenditure through the Community budget.
3. The Commission has taken note of Mr Lange's proposal contained in the resolution in question. We believe that ideas of this kind, which could for example take the form of a progressive rate for VAT contributions, could well play a part in the development of new own resources for the Community. The Commission will, as the Commissioner responsible recalled in May in his speech to Parliament on the preliminary draft budget for 1983, make proposals for such new own resources when this becomes necessary to achieve agreed objectives.

*

* *

¹ OJ C 309, 10. 12. 1979, p. 34.

Question No 36, by Mr Bonde (H-174/82)

Subject: Commission interference in Danish regional development aid

Will the Commission produce the figures to justify its interference in Danish regional development, providing for instance more favourable investment conditions in Schleswig-Holstein than in North Schleswig/South Jutland and in particular explain how it was able to conclude that unemployment was lower in South Jutland than in Denmark as a whole, although the actual figures given by the Danish Statistical Office¹ show that South Jutland has a considerably higher level of unemployment than the rest of Denmark?²

Answer

The unemployment level in the south-western part of Jutland, which was studied by the Commission, has been around the national average for Denmark in recent years. The figures used by the Commission for its analysis were provided by the Danish Government which had obtained them from the Danish Statistical Office. The figures relate to annual averages for the years 1979 and 1980. After completion of the Commission analysis, figures for 1981 became available. In the period 1979–1981, the average level of unemployment in the South-West of Jutland was 11.2% as against 10.8% for Denmark as a whole over the same period.

2. The honourable Member will by now in all probability — in view of the bulk of the material — have received the information relating to the first part of the question, i.e. the extent of aid on the German side of the border, directly from the Commission departments.

*

* *

Question No 37, by Mrs Hammerich (H-175/82)

Subject: Classification of expenditure

Will the Commission confirm that the reclassification of compulsory expenditure as non-compulsory expenditure implies the transfer of responsibility from the Council, in which there is the right of veto, to the Parliament where there is no right of veto, and that this transfer of responsibility detracts from the sovereignty of the Member States?

Answer

The honourable Member's question seems to be based on a misapprehension. The classification of expenditure as compulsory and non-compulsory is effected each year in the course of the budgetary procedure by common agreement of the two arms of the budgetary authority (Council and Parliament) on the basis of the Treaty provisions. The Council acts during the budgetary procedure by a qualified majority.

*

* *

Question No 38, by Mr Bøgh (H-176/82)

Subject: Right of veto

Will the Commission confirm that each of the ten Member States have the right to veto on decisions involving national vital interest, and that each of the ten countries decides for itself whether and when it considers a matter to be vital?

¹ OJ C 309, 10. 12. 1979, p. 34.

² Cf. the extremely incomplete answer to Question No H-88/82, verbatim report of proceedings of the sitting of 12 May 1982.

Answer

It is not stated at any point in the Treaties that a Member State has the right to impose a veto to protect vital interests. The Treaties merely state in what cases unanimity is required and in what cases a qualified majority or simple majority is adequate.

This is how the matter stands from the legal point of view.

*

* *

Question No 39, by Mr Simpson (H-157/82)

Subject: Import of frogs' legs from India

Following its answer to my Written Question No 1733/81,¹ will the Commission explain its view that a difficult economic situation in an exporting country is an adequate justification for avoidable cruelty to animals? Will it publish its guidelines as to what degree of economic difficulty justifies what amount of cruelty?

Answer

Quite obviously, a difficult economic situation is never an adequate justification for cruelty to animals. None of this was implied in the Commission's answer to Written Question No 1733/81. What was implied in the Commission's answer to Written Question No 1733/81 is that the suggested solution — a trade ban — would not provoke any modification in the methods of capture, transportation and slaughter of frogs, but would certainly provoke new difficulties in our relations with a developing country currently running a trade deficit of 900 million ECU with the Community, which it attributes to the Community's restrictive policies. It can also be pointed out that at present the main responsibility for sanitary conditions to which these importations are subject rests with the authorities of Member States. The Commission is giving priority in its working programme to the protection of farm animals during production, transport and slaughter.

*

* *

Question No 40, by Mr Pattison (H-161/82)

Subject: The future of the EMS

In the statement issued at the end of the European Council of 29/30 March 1982, it is noted that the EMS has operated satisfactorily so far, and the Economic and Finance Council were asked to report back on actions to give fresh momentum to the system. However in its Annual Report the Federal German Central Bank has virtually ruled out further development of the EMS?

Can the Commission state its opinion of the German Central Bank's view and what action it considers necessary to give fresh momentum to the EMS?

Question No 41, by Mr Boyes (H-169/82)

Subject: Commission involvement in the European Institute for Security Policy

It is understood that the general aim of the European Institute for Security Policy is the establishment of an EC defence policy.

¹ OJ C 111, 3. 5. 1982, p. 15.

Would the Commission explain in what capacity Mr Narjes, Commissioner of the EC, attended a meeting of the Institute which was set up in Luxembourg on 15 April; was Mr Narjes representing the Commission?

Answer

The task of the European Institute for Security Policy is to provide help in decision-making on security policy issues in order to promote the aim of European Union by studying the outlook in the fields of foreign policy and security policy. Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission of the European Communities, attended the meeting of the Institute which was held in Brussels on April 1982 on invitation from the Institute's Chairman Mr Kai-Uwe von Hassel, MEP.

*

* *

Question No 42, by Mr Kazazis (H-178/82)

Subject: Unsatisfactory allocation of Social Fund resources to Greece

It can be seen from the first financial statistics established for 1981 that Greece was allocated only 2.8% of the resources of the Social Fund's overall budget for that year.

Does the Community consider this to be a satisfactory state of affairs?

If not, what are the reasons for this state of affairs?

Does the Commission intend, in connection with the revision of the regulation governing the Social Fund's operation, to take special measures on behalf of Greece in order to remedy this situation?

Answer

1. Operations carried out in Greece benefited from a total of 30 648 000 ECU from the Social Fund (2.98% of the Social Fund budget) during 1981. The level of Greek participation in the Social Fund was inevitably influenced by the problems of adjustment facing any new Member State. The structure and capacity of the vocational training system within Member States also conditions the volume of eligible applications that may be submitted. In Greece much training activity is not eligible for Social Fund support since it comes within the normal school system.

2. To facilitate Greek access to the Social Fund during the period leading up to the review of the Fund, it was decided to retain the whole of Greece as a first priority region, eligible for the higher rate of Social Fund intervention. Similarly the guidelines for the management of the Fund provide for special account to be taken of the particular situation in Greece, which has enabled the Commission to finance operations which would not normally have received priority.

3. As stated in its recent response to the Greek memorandum of 19 March 1982, the Commission is willing to examine with the Greek authorities how they intend to develop the vocational training system. Depending on what priorities might be agreed, the Commission will examine whether any special transitional measures should be taken to help speed up the scheduled transformation of the vocational training system.

*

* *

Question No 43, by Mr Pearce (H-179/82)

Subject: Co-responsibility levy on milk

Since the co-responsibility levy on milk was designed to deter excess production and finance measures to dispose of surpluses, and since this effectiveness in deterring production is very much in doubt and a significant proportion of the money saved has not been spent on measures to increase consumption, will the Commission propose legislation to suspend the collection of the levy until such time as unspent balances from previous periods have been exhausted?

Answer

The Commission has proposed and the Council of Ministers has recently adopted a continued co-responsibility levy for 1982/83.

It is expected that in the 1982/83 season over a third of the co-responsibility levy receipts will be used for specific measures designed to directly increase consumption (sales promotion at home and abroad, the school milk scheme etc.), with the remainder being used towards the cost of measures for the disposal of milk products in surplus.

*

* *

Question No 44, by Mr Treacy (H-180/82)

Subject: Ineligibility of holders of British pensions for certain fringe benefits in Ireland

Is the Commission aware of the situation obtaining in Ireland, where certain categories of pensioners in receipt of British pensions are not eligible for the full range of fringe benefits available to other Irish pension holders, such as, inter alia, free television and radio licences, free telephone rental, free travel, free fuel and the living alone allowance; does it consider that Regulation 1408/71 on the application of social security schemes to employed persons and their families moving within the Community is relevant to the situation and will it call on the Irish Government to introduce the necessary measures to redress the situation?

Answer

1. The Commission would refer to its reply to Written Question No 574/80 of Mr O'Connell.¹
2. The schemes under which fringe benefits such as free travel, free television licences, free telephone rental and free fuel are granted to pensioners are non statutory social assistance schemes.

These schemes are not covered by Regulation No 1408/71 on the application of social security schemes to employed persons and their families moving within the Community, as Article 4 (4) states: 'This regulation shall not apply to social and medical assistance . . .'

It should be noted that the schemes in question apply to *all* residents fulfilling certain conditions, irrespective of nationality.

Furthermore, free travel is granted to *all* persons aged 66 or over and residing permanently in Ireland, as well as to blind persons 18 years of age or over.

¹ OJ C 238, 17. 9. 1980, p. 12.

Free electricity, free TV licences and free telephone rental are also awarded to persons aged 66 or over receiving retirement pensions from the *British* Department of Health and Social Security or the *Northern Ireland* Department of Health and Social Services.

It is for Irish authorities to decide if similar measures can be taken for persons in receipt of British or Northern Ireland invalidity and widows pensions and if the conditions can similarly be enlarged to other social assistance schemes, such as the National and Urban Fuel Schemes.

*

* *

Question No 45, by Mrs Baduel Glorioso (H-185/82)

Subject: South Korea

Mr Narjes, on returning from his recent visit to South Korea, stated that he had been impressed by that country's economic performance, and stressed the South Koreans' desire for closer relations with the EEC.

Does the Commission not agree that this economic success has been achieved largely thanks to political and social repression and, according to a recent ILO report, a legal working week longer than in any other country in the world (53·3 hours for women and 52·8 hours for men)?

Answer

It is true that the Republic of Korea's efforts in recent years to further the economic and industrial development of the country have produced remarkable results.

During its frequent contacts with the Korean Government the Commission has on numerous occasions made known its concern regarding the political régime in the Republic of Korea. Accordingly, when the President of the Commission, Mr Thorn, met the Korean Prime Minister in 1981, he was at pains to stress the importance which all democracies attach to the respect of human rights. Mr Narjes pursued the same line during the visit to which the honourable Member refers.

It is also undeniable that the hard work of the Korean people is one of the factors, although not the only one, which has contributed to the country's economic success. It is also without doubt that the working week in Korea is particularly long.

*

* *

Question No 46, by Mr Cluskey (H-189/82)

Subject: Community poverty programme

Will the Commission report on the situation concerning action to combat poverty in the Community following the recent meeting of the Social Affairs Council?

Answer

At its meeting of 26 May 1982, the Council noted the importance of the final report evaluating the programme of pilot schemes and studies to combat poverty which has also been transmitted to the European Parliament and the Economic and Social Committee and recommended that a full examination should be made both at the national and Com-

munity level of the various assessments and guidelines contained in the Commission report.

The Council instructed the Committee of Permanent Representatives to examine the report in the light, in particular, of the Opinions delivered by the European Parliament and the Economic and Social Committee and of any other factor which might prove necessary for assessing the guidelines contained in the report back to it as soon as possible.

*

* *

Question No 47, by Mr Marshall (H-194/82)

Subject: Discrimination against imported cigarettes in Italy

The Commission announced in reply to an oral question by Mr Marshall in September 1981 that it was enquiring into the position regarding the sale of imported cigarettes in Italy. Nine months have now passed. Has the Commission published its findings and if so, what action, if any, does it propose to take?

Answer

In my reply to the previous question (H-249/81) on this subject by the honourable Member, I said that the Commission still had to take a decision on the continuation of the proceedings against the Italian Government with regard to the monopoly for processed tobacco.

As the honourable Member will have been able to ascertain from reading the 15th General Report and the 11th Report on Competition Policy, the Commission has been able to reconsider appealing to the Court on all the issues except the fixing of retail margins, as a result of the changes made by the Italian Government after negotiations conducted by me personally. I would point out that the Ministerial Implementation Decree under Law 724/75 on the importation and wholesale marketing of processed tobacco was passed and published in the Official Gazette of the Italian Republic, No 42 of 12 February 1982. On 2 April 1982 the Italian Council of Ministers passed the bills on the changes to the said monopoly which were to be submitted to the Italian Parliament for urgent adoption.

On the other hand, the problem of the fixed margin, which it was impossible to solve with the Italian Government, was put before the Court on 24 February 1982 (Case 74/82).

In view of these results I believe that manufacturers from other Member States should soon be able to import and sell their products without any intervention from the monopoly, or if they so desire, to conclude new sales agreements with the monopoly without any pressure being brought to bear.

With regard to the aspect which I mentioned in my reply to your previous question concerning the distribution costs charged by the AAMS for the distribution under contract of products imported from other Member States, I would hope that I thought it better to concentrate on the main problems, for which we have obtained the above results. I shall however certainly take the required measures if they prove necessary.

*

* *

Question No 48, by Ms Quin (H-196/82)

Subject: Procedure governing applications to the EAGGF (Guidance)

Is the Commission aware that many applicants for assistance from the EAGGF (Guidance) feel that the application forms they have to complete are unnecessarily complicated and

long-winded? Has the Commission any plans to review and simplify EAGGF application forms and procedure?

Answer

The Commission assumes that the honourable Member is referring to assistance granted under the Guidance Section of the EAGGF for projects to improve structures for the marketing and processing of agricultural products in the context of Regulation (EEC) No 355/77, which is the most widely known.

The forms required for applications for such assistance are prescribed by Regulation (EEC) No 219/78 and the parties concerned, for example, cooperative organizations, were closely involved in drafting them. The Commission feels that these forms, which call for information essential for the assessment of the economic and structural value of the project, are entirely appropriate to the needs of the situation given the financial importance of the investment and of the Community aid in question.

In the experience of the Commission's services, those concerned generally accept the need for these formalities and the Commission has therefore no intention of modifying these forms at present.

*

* *

Question No 49, by Mr Moreland (H-197/82)

Subject: Tableware and ornamental ware imports from Korea and Taiwan

In a written answer to me (No 416/81)¹ last August the Viscount Davignon said on behalf of the Commission 'The Commission does not propose restricting entry of ceramic products from Korea into the Community'.

In view of the substantial increase into the Community of tableware and ornamental ware imports from Korea over the last year has the Commission changed its view on such imports from Korea and also from Taiwan?

Answer

The Commission has been informed that imports of tableware and other articles used for domestic or toilet purposes of common pottery and stoneware originating in particular in South Korea and Taiwan were increased and that the conditions in which they are taking place are liable to cause injury to the Community industry.

In application of Regulation (EEC) 288/82 on common rules for imports the Commission decided to open an inquiry procedure in respect of importations of tableware and other articles used for domestic or toilet purposes of common pottery and stoneware. This inquiry has been published in a notice annexed in the Official Journal of the European Communities No C 144 of 8 June 1982.

Moreover within the framework of the generalized preferences system for 1982 the ceilings for imports of ceramic products from South Korea under the tariff headings referred to in Mr Davignon's reply to Written Question 416/81² were frozen at the same level as 1981 to take into account the competitiveness of the Korean industry for these products.

*

* *

¹ OJ C 240, 18. 9. 1981, p. 10.

² 69.08. Glazed setts, flags and paving, hearth and wall tiles and 69.12c. tableware and other articles of a kind commonly used for domestic or toilet purposes, of others kinds of pottery.

Question No 50, by Mrs Lizin (H-206/82)

Subject: EEC-South Africa relations

Can the Commission confirm that it has established relations with officials responsible for the South African nuclear sector through the intermediary of the Director-General of the Euratom Supply Agency and can it inform us of the precise nature of its policy on the matter.

Answer

It is a well-known fact that South Africa is a major producer of natural uranium. As part of their supply policy Community consumers have concluded long-term contracts, including contracts with South African suppliers. In accordance with the tasks for which the Supply Agency is responsible under the terms of Chapter VI of the Euratom Treaty, the Director-General of the Agency takes part in the negotiation of these contracts and signs them pursuant to the Agency's 1975 rules. This responsibility also requires the Agency to consider the conditions which are written into individual uranium supply contracts and which in particular concern its use and subsequent disposal with regard to peaceful uses.

It is obvious in this context that contracts exist between the Director-General of the Agency, the users concerned and the South African authorities which seek to ensure that individual contracts contain clauses which are as satisfactory and as little restrictive as possible.

*

* *

*II. Questions to the Council**Question No 54, by Mr Cousté (H-116/82)*

Subject: Benelux revival as an example for European unity

Now that certain newspapers are reporting a Benelux revival, does the Council consider that this development could serve as an example for greater European unity?

Answer

Anything that might serve to strengthen the links between two or more Member States of the European Communities will also help to strengthen the Communities themselves.

*

* *

Question No 61, by Mr Alavanos (H-153/82/rev.)

Subject: Action by the EEC to prevent the adjustment of the cost-of-living index

At the European Parliament sitting of 10 March 1982, in reply to my question to the President of the Council as to whether the EEC intended to ask the Greek Government to keep within the margin of manoeuvre laid down by the Council or the Commission, the President stated that the Council would pronounce on the matter the following Monday.

Can the Council state — with regard to the obstruction and delays in the implementation of the automatic adjustment of the cost-of-living index in Greece — whether pressure of

any kind was exerted or 'wishes' expressed during the meeting of 15 March 1982 and the discussion of Greek economic policy with a view to preventing the automatic adjustment of the cost-of-living index in Greece; and whether the statement in the press communiqué that 'the Council endorses the main lines of the economic course to be pursued by the Hellenic Republic in its 1982 economic policy programme' also implies Council agreement on the subject of the adjustment of the cost-of-living index, when, as is well known, the governments of many EEC Member States (United Kingdom, Belgium, etc.) are opposed to such measures?

Answer

The economic policy guidelines for Greece, adopted by the Council on 15 March, were published in the Official Journal of the European Communities on 24 March 1982. The honourable Member will note that, as for the other Member States, these guidelines relate to the policies considered most suitable for ensuring a durable and balanced development for the Greek economy. They do not make any reference to the problem of the automatic indexation of wages.

*

* *

Question No 62, by Mr Christopher Jackson (H-159/82)

Subject: Action on the Lange resolution of 15 November 1979¹

At present virtually all Commission proposals involve direct financial advantage to some Member States and corresponding disadvantage to other Member States. For each Member State in the Council of Ministers the assessment of this balance of advantage usually outweighs the intrinsic merit of a proposal for the Community as a whole, and is a major factor in the current crisis in the Community.

In November 1979 in the Lange report, the European Parliament made proposals to break the pernicious link between Community policy and immediate financial cost or benefit to a Member State, and to promote economic convergence.

Does the Council believe that Commission proposals along the lines of the Lange resolution referred to above could be a helpful initiative, either in relation to the mandate, or in the longer term?

Answer

The Commission has not submitted to the Council a proposal along the lines indicated in the honourable Member's question and the Council does not intend asking the Commission to submit such a proposal.

*

* *

Question No 63, by Mr Pattison (H-160/82)

Subject: The future of the EMS

In the statement issued at the end of the European Council of 29/30 March 1982, it is noted that the EMS has operated satisfactorily so far, and the Economic and Finance

¹ OJ C 309, 10. 12. 1979, p. 34.

Council were asked to report back on actions to give fresh momentum to the system. However in its annual report the Federal German Central Bank has virtually ruled out further development of the EMS.

Can the Council state its opinion of the German Central Bank's view and what action it envisages proposing to give fresh momentum to the EMS?

Answer

At their recent meeting in Brussels on 17 May, the Ministers for Finance and Economic Affairs again confirmed that the European Monetary System has operated well in its present form and has contributed to monetary stability both in the Community and at world level.

They reaffirmed the need for convergence of economic performance and noted that all the governments of the Member States intended to work towards this aim.

They called on the Monetary Committee and the Committee of the Governors of the Central Banks to continue examining any possible technical improvements to the system which might, at the appropriate time, be the subject of a Commission proposal to the Council.

*

* *

Question No 64, by Mr Bonde (H-170/82)

Subject: Commission interference in Danish regional development aid

Will the Council dissociate itself from the Commission's attempt to restrict Danish regional development, and in particular prevent the South Jutland region being given a lower investment rating than Schleswig-Holstein?

Answer

The Council has not yet had to discuss the question raised by the honourable Member. It points out that the management of the ERDF (European Regional Development Fund) falls within the competence of the Commission. The Council would also draw the attention of the honourable Member to the fact that under the system set up by Articles 92 to 94 of the EEC Treaty it is for the Commission — subject to the powers conferred upon the Council — to decide whether aid is compatible with the common market.

*

* *

Question 65, by Mrs Hammerich (H-171/82)

Subject: Classification of expenditure

Will the Council confirm that a reclassification of compulsory expenditure as non-compulsory expenditure implies a transfer of responsibility from the Council, in which there is the right of veto, to the Parliament where there is no right of veto, and that this transfer of responsibility detracts from the sovereignty of the Member States?

Answer

The respective powers of the Council and the European Parliament as regards the budget are defined by the Treaties. Any alteration to these powers would require revision of the Treaties.

Any agreement between the Council and the European Parliament on the reclassification — hitherto a matter of controversy — of certain types of expenditure into compulsory or non-compulsory would be aimed at enabling the budgetary procedure to function properly.

*

* *

Question No 68, by Mr Megahy (N-184/82)

Subject: Uniform electoral procedure

What action does the Council propose to take following the proposals of the European Parliament for a uniform electoral procedure to apply for the 1984 elections?

Answer

At its meeting on 26 and 27 April 1982, the Council agreed:

- to examine the proposed uniform electoral procedure on the basis of Article 138 of the EEC Treaty and the corresponding Articles of the other Treaties, in accordance with the procedures laid down therein,
- to instruct a working party of experts to begin this examination under the close political supervision of the Permanent Representatives Committee.

This working party met for the first time on 9 June 1982.

*

* *

Question No 70, by Mr Cluskey (H-190/82)

Subject: Community poverty programme

Will the Council report on the situation concerning action to combat poverty in the Community following the recent meeting of the Social Affairs Council?

Answer

At its meeting on 27 May 1982, the Council took note of the submission of a report by the Commission on the programme of projects and pilot studies to combat poverty. It stated its intention to conduct as soon as possible the necessary detailed examination, both at national and Community level, of the various elements of assessment and guidance contained in the report.

The Council will be able, on the basis of that examination, to carry out an assessment of action undertaken and of the guidelines set out in the report.

*

* *

Question No 71, by Mr Horgan (H-191/82)

Subject: Outcome of Council of Education Ministers

Will the Council outline the main decisions taken, and the priority areas dealt with at the recent meeting of Education Ministers?

Answer

At their meeting on 24 May 1982 the Council and the Ministers for Education meeting within the Council agreed to a draft Resolution aimed, in the field of education and training related to the employment situation, at introducing a new series of at least 25 pilot projects at Community level for the period 1983-86.

In the sphere of the academic recognition of diplomas and periods of study, the Education Committee, whose report on the subject was adopted, was instructed to continue its work and report at a subsequent meeting.

This Committee was also asked to report to the next meeting on the effect of demographic changes on educational systems in the Community. It will also, during 1983, draw up a report on the impact of new information technologies on education and training systems.

*

* *

Question No 75, by Mrs Le Roux (H-200/82)

Subject: Social aspects of the common fisheries policy

Does the Council intend to put consideration of the harmonization of social schemes for fishermen on its agenda?

Answer

The Council is aware of the importance of the harmonization of social schemes for fishermen. It considers, however, that such harmonization has to be considered in the overall context of a common fisheries policy. Such a policy is currently under study by the Council, which devoted a meeting to the subject on 15 June 1982. Once the principles and means of this policy have been established, the Council will certainly deal with the social aspects of sea fishing on the basis of the communication submitted to it by the Commission.

*

* *

Question No 76, by Mr Van Miert (H-205/82)

Subject: EEC sanctions against Argentina

Can the Council explain what reasons prompted its President-in-Office to state at the meeting of the Parliament's Committee on External Economic Relations on 18 and 19 May last that, although EEC sanctions were important as a token of political solidarity, he doubted their effectiveness, except in the long term?

Answer

The measures adopted by the Community *vis-à-vis* Argentina on 16 April 1982 and subsequently extended twice on 18 and 24 May do not prevent the entry into free circulation in the Community of products originating in Argentina:

- accompanied by import documents issued before 16 April 1982;
- to be imported under contracts concluded before that date;

— already on route for the Community at that date.

It is understandable that in such circumstances the impact of such measures will only make itself fully felt in the long term.

*

* *

III. Questions to the Foreign Ministers

Question No 81, by Mr Rieger (H-123/82)

Subject: CSCE Follow-up Conference in Madrid

Do the Foreign Affairs Ministers take the view that East-West economic cooperation is an important factor in implementing the CSCE final act, and if so, what action is the European Community taking in this connection to create better conditions for the successful continuation of the CSCE Follow-up Conference in Madrid that has now been adjourned until November 1982?

Answer

The Helsinki Final Act is a balanced whole in which the provisions concerning economic cooperation form an essential component. Interesting progress was made in this area at the Madrid Conference. The Ten hope that when the Madrid Conference is resumed, circumstances will permit a positive result to be attained. The aim of the Ten in Madrid is to bring about the adoption of a substantial and balanced final document in all sectors of the CSCE. With this end in view, solutions must be found to those problems which are still outstanding, i.e. the military aspect of security, human rights, contacts between persons, information and the follow-up to the Conference. Thus, the problems concerning economic cooperation must be dealt with in parallel with the other issues and take their appropriate place.

*

* *

Question No 82, by Mr Van Miert (H-188/82)

Subject: Situation in El Salvador

What steps have been taken by the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation to implement the resolution on the situation in El Salvador adopted by the European Parliament on 11 March 1982, and more specifically, have they already contacted their Mexican counterpart with a view to the Member States making a positive contribution to the success of Mexico's offer to act as mediator?

Answer

The Ten are not at present in a position to take any steps likely to make a serious contribution to solving the problems of Central America and, in particular, El Salvador. The Ten are continuing with their analysis of the developments in the situation in El Salvador and will see to it that their diplomatic contacts are stepped up with those countries which are in the best position to make a joint contribution towards a solution.

*

* *

Question No 83, by Mr Ephremidis (H-154/82/rev.)

Subject: The Council's position on the Falklands crisis

The deteriorating situation in the Falklands constitutes a direct threat to peace in the South Atlantic as indeed to world peace. The Council's support for the Thatcher Government is helping to polarize the situation and to undermine the work of the UN. In view of the major threat which the Falklands crisis poses to world peace, can the Foreign Ministers state whether the governments of the Member States, conscious of their duty to preserve international peace, are willing to withdraw their support for an aggravation of the crisis and energetically to assist the Secretary-General of the UN in implementing recent UN resolutions on the Falklands together with previous UN resolutions on the decolonization of the region?

Answer

At their meeting of 24 May in Brussels, the Foreign Ministers of the Ten Member States of the European Community returned to the question of the situation in the Falklands. During their debate, they wholeheartedly endorsed Resolution 502 of the Security Council, which

- calls for an immediate halt to hostilities;
- calls for the immediate withdrawal of all Argentine troops from the Falklands;
- calls on the governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom to endeavour to find a diplomatic solution to their dispute and to respect in full the objectives and principles of the United Nations Charter.

At their meeting of 24 May, the Ten also expressed their hope that a peaceful solution would be found to the conflict. The Ten will continue to uphold this objective.

*

* *

Question No 84, by Sir Fred Warner (H-162/82)

Subject: Laos

What steps do the Ministers propose to take to insure the withdrawal from Laos of Vietnamese troops which are in occupation of the country in the defiance of international agreements and to restore the independence of the country?

Answer

The military presence of Vietnam in Laos is a fact that has been well known for a considerable time. Nevertheless, the Ten hope that an overall solution to the problems of the Indo-China peninsula will be found and that this solution will contain international guarantees enabling the withdrawal of all foreign troops.

*

* *

Question No 86, by Mrs Ewing (H-177/82)

Subject: Soviet Jewry

Will the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation state what action they propose to take and have already taken on the resolution¹ adopted by the European Parliament at its last part-session on the continuing problems of Soviet Jewry?

¹ Doc. 1-23/82.

Answer

The problems raised by the honourable Member have already been the subject of several interventions by the governments of the Member States of the Community.

This matter is being dealt with within the framework of the efforts which the Member States have been making continuously, together with other western countries, at the CSCE meeting in Madrid with a view to ensuring better application and extension of the provisions relating to human rights questions in the Helsinki Final Act. Renewed pressure will be applied when the Madrid meeting resumes in November 1982. The objective of the Member States of the Community at this meeting consists of achieving a substantial and balanced final document which must contain, *inter alia*, progress in the application of several provisions of the Final Act. These have implications for the position of the Jewish community in the Soviet Union and in particular, for the principles of the genuine exercise of human and fundamental rights and religious freedom.

*

* *

Question No 87, by Lord Bethell (H-182/82)

Subject: Visas in order to enter the United States

Have the ten governments considered the fact that, while all their citizens require visas in order to enter the United States, American citizens can enter Member States without visas? Are they aware that for several months a bill which would put right this injustice has been pending before the United States Congress? What discussions have they had about this matter and what representations have they made to the United States Government?

Answer

The problem of the visa which European citizens require in order to travel to the United States is one which interests the Ten. They therefore hope for favourable developments in this matter.

*

* *

Question No 88, by Mr Moorhouse (H-195/82)

Subject: Execution of Baha'is in Iran

In a previous answer to a question about the execution of Baha'is in Iran, the President-in-Office undertook to make representations to the United Nations Commission on Human Rights in a further endeavour to put a stop to the persecution and systematic elimination of the Baha'is religious minority. What were the results of these representations and what further action is being taken?

Answer

At the last meeting of the UN Human Rights Commission the Member States of the European Community supported a draft resolution on violations of human rights in Iran. Five of them were co-signatories of the motion.

The resolution expressed concern about reports of serious violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms in Iran and urged the Iranian Government to show respect for the human rights of individuals in Iran.

This resolution followed up the action taken on 31 Januar of this year by the representatives of the Ten in Teheran, with the support of Australia, Portugal, Norway, Sweden and Switzerland, when representations were made to the Iranian authorities in favour of the Baha'is. On this occasion the profound anxiety of the governments and the great concern of the public about the violations of the human rights of the Baha'is were expressed.

The Ten are continuing their consultations in the context of political cooperation with a view to further appropriate action on behalf of the Baha'is.

*

* *

Question No 89, by Mr Gawronski (H-204/82)

Subject: Security arrangements for dissidents from Eastern bloc countries residing in the Community

Is the Conference of Foreign Ministers aware of the disappearance in Paris of the writer Virgil Tanase and the assumption that the secret services of the Eastern bloc countries are responsible? If so, what action does it intend to take to strengthen security arrangements for dissidents from Eastern bloc countries residing in the Community and to shed light on the disappearance of the Rumanian writer?

Answer

The Foreign Ministers of the Ten meeting in political cooperation have not discussed the question of the disappearance of the writer Tanase.

I would point out, in this connection, that the same security measures apply to dissidents from the Eastern bloc resident in the Community as for other aliens within the territory of the Ten.

SITTING OF THURSDAY, 17 JUNE 1982

Contents

- | | | | |
|--|-----|--|-----|
| 1. <i>Approval of the minutes</i>
<i>Mr Pannella; Mr von der Vring; Mr Enright</i> | 188 | 7. <i>European Monetary System — Motions for resolutions by Mr de la Malène (Doc. 1-352/82/rev.) and Mr Diana and others (Doc. 1-355/82)</i>
<i>Mr Bocklet; Mr Deleau; Mr Gautier; Mr von der Vring</i> | 212 |
| 2. <i>Agenda</i>
<i>Mr Forth; Mr Pflimlin</i> | 189 | 8. <i>Emergency aid programme for the Caritas of the dioceses of El Salvador — Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-331/82) by Mr Langes and others</i>
<i>Mr Langes; Mr Pisani (Commission); Mr Langes; Mr von der Vring; Mr Enright; Mr Patterson</i> | 213 |
| 3. <i>Situation in Lebanon — Motions for resolutions by Mr Penders and Mr Croux (Doc. 1-343/82), Mr Bangemann and others (Doc. 1-348/82), Mr de la Malène (Doc. 1-354/82), Mr Glinne and others (Doc. 1-357/82/rev.), Mr Glinne and Mrs Charzat (Doc. 1-358/82) and Mr Fanti and others (Doc. 1-361/82)</i>
<i>Mr von Hassel; Mr Donnez; Mr Schinzel; Mr Donnez; Mr Israël; Mrs Dury; Mr Charzat; Mr Fanti; Mr Glinne; Mr Penders; Mr Fergusson; Mr Kyrkos; Mr Nordmann; Mrs Castellina; Mr De Goede; Mr Papantonion; Mrs Gaiotti de Biase; Mr J. M. Taylor; Mr Adamou; Mr Beyer de Ryke; Mr Romualdi; Mr Fich; Mrs Nielsen; Mr Pisani (Commission); Mr Cottrell; Mr Fanti; Mr J. M. Taylor; Mr Israël; Mr Forth; Mrs Veil; Mr Johnson; Mr Radoux; Mr Marshall; Mr Prag; Mr Forth</i> | 189 | 9. <i>Situation in Nicaragua — Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-332/82) by Mr Brok and others</i>
<i>Mr Brok; Mr Enright; Mr Langes; Mr von der Vring; Mr Pisani (Commission); Mr Hord; Mr von der Vring; Mr Collins; Mr Forth; Mr Collins; Mr Enright; Mr Collins</i> | 214 |
| 4. <i>Situation in the iron and steel industry — Motions for resolutions by Mr Calvez and others (Doc. 1-347/82) and Mr de la Malène (Doc. 1-353/82)</i>
<i>Mr Calvez; Mr Deleau; Mr Peters; Mr Franz; Miss Forster; Mr Pintat; Mr Thorn (Commission)</i> | 202 | 10. <i>Science and technology for development (Doc. 1-202/82) (continuation)</i>
<i>Mr Schmid; Mr Pisani (Commission); Mrs Dury; Mr Christopher Jackson; Mr Veronesi; Mrs Scrivener; Mr Pearce; Mr Sherlock; Mr Pisani</i> | 216 |
| 5. <i>European passport — Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-362/82) by Mr Habsburg and others</i>
<i>Mr Habsburg; Mr Irmer; Mr Patterson</i> | 206 | 11. <i>Programme on the environment — Report (Doc. 1-219/82) by Mr Alber</i>
<i>Mr Alber; Mr Collins; Mrs Schleicher; Mr Johnson; Mr Maher; Mr Eisma; Mr Muntingh; Mr Gerokostopoulos; Mr Papaefstratiou; Mr Narjes (Commission)</i> | 223 |
| 6. <i>Internal market — Motions for resolutions by Mr Moreau and others (Doc. 1-345/82) and Mr Travaglini and others (Doc. 1-350/82)</i>
<i>Mr Moreau; Mr Travaglini; Mr Rogalla; Mr von Wogau; Sir David Nicolson; Mr Leonard; Mr de Ferranti; Mr Fernandez; Mr Narjes (Commission)</i> | 207 | 12. <i>Dangers arising from the use of consumer products — Report (Doc. 1-207/82) by Mrs Seibel-Emmerling</i>
<i>Mrs Seibel-Emmerling; Mrs Lenz-Cornette; Miss Hooper; Mrs Scrivener; Mr Narjes (Commission)</i> | 233 |
| | | 13. <i>Air transport — Report (Doc. 1-286/82) by Mr Schwartzberg</i>
<i>Mr Schwartzberg; Mr Key; Mr Franz; Mr</i> | |

<i>Moorhouse; Mr Leonardi; Mrs Nikolau; Mr Herman; Mr Martin; Mr Schwartzberg</i> —	236	<i>nardi; Mrs Theobald-Pauli; Mr Fernandez; Mr Narjes (Commission)</i>	247
14. <i>Votes</i>		17. <i>Inward-processing relief — Report by Mr Rieger (Doc. 1-316/82):</i>	
<i>Mr Hopper; Mr Pannella; Mr Wawrzik; Mr Michel; Mr Irmer; Mr Pannella; Mr Cohen; Mrs Rabbethge; Mr Collins; Mr Narjes (Commission); Mr Collins; Mr Narjes; Mr Collins</i>	242	<i>Mr Rieger; Mrs Phlix; Mr Narjes (Commission)</i>	256
15. <i>Air transport — Report by Mr Schwartzberg (Doc. 1-286/82) (contd):</i>		18. <i>European coastal charter — Report by Mr Harris (Doc. 1-302/82):</i>	
<i>Mr Clinton; Mr Adamou; Mr Lalor; Mr Andriessen (Commission); Mr Pearce; Miss Forster</i>	244	<i>Mr Harris; Mr Bourmias; Mr Narjes (Commission)</i>	258
16. <i>Market for electronic products — Report by Mr Herman (Doc. 1-189/82) and oral question by Mr D'Angelosante and others (Doc. 1-259/82):</i>		19. <i>Budgetary contribution to the ECSC — Report by Mr Nord (Doc. 1-313/82):</i>	
<i>Mr Herman; Mr Rieger; Mr Seal; Mr I. Friedrich; Sir John Stewart Clark; Mr Leo-</i>		<i>Mr Nord; Mr Narjes (Commission)</i>	260
		<i>Annex</i>	262

IN THE CHAIR: MR DANKERT

President

(The sitting was opened at 10 a.m.)

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. — *(FR)* Mr President, on page 6 of the Minutes it says that Mr Pannella spoke on the speaking time allocated to the Commission. We did not allocate anything to the Commission and I would simply point out that the Commission allocated to itself a speaking time which was different from the time announced and that the person in the Chair, at the time when I was merely trying to point this out, said some very unpleasant things about Italy, Parliament and the Members and he did not allow me to give my opinion. If I attribute this to the fact that the person in the Chair was notable for his lack of courtesy, at the same time I am keen to make it clear that a certain

amount of speaking time was not allocated to the Commission. It might be better to say that the Commission took the time.

President. — Very well, Mr Pannella, we shall think about the word *allocated*.

Mr Pannella. — *(FR)* I was not talking about the time allocated to the Commission but about the time taken by the Commission in the debate.

President. — You are splitting hairs, Mr Pannella. I said we were going to think about the word *allocated*. This means that the word is not going to be in the final version of the Minutes and we shall have to find another one. Have you any suggestions?

Mr Pannella. — *(FR)* Yes, what I was going to propose, Mr President. Let us say that the Commission allocated the speaking time to itself.

President. — I do not think that is the most felicitous way of changing the Minutes, but I have noted your comments.

I call Mr von der Vring.

Mr von der Vring. — *(DE)* Mr President, in cases like this, which are always happening, may I suggest the

von der Vring

following wording for the Minutes: Mr Pannella made another irrelevant comment.

President. — I call Mr Enright.

Mr Enright. — In the first page of votes, Mr President, the name Enright appears with the correct desk number but I appear to be attributed to the EPP, the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group), which I am sure fills them with as much horror as it does me.

President. — Thank you, Mr Enright. I think they would like to have you but we shall keep you where you are.

(Parliament approved the Minutes)

2. Agenda

President. — I must now consult the House on the request by the chairman of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning for an adjournment of the debate on the report (Doc. 1-295/82) by Mr Faure on measures to combat excessive urban concentration.

In a letter of 15 June Mr De Pasquale noted that the report had been put on the agenda of the current part-session only last Monday and he pointed out to the House that Mr Faure would not be able to attend the debate because of his commitments as a member of a French delegation to the United Nations. Mr De Pasquale himself has also had to leave the part-session for important family reasons, and so he will not be here either when the debate is called. It is for this dual reason that Mr De Pasquale has asked for the Faure report to be deferred until the September part-session.

I call Mr Forth to speak against the motion.

Mr Forth. — Mr President, you will be aware that the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions recently made a ruling on this very matter to the effect that, in order to avoid removing items from the agenda at a very late stage in precisely this sort of way, each committee should accept the responsibility of ensuring that in the absence of a rapporteur, or indeed a chairman, someone else on that committee should take responsibility for seeing a report through the plenary. Otherwise, the House is always going to be at the mercy of people's absences for whatever reason. I hope that we will resist and oppose this request, because it creates a bad precedent, it makes a mockery of our agenda and it makes it very difficult for Members and indeed for the public, the press and everyone else, to follow our business in an organized way.

For these very many reasons including not least the ruling from the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions of which this, I think, would be the first test. I object. It would be most unfortunate if the entire House were to be held to ransom by the unfortunate absence of two people from that committee. On that basis, Mr President, I would beg to oppose the request for adjournment.

President. — I call Mr Pflimlin to speak for the motion.

Mr Pflimlin. — *(FR)* Mr President, I am in favour of adjournment for the reasons you gave. They are decisive. The fact is that it would be better if this item were deferred until the next part-session.

(Parliament agreed to the request for adjournment)

3. Situation in Lebanon

President. — The next item is the joint debate on the following six motions for resolutions.

- Motion for resolution (Doc. 1-343/82) by Mr Penders and Mr Croux, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group), on the Lebanon.
- Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-348/82) by Mr Bangemann and others, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, on the situation in the Lebanon.
- Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-354/82) by Mr de la Malène, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, on the situation in the Lebanon.
- Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-357/82/Rev.) by Mr Glinne and others, on behalf of the Socialist Group on an immediate cease-fire in Lebanon.
- Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-358/82) by Mr Glinne and Mrs Charzat, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the threats and attacks against the embassies of the ten Member States of the European Economic Community, their accredited representatives and their diplomatic staff in the Lebanon.
- Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-361/82) by Mr Fanti and others, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, on the Israeli invasion of Lebanon.

I call Mr von Hassel, who is deputizing for Mr Penders.

Mr von Hassel. — (*DE*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, before the Political Affairs Committee could complete its report on the Lebanon, the Penders report, the Israelis undertook the acts which concern us today. As far as I can ascertain, world reaction is critical of the Israelis and demands their withdrawal. World public opinion is fully aware of the Israeli invasion, but there is a stubborn refusal to take into account what the true situation in the Lebanon was, what was going on there and what motivated the Israeli move.

I reprove the West for not having unduly troubled itself up to now about the fact that the Lebanon's national identity was in great jeopardy, that it has been for years in an almost hopeless situation precisely because 30 000 Syrian troops had moved into the Lebanon and have been established there for years. In addition, the Christians, who originally, as you all know, were in a majority in the Lebanon, have been placed in a minority because of the immigration of several hundred thousand Palestinians, mainly under the military and militant leadership of the PLO. The slogans that have been coined in that region depicting the future of the Christians are, I feel sure, sufficiently well known here.

The tragic circumstances in the Lebanon have repeatedly prompted us, the European Christian Democrats, to go there to study those circumstances and to talk to those concerned. We have repeatedly prevailed upon world public opinion and also on those responsible in the region to do their utmost to try to recreate the integrity of the Lebanon, and not to restrict the freedoms the Christians have enjoyed up to now, that means to create the preconditions for Lebanon to return to a state of peace and national unity.

All this has, in my opinion, not interested world public opinion, or hardly at all. The repressive situation in the Lebanon was of no matter. Perhaps this was because people did not want to spoil things with the PLO, or perhaps with the Arabs in general. We have repeatedly insisted that the integrity of the Lebanon should be assured and that outside interference of any sort should be prevented, that the Syrians should withdraw and that the Palestinians, particularly the militants, should leave the region. Instead of this, the Palestinians have constantly carried out attacks on Israel from Lebanese soil, led night patrols and sent shock troops to carry out subversive operations with explosives and even with rockets, killed Jews, in other words, used naked terror tactics.

If the PLO had acceded to our demands and left Israel in peace, then Israel would never have attacked.

(*Interruptions*)

One can only judge the Israeli attack if one knows the initial situation obtaining in the Lebanon and is prepared to assess it and not to condemn one side alone.

(*Applause — interruptions*)

Even if one really knows the initial situation — and you over there ought to know it too — then one nonetheless takes one's time about drawing conclusions. But one at least should look into the motives. Anyone who subsequently makes a one-sided assessment and only makes demands on one side in the conflict will not be contributing to peace.

The Syrians must withdraw, and the militant PLO cease adopting its aggressive attitude. The integrity and the inviolability of the Lebanon must be re-established and recognized. Then any reason for the Israelis to remain in that country will cease to exist and they will withdraw.

(*Applause*)

President. — I call Mr Donnez.

Mr Donnez. — (*FR*) Ladies and gentlemen, it is not enough merely to regret the Israeli army's actions in the Lebanon and the large number of innocent victims which we all deplore. We must also suggest ways of ending this state of war and, even better, ways of preventing a similar situation from ever recurring.

We all only too frequently tend to mix up in our own lives cause and effect. I am afraid that for a large number of us the same is true of the Lebanon crisis. No right-thinking person could believe that the Israeli government lightly decided to undertake the military operations we are now following. As a result, we must seek out the fundamental motives behind their actions in order to avoid such an outcome in the future.

I am sure that everyone will admit that the Lebanon, when it still had a government, had accepted a large number of Palestinian refugees in its territory, and that this was a humanitarian and highly praiseworthy act. But quite clearly it was not the Palestinian refugees' role to become involved in the Lebanon's internal affairs. We are forced to admit, however, today that the Palestinian refugee camps had become real strongholds with fighting forces and weaponry superior to that possessed by the Lebanese army itself. The legal government of the Lebanon lost its hold on the country as a result and the PLO exercised control over a large part of the Lebanon.

This *de facto* situation could have only one outcome, and that was to create a permanent state of war between the Palestinian and Lebanese armed forces, which led to an appeal to Syria to re-establish peace. Once again we are now forced to admit that the Syrian armed forces do not behave in the Lebanon as a force for peace but rather as occupation forces. This has meant that the Lebanon only appeared to be a free country whilst in fact being occupied by the PLO and Syrian armed forces who in addition remain the avowed enemies of Israel, even to the extent of disputing its legal right to exist.

Donnez

Thus, on Israel's borders a state of tension and insecurity was gradually established and further exacerbated by terrorist acts carried out by the PLO in Israeli territory.

We can now deplore the brutality of the Israeli reaction but we can not avoid examining the reason for it. The fact is that peace will only return to the Lebanon . . .

President. — Will you give Mr Schinzel permission to put a question during the debate?

Mr Donnez. — (FR) With pleasure, Mr President.

Mr Schinzel. — (DE) Mr Donnez, is it your view that there is any reason whatsoever for anyone in the world to allow Israel in this specific case the right to kill 10 000 or more civilians?

(Applause)

Mr Donnez. — (FR) Mr Schinzel, I assure you that it was my intention to state that I deplore this as much as you.

(Interruptions from various quarters)

You over there are really not in a position to right wrongs! Why don't you tell us a little about Afghanistan or Poland and how you act in those countries! You really cannot talk. Since the converse is also true, we are on an equal footing.

I shall answer Mr Schinzel's question but not reply to your group as a whole, since we are only too familiar with your ideas. I deplore as much as you, Mr Schinzel, all these victims but I, for my part, am trying to discover the reasons behind the problem in order to avoid any future recurrence of such tragic events. This is what I am talking about and that is all. Unlike some of you I am a man of peace, whereas you are men on the payroll of others who are not after peace. This is the fact of the matter.

(Applause)

In conclusion, Mr President, peace will not in fact return to the Lebanon — and you can see that I am a man of peace from this — unless all the armed forces, and I repeat all the foreign armed forces, leave the country and the sovereignty of the Lebanese government is restored. All armed forces including the Israeli army. In this connection, I feel sure that for once we will be talking the same language and I should therefore like to conclude by telling you that our motion for a resolution is basically composed of facts. It is a logical follow-up to decisions taken by Parliament on 10 and 22 April last. It has therefore the advantage of

being consistent, and I might also say that in spite of what some people may think, it also has the advantage of showing common sense.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Israël, deputizing for Mr de la Malène.

I should like to ask the Members not to whistle since this damages the microphones.

(Laughter)

Mr Israël. — (FR) I should like to thank you, Mr President, for having taken that precaution just as I am about to start speaking.

(Laughter)

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen on all sides of this House, the most important point is to state clearly that the Lebanese people, Christians and Muslims alike, have a right to freedom, well-being and happiness. Similarly, the Lebanese State has a right to political independence, security and the observance of the integrity of its territory. The logical conclusion to be drawn from these two necessities is that all foreign forces should withdraw from the Lebanon. Syria, which has never recognized the Lebanon as an independent State, should evacuate the Lebanese territory which it has been occupying for years in the guise of an Arab dissuasion force, blowing and hot and cold alternately, sometimes attempting to put down the Christians and at others the Palestinians. The fact is that having the Syrians in the Lebanon does no more than make it impossible to find a peace. The part they assert they are playing as referee of buffer between the progressives and conservatives is mere deception. The Syrians unfortunately occupied the Lebanon in order to further their own unavowed interests.

Similarly, the Palestinian forces ought to be disarmed. The heavy and sophisticated weaponry, they possess, supplied by the Russians through Syria, no doubt jeopardizes everyone's safety, but particularly that of the Lebanese people itself.

(Interruptions from various quarters on the left)

I am sad to say that those organizations which assert to be representatives of the Palestinian people make any peaceful solution impossible because their political programme is aimed at wiping the State of Israel from the map and they are causing the downfall of the Palestinian people which for years has been legitimately seeking security and justice.

Similarly, the Israeli army must leave the Lebanon. The fighting now going on in the Lebanon involving

Israël

Israeli forces is causing too much loss of civilian Lebanese life, of innocent, ill-supplied people for it to be fully justified. The cease-fire which ought to be called should make it possible to withdraw all the armed forces now in the Lebanon.

It is clear, however, that the situation is undergoing a far-reaching transformation. Prospects for peace which did not exist before are now apparently taking shape. Perhaps some good will come of this disaster. It is to this end that determined intervention by Europe can be of use. Let us not condemn one side only. Let us help to build peace. Then we will see that the Lebanese, regardless of creed, politics or outlook, can agree and rebuild a country which asks nothing more than to live in peace with all its neighbours. The era of hypocrisy is past. We must now clearly state that the Lebanon should regain all its freedom and independence as indeed should all the peoples of the Middle East. I hope my statement has been sufficiently clear.

President. — I call Mrs Dury.

Mrs Dury. — (*FR*) Mr President, I thought that we were holding this debate in order to give voice to our emotion and indignation and in order to assume our responsibilities as Europeans. However, I now realize that we are holding this debate in order to pillory the Palestinians.

It is my belief, Mr President, that the Lebanon's present distress, the large number of civilians, women and children, killed are all reasons for us to feel indignation. We Socialists have always recognized Israel's right to exist but we believe that there is no way of bringing peace to the Middle East other than by giving the Palestinians the State to which they are entitled.

I also believe, Mr President, that if we, as Europeans, wish to hold a dialogue than we must first try to foster it. Instead of selling arms to Israel, we in Europe ought to be fostering a dialogue with the PLO which is the legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. I feel that we undertook economic sanctions against Argentina lightly and as a result I should like to know what is preventing Europe from devising sanctions which might be taken against Israel.

It is my view that there is a great deal of hypocrisy in today's debate. Naturally we are in favour of Israel's right to exist, but we are forced to condemn the invasion of the Lebanon by Israel. We are forced to condemn the mass killing of Palestinians. We are forced to condemn the fact that the Israelis wish to wipe out the PLO and do away with the Palestinian question by applying a final solution.

I should like to conclude, Mr President, by stating that, in addition, as Socialists, we feel we ought not just to support the International Red Cross but also all

the humanitarian organizations which are working to the same purpose in the Lebanon, particularly the Palestinian Red Crescent. I am making an appeal, Mr President, for the initiation of a dialogue and a move towards peace.

(*Applause*)

President. — I call Mrs Charzat.

Mrs Charzat. — (*FR*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, my motion for a resolution calling for the re-opening and maintaining of the embassies of the ten Community Member States is fully justified by the events which the Lebanon has been experiencing over the years and over the past few days, but my motion is also a declaration in favour of a future which will be that of the rebuilding of a sovereign, free and independent Lebanese State.

There are three guiding principles behind the tabling of this motion for a resolution.

The first relates to the inviolable sovereignty of the Lebanese State. The assassination on 4 September 1981 of Mr Louis Delamare, French Ambassador to Lebanon and the savage attacks in 1981 and 1982 on chancelleries and diplomatic staff of Member States, were all attempts, through symbolic and dastardly acts, to impair the sovereignty of the Lebanese State. The hooded death which struck the staffs of embassies, and of the French embassy in particular, was intended to create a diplomatic vacuum in the Lebanon. The aim in view, which is the outcome of the thirst for domination of the Lebanon's powerful neighbours, was to splinter the Lebanese State exactly as Poland was split up in the 18th century. By re-opening, maintaining and strengthening the embassies of the ten Member States, Europe will not only be reaffirming the inviolable sovereignty of the Lebanese State, but also its own determination to apply pressure towards achieving the rebirth of a free and independent Lebanon.

My second guiding principle was based on observance of international rules. These international rules, applicable to all States, have at their root a reverence in war and in peace for established diplomatic relations between States, expressed through the inviolability of diplomatic missions and their staff. This means of necessity that a State's representatives should in no way be connected with the policies of the governments of the State they represent. These international rules have not been observed in the Lebanon. Faced with the tragedy that the Lebanon is living through, the ten Member States have a duty to reject this violent blackmail. All foreign troops should withdraw from the Lebanon, but all the embassies should return to it.

The third guiding principle is based on observance of human rights. Embassy, staff can under no circum-

Charzat

stances be allowed to become the targets, and at times the victims of blind violence. Ambassadors hold diplomatic immunity. When carrying out their mission, they must not become the favourite targets of barbaric vengeance wrought for murky political motivations.

In conclusion, the democracies of Europe must flourish their sense of solidarity towards the Lebanese State. The first step in stating Europe's desire to see Lebanese sovereignty upheld, and its integrity observed, is the re-opening, maintenance and continued operation of diplomatic representation of the ten Member States. To this end, political cooperation between Member States has become an urgent necessity. This cooperation for the furtherance of right and peace will lend real weight to Europe's determination to side with the Lebanese people and the sovereign Lebanese State.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Fanti.

Mr Fanti. — *(IT)* Mr President, the Communist and Allies Group by its motion for a resolution wished to appeal to the conscience and sense of responsibility of the political groups in the European Parliament and in the institutions of the Community, that is the Commission and the Council. We are however not in agreement with the amendment tabled by Mr Barbi and consorts and we should like to lodge a protest against the procedure adopted.

The situation created by the act of aggression carried out by the Israeli forces against the Lebanon and the Palestinian people is exceptionally serious, both because of its immediate effects and its longer lasting consequences which involve Europe's relations with the Arab world, the Middle East and more generally with the whole area of the developing countries.

The Israeli leaders cynically labelled their military operation 'Peace in Galilee', an operation which, in resources, methods and effects, brings to mind the Blitzkrieg tactics which we would have wished could merely have remained a sad memory and warning of Hitler's Nazis. Peace in Galilee — as indeed elsewhere in the world — can never be founded on violence, destruction, the massacre of civilians and death.

We too wish to see the State of Israel living securely, and the Israelis living in peace, but this much must be quite clear: this can never be achieved over the dead bodies of Palestinians. What has happened and is now happening in the Lebanon can only increase from one generation to the next, the hatred, fanaticism, and violence which exist between the Israelis and the Arab world and anyone who does not adopt a definite stance in this matter is making a serious mistake and taking upon himself a weighty responsibility.

We are not just here appealing for a consistent policy. We have not hesitated one second in adopting a stance of defending peoples and human rights without being 'remote controlled' and we are amongst those who last night demonstrated in Rome with the leaders of the Christian-Democrats, Socialists and Communists in the presence of representatives of the PLO.

Our appeal is intended first and foremost to be one for the protection and defence of Europe's role and function today and in the future. Its international credibility and the outlook for its own development are closely linked to its ability to be a factor for peace and development in all international relations and particularly in North-South relations. What possible meaning could yesterday's passionate discussion on hunger in the world have if this were not the case, Mr Pisani?

For this reason, we consider as absolutely essential the request we have put forward for a determined condemnation of Israeli aggression, for the application of the UN resolution on the cease-fire and a withdrawal of Israeli troops, for a demonstration of our solidarity with the civilian population and the Palestinian Liberation Organization by recognizing that organization as the sole representative of the Palestinian people. We ask the Foreign Affairs Ministers of the Ten to take steps — including that of an arms embargo on Israel — in order to achieve a lasting peace in the Middle East, via negotiated solutions and with full observance of everyone's rights particularly those of the Palestinian people who are being so hard-hit at the moment, of territorial integrity, and of the independence of all countries, including the State of Israel and lastly of the creation of a State for the Palestine people.

These are the demands which we consider to be essential and necessary for Europe to make its voice and democratic determination clearly heard.

(Applause from the Communist and Allies Group)

President. — I call the Socialist Group.

Mr Glinne. — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Socialist Group will abide by the motion for a resolution (Doc. No 1-357/82/rev.) which it has tabled.

In the spring, a delegation of the Socialist Group was on the spot in the Lebanon and we experienced at that time tremendous sorrow. As things stand today, we can but judge the bombing and murder of innocent people in the Lebanon by the Israeli Air Force as a flagrant violation of international law.

Similarly, the invasion of Lebanese territory by Israeli forces can only be considered by us as an act of aggression, a compounding factor to those which prevent the Lebanese State from really being a sover-

Glinne

ign State, able to act and to assume the responsibilities which ought to befall it. We have always stated that, on the Middle East problem, we voice with the same determination the statement of the right to exist of the State of Israel and the right of the Palestinian people to settle in a State of its own.

With reference to the latest developments, Mr President, we approve the declaration of the Foreign Affairs Ministers of the Ten made on 10 June. We condemn, in Israel's recent behaviour in sending its troops into the Lebanon, a flagrant violation of international law. We launch an appeal to the Israeli Government to withdraw its troops inside the Israel-Lebanon border. We also feel that the political behaviour of the Israeli Government should be assessed with all the implications this will have for the cooperation agreements we hold with it. We ask for as binding as possible a cease-fire to be imposed and unconditionally observed by all parties. We hope that a dialogue will be instituted between all the parties concerned without exception since this is the only way to create a fair and balanced solution to the problems of the Middle East. Indeed, we expect the Council of Ministers of the Member States to take all the necessary steps to achieve this aim.

Lastly, we ask the Commission and the Council to implement forthwith and aid programme for the victims of the Lebanon war and to support in this respect the efforts of all, I repeat all, the humanitarian organizations involved.

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

Mr Penders. — (NL) Mr President, after lengthy deliberations both yesterday and the day before, a joint text has been produced on behalf of a number of groups. This was the best we could manage. However, I should like to point out that I am uneasy about this text. The resolution is — and I must choose my words carefully here — rather well-disposed towards Israel. Fortunately, paragraph 3 does in fact condemn the action, but I particularly find that our text could have been somewhat more outspoken and unequivocal in support of the excellent statement by the ten Foreign Ministers of the European Community, since what is the role of the European Parliament? It must apply itself to the Middle East problem with imagination — in other words, it must keep two basic principles constantly in mind, i.e. the right to existence of all the States in the region, including Israel, and the right of self-determination of the people of Palestine and I have grave doubts as to whether the way Israel is behaving at the moment is likely to do anything to help these principles be put into practice.

Don't get me wrong — I can perfectly understand Israel doing something about the build-up of Palesti-

nian and PLO artillery on its northern borders and the shooting. We all knew something like this would happen. However, I cannot sympathize with the current reaction, which goes much too far. Purges involving orgies of merciless killing are taking place among the civilian population of South Lebanon. People talk about restoring an independent, sovereign Lebanon and I sincerely hope this will in fact be done. The Lebanese people have a right to an independent and sovereign State, but this must not be an Israeli vassal State, nor must it be a State in which — and I think I am entitled to say this as a Christian Democrat — the Christian section of the Lebanese population lays down the law.

Anyone who thinks that the PLO is out of it now is making a mistake. It will obviously come back. After all, where can it go? It cannot stay in Jordan and it cannot go anywhere. I shudder to think of the massive Arab reaction which is impending. I shudder to think how this is all grist to the mill of fanatics such as Khomeini and of the enormous resurgence in Moslem fundamentalism which will result from these acts. The European Parliament cannot take on any responsibility for developments of this kind and for this reason I support this resolution.

President. — I call the European Democratic Group.

Mr Fergusson. — Mr President, this debate has all gone to show that there is no matter in the whole world on which people are so divided as they are about the Middle East. No matter whether you take the Parliament as a whole, my own or any other group, any faction within any group or indeed any number of individuals, the entire House is split down the middle about the rights and wrongs of this matter. It is reflected in all our attempts to find agreement on a text, it will be reflected in the vote: it will be reflected in almost everything we do every time this matter arises. Because here is a dispute where the claims of the two sides seem irreconcilable, a problem as insoluble as that of squaring the circle, as impossible as that two people can be in the same place at once or one person in two places at once. Mathematically, the problem is expressed in the proposition that you cannot have a square root of a minus quantity. Once we talk of blame, of the origins of this struggle, of its rights and wrongs, we are hopelessly divided. There are clearly those in this House, taking either part, who are quite happy to cast the first stone at the other side.

So what can we usefully do? We can consider where we are now; we can see where we are trying to get to and try to make plans to help. So where is the common ground at this moment about this particular new departure in the Middle East? We are all, I think, without exception shocked and appalled by the scale and the horror of the latest events, irrespective of whom we condemn — if condemnation helps. All of us, I think, believe that we must do all we can, because

Fergusson

we have the money to give aid and shelter to those who have been dispossessed and oppressed in this way. We all, I think, believe in the withdrawal of all forces from the Lebanon, however that should eventually be achieved. We are all, I think, agreed that the hapless, hopeless Lebanon, caught up in the war against its will, the base for PLO operations against Israel, must have its integrity restored. The Lebanon needs it; so does Israel; so, surely does Syria; and so do all the people living in that area, whether visiting or resident, whether military or paramilitary or otherwise — the refugees most of all. Lastly, we all, I think, believe that negotiation is the only way to solve this kind of dispute.

This is the recurring theme of Europe the recurring theme of this Parliament. What we fear is that the consequences of this latest explosion will be not good but bad. We can only pray, therefore that they may lead to 30 years of peace and not to 30 more years of acrimony and feuding.

As to the amended resolution before us, I believe it will help it does not express the full fears or the full hopes of everybody or anybody, but it is a brave attempt to reconcile all our opposing views and, with luck, to bring some kind of settlement, some kind of peace at this moment to the Middle East.

(Applause)

President. — I call the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Kyrkos. — *(GR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we sympathize with the people of Israel. During the Nazi occupation we protected the Jews in my country. We want them to be safe where they are, to have secure borders and to live in peace with their neighbours. But we cannot condone Israel's attempt to prevent the Palestinians by military means from exercising their own right to have their own homeland and their own State. And we are horrified that the governments and political forces within the EEC are covering up with platonic statements the brutality of the recent invasion of the Lebanon, the plans to partition it and to destroy the Palestinian resistance, and close their eyes to the crime against humanity which is the mass murder of the Palestinians. Ten thousand people have already been murdered, and this figure is a conservative estimate. How many have yet to be killed, Mr Israël, before we in this House show any sensitivity?

I appeal to you, ladies and gentlemen, of whatever political persuasion, let us not confine ourselves to polite and hypocritical words, but let us express our anger at the trampling underfoot of international legality by taking actions and decisions which actually hurt the Israeli Government. Fifteen Members of this House have, in a small way, already taken such action by sending an urgent invitation to Mr Arafat to come

to the European Parliament to give us the latest information, and I would propose that the House should approve this move. I agree with the measures proposed by Mr Fanti, and I should like to conclude by stating that I know how many of these measures you will adopt, ladies and gentlemen. But before you decide in this House, listen to the voices of the women and children who are being butchered and who are turning to us beneath the tracks of the Israeli tanks. What European ideals are you talking to us about, Mr Tindemans? Who fails to comprehend that what is being murdered in the camps of the Lebanon is humanity, independence, the promise of self-determination, their credibility, our credibility and the relations of the European Community with the Arab Nation and with the Third World.

Ladies and gentlemen, we know from history that, whatever happens, no matter how many victims there are and no matter how much blood is spilled, the Palestinian resistance will triumph, and it would be an act of wisdom on the part of the European Parliament for the Europe of the Ten to intervene with measures to ensure an immediate and just solution based on the condemnation of the invasion and on the recognition of the rights of the Palestinian people.

(Applause)

President. — I call the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Nordmann. — *(FR)* Mr President, the resurgence of violence in the Lebanon should give rise to a three-fold attitude of emotion, clear-thinking and maybe hope as well.

The emotion is quite obviously caused by the unbearable spectacle of war and the whole trail of destruction it drags behind it, an emotion which is all the stronger for the marked imbalance between the aims and the means employed.

However, a clear-thinking attitude demands that we not be ruled by instinctive, emotive reaction. It means that we must take today's crisis for what it really is: the culmination of a long drawn-out deterioration. The Israelis did not go into a Lebanon of milk and honey, they went into a Lebanon which was already bloodied and bullied by occupants, by the harassment and impositions of both Syrians and Palestinian terrorists. The Israelis went into Lebanese territory not with claims to ownership or aims of annexation but in order to defend themselves, and after having exhausted to no avail all the other means of parrying the relentless attacks they were subject to. They went in to defend themselves, but also to defend us. Let us not forget that it is from Lebanese training camps that the neo-nazis have arrived in order to bolster the efforts of the Palestinian terrorists who for years now have been launching the most ferocious attacks on the multi-party democracies.

Nordmann

Let us remember the bombings of the synagogues in the rue Copernic and rue Marbeuf. We hear talk of victims. But Israeli soldiers have been dying for their country too. They are also dying in order to defend the security and freedom of Europe, and the elected representatives of Europe should ponder this fact.

Hope today is for peace and for the Lebanese themselves. This hope is not unfounded. Quite clearly, the Camp David agreement has up to now stood the test of time and is more than ever a precedent and an example of the only acceptable and fruitful way of proceeding, one which is based on mutual recognition of one's right to exist. As a corollary to, and over and above, its defence objectives, the Israeli military operation will be justified if it manages to bring peace back to the Lebanon by giving the Lebanon back to the Lebanese, by resuscitating a Lebanon in which the various communities live in peaceful coexistence, a Lebanon without Syrians, without Palestinians and without Israelis.

I should like to conclude, Mr President, by merely reminding those who are now talking of Israeli aggression that on 6 June 1944 there were people in Europe talking about Anglo-American aggression.

President. — I call the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members.

Mrs Castellina. — *(IT)* Mr President, I am filled with indignation and I must state it loudly and clearly because what I have just heard in this House and what is contained in some of these resolutions can quite frankly only inspire indignation. The Palestinian people is being referred to as the aggressor, without anybody recognizing its right to aspire to becoming a legitimate State.

The Group of the European People's Party is concerned about generalized violence, and does not describe it any more closely. It does not however express in its motion for a resolution, not even once, concern about the Israeli aggression which nonetheless, heaven knows, tramples some sacred principles underfoot! Although in one supplementary amendment there is at last a reference to the fact that this is an Israeli aggression, in the first resolution there is no mention of it at all.

Naturally enough, they want to see the Lebanon rid of all the occupying forces. Well, let us see that happen! Let it be rid of the Israeli forces and of the Syrian forces! But where do you intend to put the Palestinians? Where do you think the Palestinians captured by Israel can be put? Is it really possible that this question has not occurred to you, that it is not uppermost in your minds? Of what importance is the fact that the Italian Christian Democrats demonstrated yesterday in

Rome together with the PLO, when they still do not have the courage to recognize that the Palestinians ought to be able to live somewhere or another. These matters are quite serious enough for one to get 'hot under the collar', if you do not mind me saying so.

I should like to add a remark for my Socialist comrades: it is impossible that you too should not have the courage to recognize that, if negotiations should take place, this can only occur between broad groups. If negotiations could take place today, the PLO, as the legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, ought to participate in them. If there are no negotiations — you know this as well as I do — then there will be war and with the circumstances now prevailing in the Lebanon, there will inevitably be a surge of terrorism. For all these reasons, Mr President, I will vote in favour of the motion for a resolution tabled by the Communist and Allies Group.

(Applause from the Communist and Allies Group)

President. — I call the Non-attached Members.

Mr De Goede. — *(NL)* Mr President, the terrible events in the Lebanon call for severe criticism and condemnation of this most recent act of unadulterated aggression, from everyone who hitherto felt and continues to feel sympathy for Israel. Criticism from friends should not be lacking at this time — quite the contrary.

Undoubtedly, the State of Israel has a right to recognized and safe borders and it is quite right that Israel should not entirely trust the Arab world. Too many brutal incidents involving the PLO — for example, the attack on the Israeli Ambassador in London — and too many expressions of hate and intolerance give Israel the impression that it is under a constant threat. However, this does not give Israel the right to react in such a disproportionate manner. It would certainly appear that Israel is now out to deal a death blow, not only to the militant wing of the PLO but to Palestinian society as a whole, including the thousands of poor wretches who have already been living under abominable conditions in refugee camps for years now.

It would also appear that Israel regrets having adopted that part of the Camp David agreement which states that, in addition to the need for safe and recognized borders for the State of Israel, a solution must also be found for the people of Palestine. It is an impenetrable tragedy of history that the people of Israel, who have been through so much suffering themselves should now itself be causing another people brutal and horrible suffering and riding roughshod over international agreements and codes of conduct. Israel is currently busy alienating itself from its friends, the United States, countries of the European Communities, and this is a tragic development for all concerned. It has

De Goede

become apparent once more what a powder keg the Middle East is. An outbreak of violence in that area involves major risks for world peace, as we can see from the reaction of the Soviets. We endorse the statement of 10 June by the ten Foreign Ministers of the Community in which they condemned the Israeli action in the strongest possible terms. The motion for a resolution by Mr Glinne comes the nearest as we see it, to a possible solution and we intend to support this resolution.

President. — I call Mr Papantoniou.

Mr Papantoniou. — (GR) Mr President, I do not believe that in any honest conscience there remains any doubt that the tragic events of the Lebanon were prepared a long time ago. Apart from the advance warnings issued by the Palestinians that the government of Mr Begin was preparing for a new war in the Middle East, the very fact that thousands of extremely well-equipped soldiers with plenty of supplies moved into northern Lebanon within a few days and reached Beirut is enough to convince anyone that what was being carried out was a well prepared plan, adopted at the highest military level, with the aim of wiping out the PLO and slaughtering the Palestinians as a whole. The mass killing of civilians and children decided on by Mr Begin is reminiscent of the methods used by Hitler against the Jews, and we Greeks find this particularly sad and revolting since during the War the Greek people made heroic efforts to save Jewish lives.

If this Parliament wishes to retain its prestige and not be an accessory to the mass murder of the Palestinians, it must unequivocally condemn the Israeli invasion, call for the immediate withdrawal of Israeli troops and firmly state that there can be no solution to the problem of the Lebanon without the creation of a Palestinian State.

We Greek Socialists of PASOK will oppose any motion for a resolution which blurs or deviates from these simple principles, and we would state that we shall abstain from the vote on the Socialist motion unless the amendments tabled by Mrs Dury and her co-signatories are adopted.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mrs Gaiotti De Biase.

Mrs Gaiotti De Biase. — (IT) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, even in the tragic series of events that the Lebanon has experienced in these last few weeks and is still experiencing, the first duty of this House, as of all Parliaments, is to stifle its anguish long enough to lend political support to the stance adopted by the Council by upholding the declaration of the Ten, which is a declaration consistent with previous

declarations and with Europe's role as partner, a timely and unanimous declaration.

We Italian Christian Democrats are therefore very sorry that the rejection of the possibility of a joint resolution, backed up by a large majority of this House, has led in both motions now before us, to a watering down of this clear-cut and formal support. The present Lebanese tragedy once more dispels the horrible illusion, fostered by all sides and which for decades at regular intervals has made the world's heart miss a beat, and that illusion is that you can either solve the Palestinian problem or ensure Israel's security by the use of armed force.

Many times over the past years we have stated, without leaving any room for doubt, that terrorism could not solve the Palestinian problem. This is why we were right, in spite of its limitations and shortcomings, to welcome the foundations of a path to agreement laid in Camp David.

Now, in the presence of this terrible escalation of the military situation, we must continue to state vociferously that the Palestinian problem cannot be solved through a genocide. There is only one way of avoiding the frightening chain of events from terrorism to massacre and back again to terrorism and that is to recognize that the Palestinian problem exists, that it is a political fact and a human dilemma which must be taken for what it is, and that nothing can be gained by falsely convincing oneself that it can be eliminated. It is clear that today political know-how and moral conscience concur. Anyone taking false refuge in violence may find themselves tomorrow paying the same supreme cost which is today being paid by both the perpetrators and the innocent, that is the Palestinians and the Lebanese.

Europe's role as peacemaker, with a more determined decisive shape than it has had up to now, depends on two prerequisites. Firstly, a single strategy, not just by governments but by all the political groups in this House. And secondly, a determination not to tolerate, even implicitly, any political or economic support for any nation which continues to believe in the logic of armed might.

The UN crisis is the continually worsening and widening one of the political philosophy of negotiation, a philosophy which is being replaced by the old doctrine which for centuries criss-crossed human history with wars and violence, the doctrine of armed retaliation.

Europe ought by its behaviour to bring a halt to this crisis, by showing at all times its confidence in the logic of peace and reason, the two indissociable elements of which are the Palestinians' right to self-determination and Israel's right to security.

(Applause from the Centre)

President. — I call Mr Taylor.

Mr J. M. Taylor. — Mr President, the official view of my group has been expressed by Mr Fergusson. I have approximately one minute to speak for myself and therefore may I say this. If time permitted or if thoughts were cool enough today, we might profitably reflect on a definition of Palestine and draw the conclusion, no doubt, that four fifths of it lie to the east of the Jordan. Meanwhile, the State of Israel is not only internationally legitimate and impeccably so but it also represents a formidable human success story, a formidable human achievement. And this is despite the fact that throughout the 34 years of its existence, it has been always resented, several times invaded, and almost continuously harassed. For one such harassment, this latest reprisal is certainly grim. It is my hope, Mr President, in this limited time, to give some support to the hope that maybe from this grim crisis a stabilized Lebanon might emerge. A country of its own, not one insinuated by other people's political terrorism.

I conclude by saying, Mr President, that the text with which I feel most sympathy and which I find most to commend is the Cottrell/Forth amendment.

President. — I call Mr Adamou.

Mr Adamou. — (GR) Mr President, the unprovoked invasion by Israeli forces of an independent country such as the Lebanon and the crimes of mass murder committed against Lebanese civilians and Palestinian refugees, which are reminiscent of similar action by Hitler's Nazi hordes, provoke justified anger and dismay throughout the world.

It is only in this House that most people have engaged in a suspicious waiting game. This attitude reveals an attempt to cover up for those who are really guilty and morally responsible for the attack and the crimes, namely those who govern in Washington, without whose inspiration, support and cover Begin's fascists would not have dared to perpetrate these crimes.

If we now wish to align ourselves with the sentiments of international public opinion, we must take measures immediately and the Member States of the EEC must immediately break off economic, trade, political and other relations with Israel until the Israeli forces withdraw totally and unconditionally from Lebanese territory. We must protest against and condemn the military, political and economic aid which the USA openly provides to Israel and which constitutes decisive support for Israel's expansionist and adventurist policy, which is a danger to peace.

Some people in this House call for the withdrawal of the Palestinians from the Lebanon. But where are they to go, since they have been deprived of the right to

have a homeland? They call for the departure of the Syrian forces which are in the country by decision of all the Arab States, but they do not call for the withdrawal of Israel, in accordance with the resolutions of the United Nations Organization, from all the occupied Arab territories, where they have been committing atrocities for years.

Those are the views of the Greek Communist Party.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Beyer de Ryke.

Mr Beyer de Ryke. — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, allow me to oversimplify no doubt and make four different remarks on this Lebanese tragedy. Firstly, let me define the present situation.

The three nails in the Lebanese coffin are: Syria, which wishes to wipe the Lebanon off the map, the PLO which has moved in to establish its bases there and Israel which is attempting by armed might to settle things in its favour.

My second remark is that the Israeli action, unlike what some speakers have said, is not retaliation. This action is part of a policy showing a deliberate refusal to accept a status quo which Menahem Begin considers to be more intolerable than Shimon Peres felt it to be.

My third remark is that this may yet, I hope, be a blessing in disguise. The tragedy is that people have to die. Many have died and countless more may die, and I cannot prevent myself, and I must openly say this now, from feeling that the Israeli army, Tsahal, has perhaps been easier on itself than it has on others. I take as my witness my colleague Jean-Jacques Leblond writing in the *Figaro*, an excellent journalist and witness of great integrity who states: 'There is no doubt at all that the Israeli air force has been shooting as if it were at war, dropping fragmentation bombs and firing rockets.'

Another aspect of this tragedy is that the booming of Israeli guns may well become the trump of doom sounding for the spirit of Camp David. Will Egypt not be placed in an untenable position?

Now, let me tell you how this tragedy might be a blessing in disguise since it holds the seeds of a rebirth of the Lebanon, provided that the Christian troops are backed up by significant support from the Lebanese Muslims, provided that the re-established State has the means to pursue its policies and to ensure its security and is not just propped up by Israel. It is here that Europe can and must aid in finding a solution via a United Nations peace-keeping force in the Lebanon which would no longer pursue a policy of passive de-

Beyer de Ryke

fence, which we now know was more passive than defensive.

My final remark is that the PLO obstacle has been lifted, but only fleetingly. History knows no final solution and the Jewish people has had imprinted in its flesh, soul and spirit the huge, cruel lessons of history.

Israel — and I say this forcefully, with conviction and determination — Israel must live. It must live, but without forgetting that the Palestinians — this leftover people — will unceasingly continue their search for a homeland until they find one. Israeli actions will not snuff out the fire flickering in the bosom of the Middle East, a fire which never ceases to threaten us with bursting into flame.

In conclusion, on behalf of the Mashreq delegation of which I am proud to be President, I should like to ask you to dispatch a multi-party delegation to the very spot where these events are now taking place. I always lend greater credence to eye witness accounts than to second-hand reporting. Seeing for ourselves and then telling the public about what we have seen, this is and must remain our task at all times. Please allow us, Mr President, to fulfil this role.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Romualdi.

Mr Romualdi. — *(IT)* Mr President, in our motion for a resolution tabled as Israel was beginning its offensive against the Palestinian forces in the Lebanon, and which to some extent justified our having written it, we asked immediately for the European Community, the Council, the Commission and Parliament to prevail upon or enjoin the Israeli Government to suspend any war-like action and withdraw its occupation forces. We asked for the independence and integrity of the Lebanon to be re-established, without any double-dealing, that is without any decisive influence of the PLO — which is not, Mr Fanti, the only representative of the Palestinian people, this is quite untrue — which has for a long time been established in the southern regions of the Lebanon and been carrying out operations from there, and without any further influence from the Syrians, who are called a dissuasion force but are in reality an occupation force established in the other regions of the Lebanon.

What has happened and is now happening, and cannot but be condemned by everyone and arouse a widespread feeling of pity for the hundreds and thousands of civil and military victims, should not however make us forget the political reasons for this situation, the dramatic and unsolved political problems with which we have all failed to deal and which are at the source of all acts of armed might, those that Israel is committing by attempting in this unacceptable manner to eli-

minate the threats to its independence and those of terrorist violence, responsibility for which the PLO cannot deny. These are acts which cannot lead either to guaranteeing the State of Israel, unfortunately still grudgingly accepted by the Arab world, nor to guaranteeing the birth of a Palestinian State which we all desire but which no one is making any great effort to achieve. This is true also because up to now nobody knows where it ought exactly to have its source, what size and limits it ought to have.

The responsibility for these events, ladies and gentlemen, lies with us, they are evidence of our inability to get to grips with the real problems and therefore of our shortcomings.

President. — I call Mr Fich.

Mr Fich. — *(DA)* On behalf of the Socialist Group, I should like to urge the Chairman of the Israel delegation, Mrs Tove Nielsen, to take steps to suspend work in the Israel delegation immediately and until such time as the Israeli troops have withdrawn from the Lebanon. This would also involve calling off the preparations for the work of the delegation. As we see it, our assembly cannot have dealings with a parliament the majority of which is in favour of waging war on the territory of another country and occupying that country. In our view, one of the few concrete steps we can take here in this Parliament is to suspend delegation cooperation with the Knesset. I hope the Chairman of the Israel delegation will tell us as soon as possible to what extent she is prepared to take an initiative of this kind, and we obviously hope she will give us a positive answer.

President. — I call Mrs Tove Nielsen on a point of order.

Mrs Tove Nielsen. — *(DA)* In a democracy, it is not up to the Chairman alone to decide on behalf of a delegation. I wish to respect the principles of democracy and, for this reason, the delegation will meet and it will then be up to the delegation to make certain decisions. If it was only the Chairman who made decisions, this would not be a democracy but a dictatorship and our work in the European Parliament is based, as I am sure Mr Fich will understand, on democratic principles.

President. — I call the Commission.

Mr Pisani, Member of the Commission. — *(FR)* In this dangerous situation, the political stance of the Community was clearly stated by the Council of Ministers of the Ten, meeting in Bonn on 9 June.

Pisani

I should like to reiterate the main features of the communiqué which the Ten published after their meeting and state some of the measures which, strictly within the letter of these guidelines, we have seen fit to enact.

Firstly the communiqué:

The Member States of the Community strongly condemn the new Israeli invasion of Lebanon and the bombing attacks. They consider it to be a flagrant violation of international law and feel that there is an imminent danger of a more widespread conflict. They reiterate their attachment to the independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and national unity of the Lebanon and refer to Security Council Resolutions 508 and 509. They call upon Israel to withdraw all its forces immediately and unconditionally. Should Israel continue in its course, the Ten will consider the possibilities for future action. The Ten emphasize the need for an overall, just and lasting peace on the basis of a negotiated solution which they are prepared to help achieve. The Ten will give urgent consideration to the provision of aid for the victims.

A number of decisions have been taken in strict accordance with this line of policy. Initial emergency aid amounting to 200 000 ECU and supplementary aid of 500 000 ECU have already been decided. Further supplementary aid may be planned as needs are pinpointed and means of transport brought into action. In addition, the Community, at the Commission's proposal, is intending to send 10 000 tonnes of cereals in the form of exceptional food aid. Furthermore, the Commission has discussed authorizing the European Investment Bank to lend 50 million ECU to the Lebanese State. Lastly, in order to take account of the final recommendations in the Council of Ministers' communiqué, the Commission and the Council have decided to postpone the signing of the second Financial Protocol with Israel, scheduled for 14 June.

(Applause)

President. — The joint debate is closed.

I call Mr Cottrell on a point of order.

Mr Cottrell. — I refer to what has been flatteringly described by my group as a compromise amendment tabled by myself and Mr Eric Forth. I would draw the attention of the presidency to the fact that this amendment was tabled 24 hours in advance of the similarly-described compromise amendment put forward by Mr Barbi, Mr Fergusson and others. It is my impression, Mr President, that my amendment should be called and voted on first.

President. — I am sorry that I have to disagree with you, Mr Cottrell, even if you are right in saying that

your amendment was tabled 24 hours before the compromise one. The problem is that your amendment does not touch on the original EPP resolution tabled by Mr Penders and Mr Croux. So, if I had to respect the order in which amendments had been tabled, I should still have to put, first, the Penders-Croux resolution, then your amendment and then the Barbi amendment to the vote. But that would make completely superfluous the Barbi amendment, which also covers the Penders-Croux resolution. For that reason, I think the only way to deal with the matter is to put the Barbi compromise amendment first to the vote. If that is not adopted, we shall then have to take the Penders-Croux resolution. If that is not adopted, we shall come to the Cottrell amendment.

I have another problem, and that is that the compromise text proposed by Mr Barbi says that it covers six motions for resolutions, but in reality it does not. It does not deal in substance with the resolution proposed by Mr Glinne and Mrs Charzat on the embassies in the Lebanon. There is no reference at all to that resolution. Therefore I think that even if the Barbi amendment is adopted, we shall still have to vote on the Glinne-Charzat resolution. I think that is the only way to deal with this problem, and that is the decision of the chair. I cannot have any discussion on it now.

I call Mr Fantì.

Mr Fantì. — *(IT)* Mr President, you rightly defined the amendments tabled by Mr Barbi and others as compromise amendments. But a compromise can be reached only by those who agree. I was not even consulted, nor have I accepted the compromise, and so my motion for a resolution cannot be included in this sort of compromise. I think it should be voted on separately.

President. — Mr Fantì, it is not a compromise amendment but an amendment which replaces the others tabled on the same subject. The Barbi amendment replaces — it says so if you read it — all the motions which deal with the Israel and Lebanon conflict. This means that if the Barbi text is adopted the motions for resolutions by Mr Penders, Mr Cottrell and others will fall.

Vote!

After the adoption of Amendment No 1, by Mr Barbi and others

Mr J. M. Taylor. — Mr President, there was a written request for a split vote on No 3!

¹ See Annex.

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

Mr Israël. — (*FR*) I should like to point out that you acknowledged yourself there had been an oversight. Several of us had asked to speak, before you announced that the vote was open, to ask for a vote on each paragraph. I do not want you to go back over the same ground but just let me say that, personally, I would have abstained on paragraph 3.

President. — I call Mr Forth.

Mr Forth. — I am now confused, Mr President, because I thought I heard you say that you had received a written request for a split vote on paragraph 3. Can you explain to me why, therefore, we have gone right past that and you have not respect that request? Mr Taylor tried to support it verbally. Now you have to explain to the House how it is that a written request submitted in advance can be ignored.

President. — Mr Forth, it is very simple. We have voted on the text as a whole. Even if I had received that written request it would have been included among the other papers because of the discussion that arose on the order of priority of the different amendments. An error has occurred. I admit that. The fact is that we have voted on the whole of the Barbi amendment. I put it to the vote and the vote was opened. We cannot go back on what has already taken place.

I call Mrs Veil.

Mrs Veil. — (*FR*) Mr President, in view of the fact that you had a written request I think that we could still have had a split vote, even if the vote was already open.

President. — I that case another procedure would have to be followed and the amendment which has just been adopted would have to be changed. That is impossible. Members may make a written statement in the Minutes concerning their views on this split vote.

I call Mr Johnson.

Mr Johnson. — I should just like to confirm. Mr President, that I was the author of the written request to you for a split vote on paragraph 3, and there were I think several people trying to catch your eye at the time you proceeded to the vote asking for a vote by division Mr d'Ormesson was one of them and I do feel that, given that I put in this written request first thing this morning, there was a chance for it to have been drawn to your attention before the actual vote occurred. In that case, Mr President, I hope you will proceed to take a vote on it.

President. — I call Mr Radoux.

Mr Radoux. — (*FR*) Mr President, there is not a Member here who does not consider you an excellent President. Consequently, I think you should put this to the vote again and take the view, when there has been a written request, that if a mistake has been made it should be admitted and another vote taken.

(*Applause*)

President. — Mr Radoux, the Rules of Procedure may sometimes be interpreted but it is the President's job to comply with them. That is the problem. The only thing that can be done now is to submit written statements.

I call Mr Marshall.

Mr Marshall. — Mr President, did you not say that we could vote on whether there should be a split vote? Quite frankly, this House cannot expect to be taken seriously if a request for a split vote is ignored.

President. — The discussion is closed and you can make a written statement.

(*After the adoption of the title of Doc. 1-358/82*)

President. — I call Mr Prag.

Mr Prag. — I want to protest, Mr President, at the way in which we are voting on documents which we do not have. The whole thing has become a farce and we really cannot go on like this.

President. — Mr Prag, the document is available and the amendments are available and have been distributed.

I call Mr Forth.

Mr Forth. — Mr President, I am trying now to be as helpful to you as I can. I find that under Rule 81, there is provision for points of order concerning the validity of a vote to be raised after the President has declared it closed and that that same Rule 81 (5) says that the President shall decide whether the result announced is valid — his decision shall be final. Now that rule is there to make provision for the sort of thing that we have just been through. I would like to ask you if you could still now bear that rule in mind and make your own judgment as to whether it would help the House, under that rule, to avoid what has just happened. I can only remind you of this. Mr President. I am doing this. I hope, to help you and the House but that rule, I believe, even now gives you the opportunity to look

Forth

again at what has happened and perhaps to give us some means of retrieving it.

President. — Thank you, Mr Forth, but I have already given a ruling.

4. *Situation in the iron and steel industry*

President. — The next item is the joint debate on two motions for resolutions:

- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-347/82), tabled by Mr Calvez and others on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, on the situation in the European iron and steel industry;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-353/82), tabled by Mr de la Malène on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, on countervailing duties on European steel products.

I call Mr Calvez.

Mr Calvez. — (*FR*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, a few days ago a French newspaper bore the headlines: 'The Community cannot continue to provide capital grants to a European steel industry which will lay off 200 000 persons by 1985'.

We Members of Parliament cannot remain indifferent to such information.

We have followed the discussion on steel between the United States and the European Community which was broken off on 10 June, and we have taken note of the American Department of Commerce decision to tax certain steel imports from Europe, Brazil, South Africa, at rates varying between 1% and 40% of the selling price. This measure will reduce European steel outlets in the United States and will lead to a drop in Community exports.

On the eve of the meeting of the Council of Foreign Affairs Ministers on Monday and Tuesday next in Luxembourg, I should like to know the Commission's opinion on the United States' decision and on the measures it plans, since the Community practices which we are reproached with are neither in contradiction with the GATT rules nor, above all, with the consensus agreed by the OECD.

Once again in this Chamber we are hovering over on ailing European steel industry. We have followed the development of the crisis anxiously in recent years and also the efforts made by the Commission to implement an anti-crisis plan.

Unfortunately, we have noticed one thing: the situation has not improved; we observe an overcapacity in steelworks of between 25% and 30% of the production capacity of crude and finished steels, which is quite substantial. According to the experts this reduction in capacity will lead to the unemployment of 200 000 workers.

Today each Member State is doing all in its power to implement the various stages of a 'steel' plan, whether it be production capacity, the modernization of installations and their financing, which is very expensive, or social measures arising from the closure of installations which could not be made profitable.

By deciding to introduce a modernization plan for the French steel industry which will cost more than 26 thousand million francs between 1982 and 1986, France is trying to restore a strong and competitive steel industry in four years.

Is the Commission aware of the French plan? Does it fit in with the Community's 'steel' plan?

Would it not be better for the Member States of the Community to decide together on the measures to be taken to restructure the European steel industry, uniting their efforts to restore a sector which is in crisis in all countries, without exception, while at the same time of course protecting existing jobs?

Can the Commission sum up the situation and tell us how Parliament would be associated in drawing up a joint modernization plan for the European steel industry?

Let us beware, because Parliament will be judged on its ability to settle a particularly delicate problem.

IN THE CHAIR: MR KLEPSCH

Vice-President

President. — I call Mr Deleau to deputize for Mr de la Malène.

Mr Deleau. — (*FR*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the decision taken on 11 June by the US Department Commerce to levy countervailing charges on many steel imports from Europe justifies the gravest concern today.

First of all because of its direct consequences. Under the guise of a conservation measure, it threatens in fact to prohibit the American market henceforth to practically half of European steel sales.

Deleau

The profound and disquieting significance of this decision taken despite the GATT rules by the United States, as both judge and party concerned, reflects a deliberate protectionist stance directed against the European Community.

Indeed, while the steels of two non-European countries are included amongst those affected by the Department of Commerce decision, it is obvious that the measures taken weigh heavily on Community producers.

The fact is however, European producers are not responsible for the weakness of the American market nor for the specific difficulties of the US steel industry. On the contrary, their market share has dropped over previous years, while in the past their sales have often helped to ensure the normal supply of American user industries.

One is shocked to observe that the target for attack is almost exclusively Europe, the best client of the United States and, what is more, a liquid client which overall purchases more from its American partner than it sells to it.

Of course it is obviously not in the interest of the United States and the steel industry to create the conditions for a trade conflict, even a political conflict. It is therefore indispensable that the Community authorities point out with the necessary firmness to the American Government the dangers involved in pursuing their present course and that only an equitable agreement respecting the traditional trade patterns of the European steel industry will make it possible to avoid these dangers.

At the same time the Community must protest strongly to the GATT and study forthwith the measures required to safeguard the legitimate interests of Europe should the negotiations for an agreement again encounter demands which are unacceptable to the Community.

That is, Mr President, in brief, our motion for a resolution which faithfully reflects the concern of Europeans.

President. — I call the Socialist Group.

Mr Peters. — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the Socialist Group I wish to make the following remarks.

First: a few weeks ago the European Parliament accepted a motion for a resolution in which the United States were warned against adopting such measures and were called upon to find fair solutions to the problems.

Second: the United States disregarded this warning. Last Friday they decided on unilateral protectionist measures — the imposition of supplementary duties and taxes on imports — in accordance with the American steel producers, aim of cutting back the flow of imports, or even stopping them all together.

Third: this aim — to stop all imports — has not been achieved. What, however, has been achieved? At Versailles the Heads of State promised to uphold international solidarity. This solidarity, however, has been made a mockery of by the American Government's decision. It has been shattered, it has been blatantly contradicted and puts the Atlantic Alliance under strain.

Fourth: we in the European Community cannot accept this, because these decisions constitute a breach of the GATT rules. The aid for restructuring that has been granted in the European Community does not constitute a form of export subsidy, whereas the system of duties decided upon by the Americans is quite unjustified and cannot be accepted.

Fifth: all the institutions of the European Community must resolutely reject these decisions and must express their serious concern that a trade war could result, with chain reactions on both sides; the Commission and the Council of Ministers are called upon to declare quite unequivocally to the Americans that if they do not rescind these measures the European Community will have to adopt retaliatory measures. I should like to say clearly and unambiguously, apropos of this, that the Socialist Group does not want to see a trade war break out, but it is also quite unacceptable that these measures should remain in force.

Sixth: At the EC negotiations, talks must not be based on any form of self-limiting measures regarding EC steel exports to the United States.

Seventh: the Socialist Group will vote in favour of both motions for a resolution.

(Applause)

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

Mr Franz. — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the European People's Party shares the view of the Liberal and Democratic Group and the European Progressive Democrats that a trade war between the USA and the EC must at all costs be avoided.

On the other hand, attempts should be made during the discussions with the American Department of Trade, in the interest of both parties, to get the decision to introduce countervailing duties on specific steel imports rescinded. Protectionistic measures, no matter

Franz

where they originate, cannot solve the present problems. Protectionistic measures may lead to a shrinkage of world trade, which would result in an increase in the already unusually high number of unemployed in both America and the EC. Even if the Commission is successful and succeeds in getting the American Department of Trade to go back on its decision, this will naturally still not make any difference to the causes of the American decision. The impending countervailing duty is a reminder to all of us of the problems we have created for ourselves in the Community as a result of the enormous subsidies which we have granted in recent years to the European steel industry.

In the European People's Party's motion for a resolution, which was accepted by this Parliament on 14 October last year, we once again clearly pointed out that the problems of the European steel industry could not be solved by paying maintenance subsidies. We said that there was a need to find ways of reducing the continuing excess capacity in the European steel industry. It is in the interest of the workers of Europe themselves that antiquated, uneconomic plant should not be kept operational for ever. The workers need new, promising jobs in the appropriate areas, which must be created with the appropriate support. It is, however, unreasonable that unemployment should be allowed to grow further in those very steel-producing regions where there is already very high unemployment. Happily, things have begun to move in recent months. At our instigation serious discussions are taking place about the possibilities of international cooperation in this area.

This on its own, however, is not enough. We therefore support the demand made by the Liberal and Democratic Group that the Commission should inform Parliament about the measures it intends to carry out in order to see that the competitiveness of the European iron and steel industries is restored. Of course, I do not believe that it is possible to retain all the existing jobs in the steel sector if steel production in Europe is to remain competitive.

Paragraph 4 should therefore probably be completed by the addition of some formula such as 'and to create new jobs in regions threatened by closures'.

It will not be possible in the long run to continue to sell steel produced in subsidized European steelworks on the world market. There is therefore no time to lose.

In the long run, neither in the USA nor in Europe can these problems be solved through protectionism or subsidies. We must carry out the necessary modernization, we must continue with research and development so that in the future the European steel industry will be competitive in the world market without subsidies and without provoking retaliatory measures.

(Applause)

President. — I call the European Democratic Group.

Miss Forster. — Mr President, my group will also support these two motions and I welcome the comments already made by the other speakers.

Although the US decision last week on countervailing charges has stimulated this debate, it is really the last step in a series of negotiations. The US is operating at less than 50% of capacity, while already 200 000 jobs have been lost in Europe and probably another 200 000 will go before restructuring is complete. This is against a background of worldwide overcapacity and decreasing demand for steel in construction and cars because of the recession. It is therefore naive to expect that there will not be a commercial war for markets.

Nevertheless, I do not think we should let the present situation deteriorate into a trade war. We do not want increasing protectionism nor do we want relations between the USA and ourselves to be spoiled by this dispute. It is therefore essential that the Foreign Ministers discuss this matter next week on Monday and Tuesday and decide what the Community should do about it.

Britain, France, and Italy will be badly damaged by these countervailing charges not only because of the uncertainty of their future export markets but also because of the cost of the bonds that will have to be put forward to cover current exports. In addition, there is the anti-dumping case which will come up for decision in August, and this may damage the German steel producers. All the Member States therefore are involved, and it is absolutely vital that we act together in the same way as we are already doing under Article 58. I would like to make three recommendations. First and foremost, we must contest by all legal means the decisions that have been made by the Americans. 40% against the British, 20-30% against the French and 18% against the Italians — these figures are far too high and we must question their validity.

Secondly, we must go to GATT, if necessary, and not allow the Americans to decide unilaterally which kinds of subsidy are legitimate and which are not. In the UK our subsidies have gone to restructuring and to a reduction of capacity down to 14 million tonnes. In Germany the subsidies are for freight and power but they also help the steel industry, and yet the Americans have not declared these invalid. On their side, the Americans have the DISCs and, if necessary, we must contest these.

Finally, Mr President, we must put our own house in order. We must eliminate steel subsidies by 1985, because the only real way to win a trade war is to be competitive and money must not be wasted on preserving obsolete plants but invested in the future growth industries.

President. — I call the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Pintat. — (*FR*) Mr President, no long speeches are required to express our support for the motion for a resolution tabled by the Group of European Democrats.

I am even tempted, to tell the truth, to consider its terms too moderate. Indeed we cannot disregard the gravity of the situation resulting from the American decision of last Friday. The United States cannot seriously maintain that the European steel industry is causing any damage to its national steel industry, which is far more prosperous than ours.

European producers' share in American steel imports has been dropping since 1978. The price of European products on the American market, protected moreover by the evocatively named 'trigger price' system, have always been higher than those applied within the ECSC. For my part I do not hesitate to support Mr Davignon's opinion and regard this as a bad commercial, political and legal decision.

Let me add that this decision is the more unjustifiable in that it in fact anticipates the evaluation of the size and existence of the damage invoked by the American steel industry. Furthermore, we cannot accept the risk of similar measures being taken at another time in other sectors, and here I am thinking for example of our agricultural exports, which are also under severe attack from the American administration.

President. — I call the Commission.

Mr Thorn, President of the Commission. — (*FR*) Thank you, Mr President, I have had an opportunity to express an opinion on this subject on several occasions, the last time only the day before yesterday; for that reason I do not need to speak at length and enter into too much detail.

Allow me to point out a few important facts in the context of this discussion. It was on 10 June 1982 that the Department of Commerce of the United States Government arrived at the conclusion, and I wish to emphasize 'provisional conclusion' that in 19 cases steel exports from European companies were benefiting from export subsidies. This conclusion implies that the American Department of Commerce will continue its investigation with a view to arriving at a final decision on the 19 cases in question within 75 days, in other words by 24 August 1982. At the same time the International Trade Commission of the United States must decide, within 120 days, thus before 8 October at the latest, on the extent of the damage to the internal American market from our imports.

This decision implies that as from 10 June, the imports in question will be subject to a tax equal to the level of

the subsidies enjoyed, according to the Department of Commerce, by the exports concerned, and which in their opinion amounts to up to 40%.

Pending the final decision on the 19 cases, steel importers are henceforth obliged to lodge the equivalent of the charges to be paid. These deposits may be refunded, totally or in part, if the provisional decision of the Department of Commerce is not confirmed in full. This shows you the extent of the damage.

These new measures, involving the application of different taxation rates to the exports of various companies, affect the various parts of the European steel industry in a very grave and unequal manner.

The Commission fully shares the concern of Parliament in the face of the unilateral measures just taken by the American authorities against Community steel exports.

As regards our position, the position which the Commission intends to adopt in the face of this new situation, it will contest, both legally and economically, all the arbitrary elements contained in the American analysis. We cannot imagine that imports which represent only about 5% of American consumption can cause serious damage to the American industry, the difficulties of which arise, as we have said on several occasions, mainly from inadequate progress on productivity and modernization. Furthermore, one can wonder about the role played by the development of exchange rates. Ladies, gentlemen, I should like to juxtapose the American assessment of the content of aid incorporated in European sales with the changes in the exchange rates. In less than two years the dollar has been revalued in relation to European currencies, by 30, 40, even 50%. It appears to me that this development provides an explanation for many of the alleged advances in the competitiveness of Community exports.

As you have requested, the Commission will not accept any abusive or unilateral interpretation of the GATT rules. Furthermore it will prove that there are no subsidies designed to help European steel imports to penetrate any market. The national and Community measures benefiting the European steel industry are designed solely to aid restructuring and support is only granted to projects which conform to the aid code by means of which the Community has imposed a strict and consistent discipline upon itself which fact deserves to be appreciated far more by the United States. The aid code demonstrates the European Community's wish to ensure greater transparency of the policy pursued in this sphere and to contribute to the maintenance of healthy conditions in international trade.

It emphasizes that this effort has involved considerable sacrifices on its part, as you know, ladies and gentlemen; in less than six years the Community has reduced

Thorn

the labour force employed in the steel industry by about one third, from about 800 000 jobs in 1975 to 547 000 jobs in 1981. During the same period the Commission introduced joint measures designed to significantly reduce capacity and improve the competitiveness of the whole European steel industry by concentrating production on the most efficient plant and on products offering the best prospect of market equilibrium.

According to the terms of the aid code, these measures are only temporary: their objective is to restore a competitive European steel industry which can offer lasting employment to its workers. These structural improvements inside the steel industry are accompanied by programmes designed to offer alternative employment in other sectors: this in reply to some questions asked here. This is why our Commission attaches at least equal importance to the financing, through Community loan instruments, of conversion projects in the steel basins. In reply to Mr Franz let me say that we agree that subsidies should not become permanent. The aid code plans for the abolition of these subsidies; those which are granted, I repeat, are for investment and restructuring purposes. To Mr Calvez, who asked about the French restructuring plan, let me say that this plan has not yet been communicated in due form to the Community. Once it has been officially submitted, it will be studied of course on its merits and the Commission will take a position on it.

Now, Mr President, I would like to re-situate the American decisions in the framework of our Versailles discussions. The clear conclusions of this Summit were that all of us, all the participants, wanted to preserve an open system of world trade, safe from any protectionism. The western world, as Parliament here appears to wish, must avoid a trade war which would weaken all the parties concerned. Our economic difficulties are such that neither the United States, nor even Japan, nor the Community, have anything to gain from commercial confrontation. My very definite view today is that these measures adopted by the Americans conform badly with the spirit but also with the letter of the Versailles conclusions.

What attitude should the Community adopt?

At the moment, we must first of all avoid falling into the trap of unconsidered and hasty measures. The Americans must bear the full responsibility for their unilateral decisions which have the effect of gravely disturbing the traditional trade patterns between Europe and the United States.

For our part, Mr President, we will be neither weak nor accommodating. We will examine the American analysis closely calling on all the necessary technical expertise. With the Member States — which I am sure will all act in concert — we will work out a common strategy which should convey the solidarity which is more necessary than ever in the Community today.

We will defend our case before all the American courts and also at political level as Mr de la Malène advocates.

In view of the gravity of the situation we will also, as certain speakers requested, defend our steel policy before international bodies — in this case GATT — adopting the appropriate procedures. We will do everything including direct negotiation with the United States, to ensure that the Community measures are understood.

Ladies and gentlemen, the views which I have just expressed are the result of a very early assessment of the situation. On Tuesday next, 22 June, the Council of Ministers will hold a policy debate. In this context the Commission considers that the adoption of the two resolutions proposed in Parliament and which are being debated today, would be a valuable support for all the Community action, at least in this initial phase.

President. — The joint debate is closed.

Vote¹

5. European passport

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-362/82), tabled by Mr Habsburg and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group), on the European passport.

I call Mr Habsburg.

Mr Habsburg. — (*DE*) Mr President, I am delighted to be able to tell you that last night I received from the relevant Council officials a letter stating that the problems prompting urgent procedure had been cleared up. Before I now withdraw our motion for a resolution, there is one thing I want to say. We saw yesterday how most people in this Parliament are very aware of the human side of European problems. Against the Bureau's will we managed to get this motion for a resolution put on the agenda. I should like to hope that the higher echelons of the Council will regard this as a shot across their bows. We shall see to it that these measures of relevance for our citizens are taken further.

President. — The motion for a resolution has been withdrawn.

I call Mr Irmer on a point of order.

¹ See Annex.

Mr Irmer. — (*DE*) Mr President, after the vote on the de la Malène resolution you stated that the House had voted unanimously in favour of it. I abstained. For very well known reasons my vote was disregarded by the Chair.

President. — We shall check on it.

I call Mr Patterson.

Mr Patterson. — Mr President, my point of order is this. In the slightly calmer atmosphere of the previous vote and in the course of the discussion of procedural points which followed the vote on the Lebanon, your predecessor in that chair, the President of Parliament, declared that written declarations could be made. Now as Rule 48(4) specifically excludes explanations of vote after debates on matters of urgency under Rule 48. I just want to ask the chair to clarify what kind of declarations can be made on that vote. Is this a special procedure which we are being given? If so, perhaps you could, either now or later, outline to the House what procedure we go through in order to make these declarations, which of course are separate from explanations of vote under Rule 80.

President. — The President has already stated that he will accept written statements on the voting procedure.

6. Internal market

President. — The next item is the joint debate on two motions for resolutions:

- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-345/82), tabled by Mr Moreau and others on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, on the progress made during the Belgian presidency as regards the functioning of the Community's internal market;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-350/82) by Mr Travaglini and others on a Community industrial strategy.

I call Mr Moreau.

Mr Moreau. — (*FR*) Mr President, the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs wanted to discuss this motion for a resolution before the end of the Belgian Presidency.

Twenty-five years after the signing of the Treaty of Rome, the concept of a common market is certainly not new; however, this market is not yet a reality, at least not totally. The customs barriers have been abolished, but other barriers have been and continue to be

raised; these are the technical, administrative barriers, the national standards, the tax barriers, which are obstacles to the free circulation of goods and persons and to the existence of a real internal market.

The delegation of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs which is investigating these problems and is at present trying to bring home to national members of Parliament and the ministries concerned the importance of this subject, has returned from its first two visits to Brussels and Paris convinced of the justification for its representations in the general interest of the Community.

This is the reason why we have presented this motion for a resolution in accordance with Article 48 of the Rules of Procedure. Our intention is to support in particular the intention of the Presidency-in-Office to hold a meeting of the ministers involved in the functioning of the internal market before the end of its term.

Indeed it is vital that the 21 directives of which the Council has completed its technical consideration and which concern the internal market, in particular a Community method of testing products, should be adopted. This would remove the principal non-tariff barriers to trade and improve the position of the Community in trade negotiations.

We also hope that the Council will concentrate especially on a series of fiscal problems in particular the collection of VAT in the ordinary accounts of companies and not at the frontiers. This procedure would substantially reduce the cost of transporting goods. There is also a need to increase the duty-free allowances and to simplify the temporary import formalities for craft and artistic material in the frontier regions.

One could quote also amongst the required measures, the gradual opening of public markets in micro-electronics and progress in the area of travellers' private documents, including the European passport.

In our opinion decisions on these matters could contribute greatly to restoring the competitiveness of our economy and reducing unemployment. The Belgian President-in-Office, whom we spoke with, was prepared to make progress on these issues. Thus a Council of Community Ministers should be held soon to examine these issues urgently.

President. — I call Mr Travaglini.

Mr Travaglini. — (*IT*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Community is way behind where industrial policy is concerned, particularly structurally speaking.

The need to organize a more efficient system of production to face the challenges of other important manu-

Travaglini

facturing centres outside Europe has been recognized in all responsible places; anxiety is expressed over traditional sectors; recurrent energy crises are feared; while unemployment is increasing dramatically, the Member States continue to organize their production systems in total independence of each other without making use of national complementary measures, and protectionist tendencies are coming to the fore again and are threatening the very foundations of the Common Market edifice.

Some sectors of the Community continue to view the Common Market as an end in itself and the purpose for which the Community institutions exist, rather than as an instrument of economic expansion.

But the Community must evolve from being a community of trade to being one of production. The Community must organize and implement joint or at least harmonized action programmes in order to build a manufacturing base which is as homogeneous as possible.

Not only must the internal market be made as open as possible, but a framework must be built within which the system's potential can grow, providing practical incentives for research and innovation, so that we can avoid the piecemeal organization of labour on the one hand and taxation in the market on the other. In some high-technology sectors, competitiveness can only be restored and assured for the future if production is reorganized at the European level.

Community preferential tariffs and a reasoned supervision of investments outside Europe must not be seen as elements of European protectionism, but rather as constituent parts which can be used to weld a European identity, just as there is a given identity in the United States or Japan.

What we need therefore are practical measures to promote agreements between European firms, to develop European technologies, to lay down European standards — particularly where new products are concerned — and encouragement to large public organizations to give preference to European firms.

With regard to Community resources earmarked for industry, I could hardly fail to repeat the points made by this Parliament and the urgent tone of entreaty in which they have been expressed. Quite simply, the appropriations are derisory a mere drop in the ocean.

With this motion for a resolution, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we are asking the Commission and Council to be much more incisive and decisive and to take direct steps to promote the organic development of the Community production system.

Unless we embark on a new course for industrial cooperation, for the restoration of competitiveness and a solution to the problems of unemployment and

technological modernization for the entire Community production system, we are never going to make any progress along the path of economic integration. We might even find ourselves forced back into absurd protectionism and hence commercial and economic rivalry between our various countries.

President. — I call the Socialist Group.

Mr Rogalla. — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, a wise Belgian statesman remarked some years ago that there were many pocket States in the European Community, but that a distinction must be made between those that were aware of the fact and these that were not. He knew what he was talking about. In this respect, I too have no illusions.

The conflict over the Falkland Islands certainly has not done anything to improve awareness in Europe of our own particularism. All the more reason, therefore, for us in this House to struggle, time and again and sometimes with impatience, for control of the common internal market, the heart of the Community, which is the subject of so many earnest entreaties. In so doing, we are also fulfilling one of our principal duties, namely, keeping a watchful eye on the Council of Ministers.

In the Treaties, particularly in the EEC Treaty, this is all clearly laid out. The Treaties state that over a transitional period of 12 years a genuine common market must gradually be achieved. As we are all well aware, the 12 years in question have long since elapsed. If the Council continues to fudge the issue, then we shall not have a common internal market worthy of that name if we wait 112 — one hundred and twelve — years.

Today, we as a Parliament are making use of a procedure covering relations between the Community institutions, which also allows for making a formal complaint of inactivity to the European Court of Justice. We are making use of our rights to burrow away patiently here in order to eliminate prejudices and attempts to keep issues in isolation. We are using the plenary session of the European Parliament to call upon the Council — which I do not see represented here today — to be much more diligent in the exercise of its legislative function and to do much more to make the needs of our citizens and our economy the focal point of its work.

It is really ironical that in spite of the massive unemployment problems we face, we are still not capable of dispatching legislation which will help the cause of simplification and which will promote trade and commerce. We talk about full employment and the problems of getting back to it, but we are simply not capable of the mere stroke of a pen with which millions of units of account could be saved and simplifications could be achieved and with which, naturally, jobs could also be created.

Rogalla

Instead of a common internal market and freedom of movement for everybody, wherever small print is involved we come up against red tape and an exaggerated obsession with checking things. This constitutes a real challenge for every member of the European Parliament. Our Parliament has a duty to fight against narrow-mindedness, reputed interests, even against simple prejudices and dislike. I also call upon the Commission, which happily has a deeply committed departmental head for the domestic market, in the person of Mr Narjes, to cooperate in the attempt to get the Council to use in respect of the 21 directives relating to this matter the option of simple majority decisions which it has already made successful use of once before this month, in order to promote simplification, openness and the free movement of goods and to combat unnecessary checks and particularism, in the interest of all Member States.

The Socialist Group will vote in favour of both requests for urgent procedure.

(Applause)

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

Mr von Wogau. — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in drafting this proposal, the authors, of whom I was one, proceeded on the assumption that before the Belgian presidency came to an end one meeting of the Council could be devoted specially to questions connected with the internal market. Since then we have learned that this will not be possible. Our initial reaction of enthusiasm has naturally given way to disappointment, because in our view it is absolutely indispensable that certain matters, which have already been discussed at the technical level and on which all that needs to be done is to take a political decision, should be dealt with and dispatched before the end of the Belgian presidency.

These are partly matters which have been pending at the Council for years. Let me mention, as an example, the directive that could lead to an opening of the telecommunications market. That is an important sector, capable of creating new jobs, but instead jobs are being lost. If we lose our competitiveness there we shall lose jobs here in Europe, and we are of the opinion that something must be done in this sector, something must be decided.

I shall also mention the directive on imports from non-Member States. The fact that we have no common position on this matter is the reason why other directives — a total of 21 are mentioned here — which could help to open up the domestic market are being held up. Here too, in the end, a decision will have to be taken.

Let me mention a third point: the raising of duty-free allowances for travellers within the Community. This is also a matter which has been discussed for two and a half years. The information we have available suggests that objections to this have been withdrawn. It will be quite incomprehensible to us if no decision is taken on this by the Council before the 30 June. I think this is something that we must say quite plainly.

The ancient Romans had a proverb: *senatores boni viri, senatus autem mala bestia*. With reference to the Council I should like to say: *membra consilii boni viri, consilium autem mala bestia*.

(Applause)

Many members of this body deserve our respect, some of them may even be deserving of our admiration. But when they come together as the Council of Ministers they are a hindrance to almost everything which could make a success of Europe, and turn it into a finer and better place.

(Applause)

President. — I call the European Democratic Group.

Sir David Nicolson. — Mr President, last part session the vital subject of industrial strategy was squeezed out of the agenda by a debate on plastic bullets, and this time very nearly by one on Israel and the Lebanon. In neither of these cases will the views of this Parliament be paid any attention to by the powers concerned, while industrial strategy, which this Parliament would influence, always seems to be given second priority. This is a very grave reflection on the practical conduct of this Parliament.

How could we cope with the steel crisis without a European strategy? Next we shall see the same problems arising in chemicals, with a new Saudi industry pouring exports into the Community. We are in trouble in aluminium too. In many other areas, our share in the world market is falling. We have record unemployment, and the Council of Ministers, despite promises over the past two years, has totally failed to mobilize the energies of the Community to stimulate industry.

This is not time for ideological bickering about intervention or workers participation, it is a time to do something to find ways to make use of our real assets — skills and high technology in new fields, and not in declining industries: a time to launch more joint ventures like the airbus and a time to improve our infrastructure and create employment.

I cannot comment effectively in two minutes on Community industrial strategy, as I am sure you will appreciate, but I will say that this is of vital and urgent

Nicolson

concern, and on behalf of my group I support the resolution.

(Applause)

President. — I call the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Leonardi. — *(IT)* Mr President, we approve of both motions for a resolution because we feel that the internal market can never be developed except through an appropriate industrial policy. Such a policy is today the only — or at least the most important — instrument which will enable our Community to achieve active integration.

We are asking the Commission, however, to make a decisive move from proposals for an industry policy based on the so-called traditional industries or from general proposals to much more precise and specific suggestions on an industrial policy for sectors of the future such as electronics, telecommunications, etc.

It should be obvious that in these sectors scientific research and the industries themselves can only be properly developed at Community level. Only in this way will such industries be able to compete with other industrialized nations, among which we may count not only the United States and Japan but also others which are emerging as newly industrialized States.

I should like to remind those present that it is not sufficient for Parliament to demand these things. When the proposals are formulated we must all think very carefully and with responsibility about the sacrifices which we are all going to have to make in order to arrive at mutual advantages, bearing in mind that the advantages will outweigh the sacrifices. When the time comes, we will have to support the Commission in its efforts to create such a policy, all the while knowing that a price for it will have to be paid by the various Member States, but that the price to be paid will be greatly compensated for by the future advantages.

President. — I call Mr de Ferranti.

Mr de Ferranti. — Mr President, I am sorry that the Council representatives are not present, because my remarks are addressed directly to them. The certification and testing procedures described in the resolution are used by Member States to protest minority producer interests and thereby distort trade and cheat consumers even more than the tariffs used to do. The Council now has before it a reasonable proposal for a Community procedure which would resolve the problem. If it cannot agree to it, then this means that the economic community towards which we have all of us in this House strived so hard becomes a dead letter. I would be misleading my constituents if, in the event of a non-decision by the Council. I then continued to

attend this Parliament and continued to lend credibility to a movement in which the Council itself no longer believes, and its absence today confirms my view.

President. — I call Mr Fernandez.

Mr Fernandez. — *(FR)* Mr President, I should like to voice the opposition of the French Communist and Allies Group to this resolution.

If the stated objective, i.e. growth without inflation and employment is true, we cannot see how such a problem can begin to be solved simply by increasing trade in the Community market and improving the functioning of this market.

First of all there is the important problem of restoring the balance of trade. France's trade deficit *vis-à-vis* the Federal Republic in particular, aggravates inflation and the difficulties of the French economy.

Secondly, there is the problem of reconquering the internal market; the French Government, and recently Mr Mitterrand, outlined the problems as regards our country. This reconquest must be based on the fight against austerity and a national industrial policy of developing the production potential. The Community should play a complementary and positive role by means of incentives, aid or coordination. However there will be no Community market if we do not take care to protect the means of production in our respective countries.

Finally, it appears to us unrealistic and dangerous to ask the Council to adopt 21 industrial directives at a single meeting. These problems are too serious not to allow the Member States the physical possibility of assessing the proposals put to them.

President. — I call the Commission.

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — *(DE)* Mr President, the Commission first of all welcomes the motion for a resolution by Mr Moreau and the members of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, and confirms the statement that Mr von Wogau has just made. As we heard, there will unfortunately not be a special meeting of the Council of Ministers this month to discuss internal market problems.

The Commission too regrets that the Council of Ministers finds it impossible to meet this month to discuss only the problems of the internal market. But at this point I should like to reiterate how urgently we hope that the Council of Ministers will deal with internal market affairs immediately and intensively.

It is precisely in the present crisis that the European economy, undergoing a difficult restructuring process

Narjes

and faced with more urgent demands for innovation, needs the possibilities which only an internal market the size of a continent can offer, to enable the economy of each Member State to make full use of its inherent strength. If the Community fails to make clear progress in this situation, it will retrogress putting its present achievements at risk, and this would be the result of unbridled protectionism.

The Community's possessions are not yet crisis-proof or so secure that they would survive our failure to consolidate the internal market and resist the onslaught of protectionism. Our problem is partly that, although the Heads of State and Government are prepared to issue impressive resolutions supporting the Commission in its alarm at the state of the internal market, this is never adequately reflected in concrete decisions by the Council of Ministers. In other words, the discrepancy between word and deed at the decision-making level in the Community has become intolerable!

Twenty-five years after the Treaties of Rome were signed, even public opinion is justifiably grieved that traditional customs formalities still exist at the Community's internal borders. We should at least reduce them to the level already successfully applied between the Benelux States. But for this we will have to persuade the customs, tax and statistics experts, and goodness knows who else, to consider their technical problems, indisputably important though they may be in relative terms, against the broader aspects of the need to revive the internal market. It is only by making real progress in this direction that we can regain public support for the construction of Europe and reduce costs for the consumer and the economy.

The Commission's efforts to achieve fundamental political progress in this field in carrying out the Mandate of 30 May 1980, which mentions these points in Chapter 1, have so far proved in vain. It has now given up hope and will therefore submit the necessary technical advances as soon as possible for a decision by the Council of Ministers (which is its job), regardless of what the fate of the Mandate of 30 May may be.

A second fundamental problem mentioned in the resolution, for which a solution is long overdue, concerns technical tests on products from third countries. This is not merely a matter of the 21 proposals mentioned, which are still with the Committee of Permanent Representatives. The Council's working parties are dealing with a whole series of further proposals for directives, and it is no exaggeration to say that almost all the work on removing technical trade barriers has been brought to a standstill by this one unresolved question.

As early as last October I had the opportunity of describing the Commission's position on this matter to the House. I would repeat, as it is such an important question, that we are being guided by four basic notions.

Firstly, the Community must be able to establish its own identity even with non-tariff trade barriers, otherwise it would be self-contradictory. Secondly, technical protection measures with third countries must include the possibility of negotiations in the interests of a reciprocal approach.

Thirdly, a customs and economic union must involve different treatment for goods from within the Community and goods from third countries. This principle, which was clearly expressed in the most recent pronouncement by the Court of Justice, will reinspire confidence in Community producers that European integration should primarily benefit employers and workers in the Community.

Fourthly, the application of these instruments comes under the provisions of Article 110 of the EEC Treaty. The Community must give priority to a liberal external economic policy in the interests of the European economy. With this in mind the Commission has drawn up a compromise which seems to offer a real chance of unity, provided that there is rapprochement between the Member States and that they show confidence in the Community and its institutions. What is now required is a decision of political principle — we think this too is possible.

Because of the short time available, I am unable to deal with a whole series of other points. I should just like to mention that there is a little movement going on in one of the more sensitive areas: the increase in duty-free allowances at the border to 210 EUA, which is to come into force from 1. 1. 1983, with the exception of Denmark which has a 12 month delay, seems now to be ready to be submitted to the Council of Ministers for a decision next week.

The second motion to be given consideration concerns industrial policy problems. The speeches which have been made and the wording of the motion indicate that we are dealing with more major problems of principle which need further debate. They are couched in the various interpretations given to the word 'real' in the industrial policy. What is a 'real' industrial policy? Different views on this are obviously held in this House and between some Members of the House and the Commission. What are the simple aims and essence of the industrial policy? — an alien concept to the Treaties of Rome. This is not the time and place to be holding a debate on these principles. I should simply like to spell out the problem very clearly and remind you that the economic consensus of the Treaties of Rome was reached on the basis of the Community establishing essential basic and general principles.

These are: firstly, a European internal market, secondly, a common liberal external economic policy to suit the European requirements of a processing area poor in raw materials, and thirdly, genuine and effective competition in proficiency. In addition to these basic principles which are to be established under the

Narjes

Treaties of Rome, and which the institutions are to put into practice, there is a series of further general principles to which the Community is committed in subsequent years — I would mention for example, environment protection and measures under the research policy, which I cannot go into here. As well as these, there are special commitments on action to be taken, such as under Euratom, the agricultural and regional policies and so on.

For the rest, however, the Treaties of Rome go no further than giving the Community a coordinating role in the fields of short and longer-term economic policy and monetary policy, and our experience over the last 25 years has shown how arduous it is to make real progress in these areas and to broaden the area of responsibility for them. The Member States differ very broadly in their opinions on the economic order and also on the aims and instruments which a short-term economic policy should have. We cannot afford not to admit this. That is why, against this background, there can be no question now of the Community having general intervention powers, quite apart from the fact that the budget could not provide for them.

I think I should add, on the subject of concrete proposals, that many industrial problems, particularly unemployment, the consequences of stagnation and inflation and weak investment, are felt to varying degrees in the individual Member States, and that it would be asking too much of the Community to expect it to put right any wrong turns taken in national economic policies. And the Community would certainly not be well advised to try to repeat unsound national concepts at Community level. If a short-term economic policy is based on shaky foundations, neither subsidies nor interventionism can help — the treatment must begin at national level, in the long and short-term economic and monetary fields.

Having described all this, I need not go into the individual measures which come under our responsibility and are to a great extent known to the House. I should merely like to point out that the Commission intends to submit in the near future a long-term research and development programme which is now being prepared or is to be prepared together with the economic bodies concerned and the unions. As far as all other measures are concerned, we have long since submitted our plans and possibilities to the Council of Ministers for a decision. The ball is now plainly in the Council's court, and we would be delighted if it would make up its mind to decide more boldly, quickly and with a greater readiness to compromise both in this field, which has been specifically assigned to us, and in the internal market.

President. — The joint debate is closed.

Vote!

¹ See Annex.

7. European Monetary System

President. — The next item is the joint debate on two motions for resolutions:

- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-352/82/rev.), tabled by Mr de la Malène on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, on the conclusions to be drawn from the current operation of the European Monetary System;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-355/82) by Mr Diana and others on variations in the parities of the currencies of the Member States.

I call Mr Bocklet on a point of order.

Mr Bocklet. — (DE) The two motions are about something which is topical but hardly urgent. In my view the problem is no complex that it needs to be gone into thoroughly. I therefore move, under Rule 85, that the two motions be referred to the relevant committee.

President. — I call Mr Deleau.

Mr Deleau. — (FR) Mr President, I am going to speak in favour of urgent debate on these motions for resolutions. I do not share the opinion that was voiced a moment ago by another Member. I think it is urgent for this Parliament to raise this matter, which is of extreme importance following the readjustment of the parities which was decided a few days ago, especially where agriculture is concerned. I therefore request that the debate on these two motions be held.

President. — I call Mr Gautier.

Mr Gautier. — (DE) We second Mr Bocklet's request. I really do feel that the subject is far too complicated to be dealt with in a couple of minutes. In connection with the fixing of prices we had a thorough debate on how we wanted to handle the parities. As a result, I do not feel that this short motion is suitable when it comes to reopening this matter and getting Parliament to find a consistent position. We are therefore in favour of having this matter properly discussed in committee.

President. — I call Mr von der Vring.

Mr von der Vring. — (DE) There is a difference between referral to committee without a vote but with debate and referral by way of ending a debate. I would not consider that the latter is any longer admissible

von der Vring

after the decision on urgent topics, but I do consider the former to be logical and correct.

President. — In accordance with Rule 85 of the Rules of Procedure referral back to committee may be requested at any time. That has been the procedure until now. Until the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions informs us otherwise, I am obliged to act in accordance with the President's decision of 10 May.

(Parliament agreed to Mr Bocklet's request)

8. *Emergency aid programme for the Caritas of the dioceses of El Salvador*

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-331/82), tabled by Mr Langes and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group), on an emergency aid programme for the Caritas of the dioceses of El Salvador.

I call Mr Langes.

Mr Langes. — (DE) Mr President, following on from yesterday's debate on hunger in the world, what we have here is a straightforward resolution on charity aid. We have simply to decide whether we want to supply the Catholic Church's aid organizations in one of the world's trouble spots with special aid in the form of rice, butteroil, red beans and maize. I am sure that every Member, no matter what his political beliefs, realizes how essential it is for this aid to reach the Catholic Church in El Salvador so that refugees and those who are starving can be helped. I really do ask you to give your unanimous support to this motion.

President. — I call the Commission.

Mr Pisani, Member of the Commission. — (FR) Mr President, the honourable Member's comments meet with no criticism on our part — indeed, quite the contrary. I wanted to say that the Community began helping the people of El Salvador as long as three years ago, and it tries to help by adapting its aid to the real needs of the people. As far as possible they are provided with products from that part of the world, because the eating habits of the people there are different from ours.

There has been some query about whether the oats and rolled oats sent to these people matched their requirements. The fact is that we have not noted any criticism and I can even say that it was the non-governmental organizations in charge of distribution which requested these products.

As for the last point raised by Mr Langes, let me tell him that most if not all of the aid in question passes via the Caritas organizations and sometimes via *Médecins du Monde* and via *Cebemo*, and that so far we have encountered no problems in implementing this aid.

Such is the case that we are waiting until the present aid runs out completely or is about to run out before we think about any additional aid. The fact is that the situation of the people in this region is alarming.

President. — I call Mr Langes.

Mr Langes. — (DE) Mr Pisani, my information comes from the head of Caritas in El Salvador and from the Papal Nuncio, Archbishop Kada. I therefore beg you not to say that we should go on waiting; rather it is vitally important that this extra aid be given.

(Applause)

President. — The debate is closed.

Vote¹

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

Mr von der Vring. — (DE) Mr President, I should like some information regarding the interpretation of Rule 85(3). A motion for referral back to committee was tabled. I said that a closure of the joint debate was not automatically connected. I wanted to table another motion. You can close the debate at any time but this is a separate procedure and you said yesterday during the vote that there was no way I could say anything else on this point.

If it is found in connection with an urgent debate that there is no point in discussing the subject, I think it makes sense to refer the matter to committee. But I do not think it makes sense if this occurs without a debate, after the subject has in fact been placed on the agenda. This is contrary to the Rules of Procedure and I would ask you to observe the distinction between the first and second parts of Rule 85(3).

President. — The Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions will be asked for a clear ruling.

I call Mr Enright.

Mr Enright. — It is all very well to refer things to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions of

¹ See Annex.

Enright

which I happen to be a member and we have had that said by Presidents this morning on several occasions but in fact the very first ruling this morning was to overturn a previous decision of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions. So we really must make our minds up whether we are in earnest when we refer something to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions, or whether it is just an excuse, and once the committee has made its ruling, then this House must accept it and not throw it aside in the cavalier fashion that it did earlier this morning.

President. — Mr Enright, the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions will consider the matter at its next meeting on 24 and 25 June.

The President asked this morning for statements on the proceedings to be submitted in writing. They will then appear in the Minutes of Proceedings. We are aware of the fact that a misunderstanding occurred in one of the languages, in the English translation in fact.

I call Mr Patterson.

Mr Patterson. — Mr President, you have just made a statement, and that is what I understood the first time, on written explanations on procedure. Could you tell me whether that includes saying which way you would have voted had there been a separate vote? Because I think that is what most people want to do. If it is only a procedural point we can make, then I think that is different. But if we can give an explanation on the substance, namely, the way in which we would have voted on the issue, that is a different matter. Could you be absolutely clear which you mean?

President. — I would ask you to submit your statement, if you wish to submit one, and to include in it all the factors you wish to have included. It will then have to be decided whether they correspond with this morning's explanations or not.

9. Situation in Nicaragua

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-332/82), tabled by Mr Brok and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group), on the situation in Nicaragua.

I call Mr Brok.

Mr Brok. — (DE) Mr President, I should very much like Parliament's support for this urgent motion since it deals with direct humanitarian aid for the people of Nicaragua and also about the very real threats to the Misquito tribe of Indians. Parliament followed a num-

ber of criteria in adopting its resolutions on El Salvador and Turkey at the beginning of the year. This motion for a resolution is similar to the other two as regards criteria, contents and wording. What was expressed on that occasion must be repeated again now if we want to retain our credibility in the eyes of the world.

The immediate threat to people's lives should be a matter of such urgency that we do not defer this motion again — it has already been on the agenda once — but instead we should take a decision for the sake of the people involved, especially the Indian tribes in this country.

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

Mr Enright. — Mr President, I would like to quote the well-used Rule 85 again and suggest that this be referred back to committee. I waited until Mr Brok had spoken on it to see if there was any urgent reason why we should not consider the matter in depth. I think he is absolutely right; it needs to be considered in depth and therefore I think that it is far better done by the appropriate committee, and I so move.

President. — I call Mr Langes.

Mr Langes. — (DE) Mr President, the resolution is supposed to serve as a signal. The European Parliament is considering these matters and how they are being viewed in Nicaragua and these events and how they appear, along the lines of our motion for an urgent debate. Anyway, we have just referred a difficult and sweeping problem back to committee.

President. — I call Mr von der Vring.

Mr von der Vring. — (DE) Mr President, we are greatly concerned about the matter raised by Mr Brok. Certain anti-democratic and repressive trends in Nicaragua are having a deep effect on us, but we have found out that the information is very contradictory and that only unconfirmed newspaper reports are available, so that there are reservations which should be taken seriously and this matter should be dealt with thoroughly in committee so that we can then vote on it.

(Parliament rejected Mr Enright's request)

President. — I call the Commission.

Mr Pisani, Member of the Commission. — (FR) The information which the Commission has on the situation in Nicaragua does not entirely tally with the pic-

Pisani

ture given by Mr Brok. If there was a problem, it was raised during the talks we had in Brussels with a Nicaraguan official who was visiting us. He told us that his government was ready to allow a committee on human rights into the country to verify the precise situation.

In the circumstances, the Commission will not suspend aid to Nicaragua, especially as this aid is for specific needs and we have been assured that it will actually reach the population.

Lastly, as part of the programme submitted to Parliament in the supplementary and amending budget for 1982 there is a development aid programme for Nicaragua. When this programme is put into effect, we shall have closer contacts with the country in question and we shall thus be in a position to view the situation better. I would point out to the House that the situation is difficult and that Nicaragua, after all it has been through, needs our support.

President. — The debate is closed.

Vote¹

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

Mr Hord. — May I suggest that for the voting the bell is rung some time before the actual vote is taken? In the last two votes the bell was rung immediately before you called the vote, which gave no time for Members to get into the Chamber.

President. — The reason, Mr Hord, is that the votes follow each other so closely.

I call Mr von der Vring.

Mr von der Vring. — (DE) Mr President, there is a mistake in yesterday's Minutes. On page 49 of the German version it correctly says that subparagraph (e) was adopted but nothing was done as a result of this, by which I mean the deletion of subparagraph (g).

President. — The Minutes will be corrected.

(The sitting was suspended at 1 p.m. and resumed at 3 p.m.)

¹ See Annex.

IN THE CHAIR: MR ESTGEN

Vice-President

President. — I call Mr Collins.

Mr Collins, *chairman of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection.* — Mr President, speaking in my capacity as chairman, I wish to refer to item 108 on this afternoon's agenda, the report by Mr Remilly on the action programme in the field of shore-based maritime navigation aid systems.

Under Rule 85 I would like to put it to you that in the light of the very large numbers of amendments which have been put down to this report by members of the Committee on Transport, it is fairly clear to me and it must be clear I think to the House that there were aspects of this matter that were not covered completely in the report which is being presented to the House. I think that in all fairness it would be a good thing if the committee were allowed to reconsider it and take into account the amendments which have been tabled.

President. — I call Mr Forth.

Mr Forth. — I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection a question, if I may, namely if he could tell me whether or not the Committee on Transport were asked for an opinion on this matter and, if so, have they given an opinion and, if not, why not? To come at this late stage to the Chamber with what sounds like a very valid case is disturbing in that it suggests complete lack of communication between committees.

President. — I call Mr Collins.

Mr Collins. — First of all, the Committee on Transport did not offer an opinion and, as far as I can see, it was not given the opportunity to offer an opinion. But whether that was because it was not referred to it or whether it was because we chose not to I am, at the moment, a little bit unclear. But the point is that we did not have the benefit of the Committee on Transport's knowledge until the amendments were put down. I take Mr Forth's point, but I think in a way this is a general criticism of the system of referral to committees and the way in which they communicate generally, and I think it is a criticism that I would share.

President. — I call Mr Enright.

Mr Enright. — In view of the disturbing implications for the relationships between committees, should this not now go to the already overburdened Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions so that they can examine the whole philosophy behind it and see if they can make a ruling for this House which it can then subsequently ignore?

(Laughter)

President. — Mr Enright, the matter has already been referred to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions. We now have yet another example.

Mr Collins, are you moving referral to committee?

Mr Collins. — It is always very useful to have the judgment of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions, but I would not like to think that the report itself would be held up. I am sure that Mr Enright in his wisdom would not wish that either because he is always very keen to have things roll along quickly. So, yes, I am requesting that it be handed back to committee but I have no objection at all that the general principle is looked at yet again by the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions.

(Parliament agreed to Mr Collins' request)

10. Science and technology for development *(continuation)*

President. — The next item is the continuation of the debate on the Rabbethge report (Doc. 1-202/82).

I call the Committee on Energy and Research.

Mr Schmid, draftsman of an opinion. — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Committee on Energy and Research, on whose behalf I am speaking, rejects the programme in its proposed form. If it remains as the Commission has proposed we cannot agree to it, and we would go so far as to say that in its present state it would be wasting taxpayers' money on the one hand and making unreasonable demands on the developing countries on the other. We shall be watching very carefully — and let this be a clear warning to the Commission for the budget debates — to see whether the programme has been changed. The Commission cannot rely, as was often the case in the past, on Parliament finally giving in in an excess of European fervour. You may find yourself, Mr Commissioner, in a situation where you have the Council decision, but lack the Parliament majority to approve funds from the budget. I want to make this quite clear as from today.

The Committee on Development has — as we are very grateful to see, Mrs Rabbethge — taken up many of our criticisms. Not all, and I should like to add on my own behalf that I would have preferred to see more, but nevertheless a very great deal. The difference between the two committees, I must say in all honesty to the House, is really only in the tactical approach to be used. The Committee on Development says that if the Commission is prepared to make a few changes it will agree. The Committee on Energy and Research, having some misgivings, has demanded that the Commission should submit a completely new text for us to consider. We both have the same aim, as far as I can see, that changes must be made. It is merely that we have different views on the best way to achieve this.

I should now like to outline a few of the reasons why we rejected the programme. The Committee is fully aware that research is required for the benefit of the developing countries. There are more than 500 million people in the world who are underfed. In 50 countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America crops are threatened by pests and diseases. There are over 1 000 million people suffering from tropical diseases, which might be called the 'scourges of modern man'. In this we agree with the Commission that research is definitely required. But the solution given in the Commission's proposal is, in our view, the wrong one.

And that for three reasons:

Firstly, the programme relies on building up research capacity in Europe. In our opinion, this cannot be the answer. We must build up research capacity *in situ* in the developing countries, *helping them to help themselves*.

Secondly, the proposal barely gives a thought — if any — to how the results can be transposed into the working reality of conditions in the developing countries. In technical terms, this means that there is no information on how technology and knowledge should be transferred.

Thirdly, we believe that research for the benefit of the developing countries should be incorporated into an overall plan since conditions there must be taken into account. If I may give you an example, there is no point in developing wonder-drugs to cure tropical diseases if the people there do not have the money to pay for them. There are many examples to show that science has long since produced a solution, but the people still cannot be helped because a treatment — for bilharziosis, for example, one of the main 'scourges' costs 5 EUA. For us this is a paltry sum, but for people in Egypt it is simply beyond their means.

So what is the point, we ask, of intensifying our knowledge if the outcome is useless and is not incorporated into an overall plan. Information on how this is to be done does not feature in the Commission's document,

Schmid

and as long as we are still in the dark about this we are not prepared to agree.

I will give you a second example. It often happens in the developing countries that humans and animals must compete for food. It is an aspect of the prevailing social conditions, which no research in Europe can alter, that food is fed to animals instead of to humans. An expert from a German development aid society once expressed it like this, and with the President's approval I quote, 'the concern to fatten up the swine sometimes provides an astonishing contrast with the retarded growth and poor health of children in the same region'. This may be attributed to the fact that the second case will have no immediate economic effects, for it is well known that death counts for nothing in these countries. It is our opinion that if these social conditions exist, our research here cannot change them — there must be more to it.

I should finally, Mr President, like to point out a few of our reservations as regards research. There is no information, Mr Commissioner, on how success is to be monitored. As it stands in the proposed text, the Commission will be monitoring itself. There can be no point in this — the official has yet to be discovered who will freely admit that he has done something wrong. We will never manage to invent him, even if we all try using the most up-to-date biotechnological methods, Mr Commissioner. Controls must be carried out by independent experts, which is not guaranteed as your proposals stand:

This also applies to the mid-term assessment of the programme, which you suggest should be carried out after three of its four years. I have checked the calculations, and according to the financial plan attached, you have already spent 87% and 92% of the funds for the two sectors — agriculture and medicine. Do you still intend to carry out a mid-term assessment for the sake of the remaining 10%. It only makes sense if this assessment is carried out after two years, when around half of the money has been spent.

Finally, personnel and administration costs have been set far too high. The Commission wants four A posts, two B posts and four C posts — completely exaggerated. It is also not clear why the administration of one part of the programme with 30 million EUA requires just as many staff as a part of the programme with 10 million EUA. You would have to supply an answer to all these technical aspects, quite apart from the fundamental considerations, before we would be prepared to agree.

President. — I call the Commission.

Mr Pisani, Member of the Commission. — (FR) I should like to thank Mrs Rabbethge for her report — with which the Commission is largely in agreement —

and I should like to be more precise about various important points before going on to discuss the philosophy behind this document that has been submitted to us.

The proposal on the table represents only the first phase of what needs to be done. The Commission accepts the amendments to the draft decision that were submitted by the rapporteur on behalf of the Committee on Development and as a result we will make sure that the amendments to our initial proposal — in accordance with Article 149 of the Treaty — appear in an amended proposal which we will submit to the Council. The only exception — and it is of minor importance, so I hope Parliament will accept it — concerns Article 1 a) of the draft decision. The Commission considers that the general criteria on which the selection of projects must be based, can — following a declaration from the Commission — be incorporated in the report on the Council's decision and do not need to be put into a specific annex. I think that we are more or less all in agreement on this point.

Where references in the report and in the motion for a resolution regarding the development of research in developing countries themselves are concerned, I undertake — on behalf of the Commission — to draw up a communication to the Council on this subject as soon as possible. This communication will take the most pertinent parts of the report and of the motion for a resolution discussed here today into account.

With regard to the other amendments, I have absolutely no criticism to make regarding those submitted by Mr Jackson, but I cannot accept those submitted by the Socialist Group as they do not correspond to the objectives which we are seeking to attain with this programme.

As for the questions raised by Mr Schmid a moment ago, firstly, I should say that he is mistaken about the total of the administrative costs; they are more like 5% than 15%. On the other hand, I concur wholeheartedly that an evaluation study of the impact of the programme should be commenced not in three years, but in two years' time, so that we can assess the programme's success before all the funds or nearly all of them have been committed.

Having made those points, I should now like to tackle the main issue at stake. In recent years, we have been witnesses to dramatic changes in the role of research in the management of societies. Even quite recently still, research merely accompanied developments in society and was geared to meeting requirements as they arose.

Subsequently, as research began to make use of models and scenarios, and as computers came into use — and they play a by no means insignificant role in this respect — research became a system and hence systematic. Nowadays, research tends to encompass

Pisani

the entire spectrum of knowledge available. Its purpose is to pinpoint the areas within this spectrum which call for greater efforts and hence it is now an essential part of social, economic and strategic forward-planning. As a result, having the capacity to keep tabs on the entire research system or, I should say, the entire system of knowledge at our disposal is becoming one of the most vital things which governments need to conduct their affairs. Japan is the living example of this. While not one single country in Europe has this capacity, if Europe as a whole were to draw on its diversity it could cover this entire spectrum and with coordinated efforts between countries and research centres could direct its forces where required on the most promising and the most tricky points. This would be feasible for Europe as a whole.

I should now like to touch on the specific problem of research in developing countries. Firstly, I must point out that while it is true that the living standards, production capacity and organizational abilities of developing countries are way behind those of developed countries, it is also true that the gap between the two is tending to increase because the percentage of income which developing countries can devote to research is much lower than ours, while their income itself is already a lot lower than ours. It is therefore essential, not to say vital for the future, given what I said on the first point, that developing countries are given the opportunity of carrying out research which can soon become independent research.

But what we must ask ourselves right now is whether developing countries have the possibility of mobilizing the requisite financial resources, the ability and physical instruments needed for research, the organizational instruments, laboratories etc., and whether they are capable of mobilizing teams of workers, i.e. whether they already have enough researchers who are capable of setting up research units to tackle the situation facing them. Unfortunately, we have to admit that they do not. So we thought — and our proposal is based on this thought — that it would be good to involve European researchers in research on behalf of developing countries in such a way that Europe would use its capabilities and devote part of its resources to research on developing countries.

It is surely obvious that, if Europe did not do this, the developing countries which are associated with it would not even be able to form the research teams who — one day — are going to enable them to catch up.

It is therefore essential for Europe to step up its involvement in the future of developing countries — and this is the spirit behind our text — but at the same time Europe must help to provide developing countries with resources which will enable them to carry out independent research. If we were to believe that the proposal before you today constituted the entire research policy which Europe intended to devote to

developing countries, then this would of course constitute, in a way, a 'denial of justice' towards these countries, as they would never be able to catch up.

So, in addition to the efforts already evoked here, we must also have the ability to help developing countries to build up their own research capacities and to gradually catch up with the industrialized world. But how does anyone think they are going to ever catch up unless we help them with our own research to become capable of so doing? For that to happen, a number of precautions need to be taken, a number of research teams and individual researchers will have to be invited into our laboratories and we must be prepared to accept the fact that these countries are going to develop their own research systems, with the risk that they will catch us up and even compete with us soon.

This is the general philosophy behind this first text of ours and to the Socialist Group — who have submitted a large number of amendments — and to the rapporteur of the Committee on Energy and Research I should like to point out that if this document were to be the only one it would mean that we were running a large number of risks which are unacceptable. But I undertake to do my utmost to produce in the coming months a document, the precise purpose of which will be to increase the independent research capacities of developing countries. Initially, this would be drawn from our own research and at a later stage it is to be hoped that they will devise their research systems.

It cannot be said that I am building castles in the air since, in the plans for combating hunger and the instrument which has been proposed to you as part of the additional budget for 1982, there is a line devoted to research in developing countries and for developing countries which shows that we are already taking action in this sector.

I should like to close, Mr President, by explaining why we feel that independent research is so crucial.

I could almost take as the basis of my argument a sentence from the Sermon on the Mount, that sermon par excellence, when Christ said: 'You would not seek me if you had not already found me.' In reality, we do not know whether we are asking those who seek the real questions which have to be answered.

When it is we who are asking ourselves what the needs of the Third World are, we are responding to our own concerns. Those who do not yet have their own research system are not capable of asking what their problems really are. That is why we will be fighting — believe me — at Parliament's side to make sure that research facilities can be developed in developing countries. I am therefore asking the Committee on Energy and Research and the Socialist Group to be good enough to accept this promise as a formal undertaking on my part and hence to withdraw their reservations and amendments. Having said that, I should

Pisani

not like to conclude without having once again thanked Mrs Rabbethge, the rapporteur, and the Committee on Development, all of whom have devoted the attention warranted to this vital subject.

(Applause)

President. — I call the Socialist Group.

Mrs Dury. — *(FR)* First of all, Mr President, I should like to make a comment about our working methods.

Mrs Rabbethge's report is the outcome of a great deal of hard work. We laboured for months over this project, but I really do feel that the working methods that we use here are a great hindrance to the actual work. For instance, Mr Rabbethge was obliged to present her report yesterday in a rush, we will be discussing it today and maybe we will vote on it tomorrow. We are always harping on about the fact that the European Parliament's activities are not publicized sufficiently in the press. I really do feel that if we want extremely vital projects of this type on which we are working to be publicized, we ought to change our working methods. That was just a preliminary remark. Now I should like to get to the heart of the matter.

We have just heard Mr Pisani defend his programme. I am glad that he promised us that there would be other programmes and other viewpoints on research from the Commission. Nevertheless, it is on this current programme that we must give our opinion. To my mind, the dominating viewpoint behind this programme is quite obviously one which regards Europe as the centre of things, since the basic aim is to finance research in our own countries rather than to base it on the priorities of developing countries. I regret having to point this out, but the Socialist Group thought that this needed to be emphasized.

Four basic principles must be borne in mind when one is devising a research programme: firstly, all research must be conceived in accordance with priorities whose objectives truly contribute to solving the problems of underdevelopment. Secondly, all programmes ought to be designed and thought out to fit in with the needs expressed by the developing countries, themselves, independently of partisan interests and of economic and strategic calculations. Thirdly, I would say that such programmes should be carried out by developing countries themselves and should be assessed, not in accordance with *our* criteria, but in accordance with their own. Finally, I would add that any research programme should take into account what is happening elsewhere in other international bodies and institutions.

I feel that there is nothing to be gained by trying to save ourselves the trouble of making a proper assessment, since, if we do not, we are more likely to squan-

der what we have. The fact that the Commission has presented a report which does not take these principles sufficiently into account — and I think that Mrs Rabbethge's report did not play on this enough — makes me feel that, in the last analysis, underdevelopment is serving as a pretext for promoting research in our countries. Apart from that, the subtle distinction made by the Commission between strategic and adaptive research does not seem to me to justify the directions taken since all research which is motivated by reality and local requirements is bound to be adapted.

Yesterday, we held a debate on hunger in the world and Mr Pisani himself underlined the importance of food crops but, in the programme he is now proposing, it is suggested that commercial farming should also be encouraged in developing countries. There is even mention of manioc. But this means that the European Parliament is almost being schizophrenic; the Committee on External Economic Relations is in the process of studying a report on an agreement with Thailand which seeks to limit the importation of manioc into our own countries. Yet, at the same time, another research programme is asking us to approve the promotion of manioc growing in developing countries. Whether we are talking about development strategy or whatever, I feel that we really must be consistent at all times, not only on research but also where international trade with developing countries is concerned, whether African or Asian countries. There is therefore an inconsistency here and I should like Mr Pisani to explain himself on this point.

I do not wish to dwell at length on examples, but there are others to mention particularly where health is concerned. Gastroenteritis, for instance, is an illness which severely afflicts children. We are not going to be able to solve this problem, however, by carrying out research on the origins of this disease in laboratories in our countries; it can only be solved by hydraulic engineering, by drilling wells in developing countries and by promoting good hygiene rather than devising vast research programmes in our medical institutes.

To sum up, research is just not a scientific question, it is a political one, and is a question of a model for development.

The upshot of what the Socialist Group is saying to the Commission with the amendment it has tabled, is this: 'If you do not take account of our amendments, we will not be able to give you our endorsement on the budget'. This issue is so important that we feel we must be firm and demand consistent policies, whether we are talking about hunger in the world or research in developing countries.

President. — I call the European Democratic Group.

Mr C. Jackson. — Mr President, I can be brief in referring to the proposed programme of European

Jackson

research for development, but first I want to pay tribute to Mrs Rabbethge's work as rapporteur: the report and the amended proposal are excellent, and in my group's view this programme can be a significant contribution to our efforts to help developing countries.

I am particularly pleased that the committee accepted the Conservative amendments, in particular those making provision for competent research bodies in the Community to propose research and development projects themselves. This will add considerably to the practical impact and value of the programme, and I very much welcome the Commissioner's statement this afternoon in which he expressed the Commission's agreement.

Let me now, however, repeat to our Socialist colleagues, with all respect to them, why their view is short-sighted and why this proposal is so important. Of course, in the long term, successful medical and agricultural research will be carried out throughout the less-developed countries. Indeed, there is already a UN programme providing 25 million dollars a year to boost medical research in the developing countries. But some fundamental research needs sophisticated resources which will not be available in developing countries for many years to come, and this is where Europe comes in. For example, the President of the Royal Society for Tropical Medicine and Hygiene in Britain told me the other day that work now being carried out in Europe could revolutionize the control of certain tropical diseases and provide field workers with powerful new weapons for fighting disease. Fundamental research includes and I apologize for being technical here but it is necessary — the systematic analysis of tropical parasites in terms of their genetics, enzymes and immunological defences, and the application of new discoveries concerning their basic protein structure and the use of mono-clonal antibodies. In agriculture too some research requires high technology which simply cannot be established at present in most parts of the tropical world.

This may sound technical, but the results may lead to the relief of untold suffering. Yet today, the recession and its budgetary consequences are seriously threatening research in Europe, which is of direct, immediate value to the Third World. I quote places at risk such as the London and Liverpool Schools of Tropical Medicine and East Malling, the world's premier crop research institute.

Mr President, I hope that this report will be given overwhelming support by Parliament and, looking forward, I ask the Council to agree the programme, which can be of such enormous help to the Third World, without delay.

(Applause)

President. — I call the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Veronesi. — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the proposal for a Council decision on a scientific and technical research and development programme in order to benefit developing countries has given rise to heated discussions both within the relevant committee and with the other committees whose opinion has been sought. To discuss these matters in a committed way is a very good thing since it shows we take our responsibilities seriously.

On the other hand, I must admit that I have not managed to understand the attitudes of some people who have fought over, rather than tackle, the issue at stake. The Italian Communists will be voting in favour of the Council draft decision, just as our members on the Committee on Energy and Research did. We feel that the proposals can be incorporated into a strategy for helping developing countries, a strategy whose overriding form was described yesterday by Mr Pisani in the most thorough and exhaustive way.

Can it be said that the programme is ideal? I honestly do not think so. Mrs Rabbethge's report, which analyses the proposals in detail and in depth, has revealed their limitations and drawbacks, while the motion for a resolution — which is well-reasoned and to the point — is capable of providing the stimulus for further measures and corrections when the programme is actually implemented.

On the whole, however, I am convinced that the general principle behind the proposal before us is a valid one.

Nevertheless, I should like to make a few points.

The programme is not without its merits, even though, if we compare it with similar activities like the FAO programme and the World Health Organization programme, we can see that the picture of hunger and disease in the third and fourth worlds and the serious problems which still remain to be solved make other initiatives imperative and show that even greater efforts will have to be made in the future.

The idea that research should involve collaboration with other scientific institutions in order to avoid duplication is without doubt a sound one. I do not think that it should be too difficult to find bases for profitable joint activities to meet the proposed aims.

It is also important to involve the scientific institutes and workers — where they exist — of developing countries in implementing the programme. If we want — as Mr Pisani was saying yesterday — the populations of developing countries to become the protagonists of their own emancipation, all that is necessary. This aspect must be assessed in relation to the individual parts of the programme.

It seems to me that a policy of this kind cannot be contained in a four-year plan; that is a contradiction in

Veronesi

terms. Plans for the future need to be made if these activities are to be given adequate scope.

Finally, Mr President, we agree with those who have said that the results should be widely publicized and that the priorities about what needs to be done should be chosen carefully.

Summing up, I believe that it is our duty to translate our many declarations of principle into hard facts. This would be a definite sign of political good will towards Third World countries, even if we do not thereby manage to solve all the problems facing the populations of these countries.

President. — I call the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mrs Scrivener. — (*FR*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, from the debate we held on Mr Michel's report, it emerged that Third World countries suffering from hunger and malnutrition — which is the particular case of most countries in Africa — are only likely to achieve self-sufficiency in food if they manage to implement rapidly national food strategies based on land development, increased foodstuffs production, and improvements in transport, marketing and storage facilities. Such strategies call for increased research, and technology which is adapted to the lives of ordinary people. Above all, it must be possible to introduce inexpensive improvements and to facilitate the maximum use of manpower in agriculture. Above all, such strategies presuppose a tremendous amount of training to provide an efficient technical and administrative setting for progress in the place where it is required.

Thus it can be seen that training and research in both tropical agriculture and in medicine, health and nutrition are indispensable accompaniments to any efficient plan to combat hunger in the world.

I should, of course, like to pay tribute to Mrs Rabbethge for having emphasized in her report that just as much attention needed to be given to developing human potential as to the content of the research. Unfortunately, the Commission document does not have any mention anywhere of training of technicians in developing countries even though this would appear to be absolutely essential.

Let me remind you that in December 1981, Parliament reiterated its commitment of 2 500 000 EUA from the general budget of the Community to be awarded over a period of several years to nationals of non-associated developing countries to enable them to undertake special occupational training in specialized institutes of either Member States or of developing countries, such training to be focused mainly on the management of agricultural and even industrial undertakings.

This House also approved the disbursement of 400 000 EUA to assist specialized training institutes for their programmes to benefit nationals of developing countries. When you spoke to us at length just now, Mr Pisani, you said there would be a document. Perhaps this question of training will be taken up again at that point. By its act of approving these funds and in particular by committing them over a period of several years, it is obvious that this Parliament believes that training programmes are a vital long-term investment and are a by no means negligible part of any development policy.

We are all aware that the educational needs of these countries are enormous. They are bound to increase as national food strategies are worked out. Training outside the school system — whether on the site or as part of technical assistance schemes — encompasses a vast range of activities which, to a certain extent, depend on us for inspiration and may range from linking work and training to classes on nutrition given to mothers in baby clinics. That is why I believe that the time is right for changing our general approach to these problems. This aspect has been totally ignored in research and development programmes submitted to us. Fortunately, however, the budget which we approved in 1981 should enable us to make up for this shortcoming somewhat by stepping up training schemes to benefit nationals of developing countries, whether or not such countries are associated to the Community. For we must surely all be aware that we will not get very far unless we train the human beings concerned.

President. — I call Mr Pearce.

Mr Pearce. — I would like to use this opportunity, Mr President, to compliment Mrs Rabbethge on her report and to draw attention yet again to the question of schools of tropical medicine. Mr Jackson referred to the London School and the Liverpool School in his speech a few moments ago. I would like to amplify this. I am talking more about the Liverpool one than the London one because it is nearer to where I live.

This school is an established centre of research and knowledge on matters of tropical medicine. It has a high standard of knowledge and technology; it is linked in with the university in the area, which means that its standards are those obtaining in the United Kingdom; it is experienced in the field since a long time ago; it has relations with similar institutions in other Member States, and in particular, with the Tropical Institute in Hamburg.

The present economic situation has brought about difficulties which means that some of the work concerning the care of children in the tropics and also, indeed, on the problems of purifying water in the tropics, is at risk. We would like to see support from the Community for this effort. That support could come from

Pearce

projects financed under the EDF, but whatever is done in the field, on the basis of projects, also needs support from back home to keep standards up, to keep research forging ahead. I believe that this is one of the useful and practical and immediate benefits that could come from the adoption of the course of action which Mrs Rabbethge has proposed and I am therefore very happy to support her report and to ask that the work of these two schools of tropical medicine, London and Liverpool, should benefit from the result of her report.

President. — I call Mr Sherlock.

Mr Sherlock. — It seems that in the European Democratic Group we are having a little more than our share but I do assure you that we feel very deeply about this matter.

If the father of European medicine had been rewriting today, he would have said that the art is long and life is short, judgment difficult, experience fallacious and he would have added equipment and staff are very expensive too. He would have added, I am quite sure, that medical research and medicine are one topic — tropical medicine is not isolatable from other medical research. This is why in the first instance, Mrs Dury, research in medicine, which includes research in tropical medicine, is better conducted for the most part while world resources are concentrated in the present centres of excellence.

My group spokesman has already drawn attention to some of the intensely complicated research and I would underline that it is research in medicine in general that sometimes produces spin-off results in tropical medicine.

I welcome the wider recommendations made by Mrs Rabbethge. I welcome especially the promise that Commissioner Pisani has given us this afternoon of increased, wider and better funded continuing research in this field, where the benefits will be immense. I would have said a little while ago until the all-pervading Committee on Women's Rights had exerted its influence upon even me, that this was a *workmanlike* report. It now has, of course, to be a 'workpersonlike' report, which is not quite as nice in English but. Mrs Rabbethge, my deepest congratulations on a study that will stay in my bookcase as well as, I hope, our working committees for a very long time.

(Applause)

President. — I call the Commission.

Mr Pisani, Member of the Commission. — (FR) The point which will have struck the Commission most was Mrs Dury's appeal for consistency. I should like to

point out to Mrs Dury that in life as in political struggles, consistency is not an edifice which can be drawn in order to be constructed afterwards. No, consistency means continuous attempts at correction and incorporation. That is exactly what we have proposed.

I should like to ask Mrs Dury the following question: what would have happened if this report had not been drawn up, if Europe, too busy creating its own research system or trying to do so, had not even considered the question of developing countries? In that case, the issue would not even have been raised and Europe would have selfishly gone on developing its own research system.

In fact, while continuing to develop our own research system, we in Europe have taken the initial step of saying: 'we cannot devise a scheme for research focused on Europe which is not at the same time open to the Third World.' What is more, having opened European research to the problems of development, Europe is going to help the Third World to work out its own system of development. A beginning to this can be found in the supplementary budget before us. Other documents will be submitted to you containing attempts at identifying ways of developing research systems in the Third World as such so that researchers in those countries can gradually become the enthusiastic and demanding partners of European researchers.

That is the logic governing our actions. We are defining our intentions which are to open our facilities to the outside world. But this opening to the outside world is not enough. We will be aiding Third World countries to develop their own research facilities.

To Mr Veronesi I should like to say that ACP experts will be associated with the management committees of our own research system.

To Mrs Scrivener, I should like to say that it is of course essential for European centres, laboratories and schools to be able to welcome into their midst researchers, trainee researchers or experts from Third World countries so that they can undergo technological and practical training. These activities come under the budget of the Commissioner responsible for development policy. These funds will be deployed. But — I repeat — you will only be able to make your minds up about the structure of the system we are proposing when, in a few months' time, the second phase — just as important as the first — will be revealed to you. This second phase will involve creating the means for Third World countries to achieve their own scientific development.

President. — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

11. *Programme on the environment*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-219/82), drawn up by Mr Alber on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, on the

proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-793/81 COM(81) 626 final) for a draft action programme of the European Communities on the environment.

I call the rapporteur.

Mr Alber, rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we have before us today the third Community action programme on the environment. Since 1972, the European Community has devoted a very great deal of attention to questions relating to the environment, and I should like, right at the outset, to express my very sincere thanks to the Commission and to all the other parties concerned for everything that has been achieved so far. It seems to me that, in a debate which tends to be characterized by moaning and criticizing, we hear too little in the way of appreciation, and for that reason I should like to say once again that thanks are due to all those who are taking an active and practical part in environmental issues.

We are especially pleased that the idea of environmental protection has gained increasing acceptance. We began by merely endeavouring to put right damage that had already been done; in other words, we were doing no more than reacting to *faits accomplis*. The next stage was to introduce preventive planning so that the damage would not be done in the first place. We are therefore all the more pleased that we have now reached a third stage whereby environmental considerations are taken into account at the planning stage of all policy decisions.

However, if our efforts are to bear fruit, we must work out a coherent environmental strategy. That is something we called for in the report on the state of environmental protection work in the Community, and we are very pleased that the Commission has taken up the idea of an environmental strategy in its programme. It is important to leave emotional issues aside in this matter. Nothing would be more damaging to the cause of environmental protection than to seek to make it a vehicle for ideologies, a means of disrupting State affairs, as is unfortunately the aim of certain people who purport to be concerned about environmental issues.

Nor has environmental protection anything to do with nostalgia. However sorry we may be at its passing, the era of the idyllic garden populated by garden gnomes has now passed. Some of my neighbours are always complaining that our wild plants are dying out, but they themselves go round with their lawnmowers

every second day chopping down everything growing around their houses.

I also believe that environmental protection begins at home. It has nothing to do with the kind of nostalgia evoked by a graffiti artist in London once, who sprayed on a wall the legend *Remember the good old days, when air was clean and sex was dirty*. That may have been so once, but I think things have changed in the meantime.

We must view the whole issue of environmental protection in the context of the conflict of interests between economic development on the one hand and ecological constraints on the other. We shall only be in a position to do something positive about protecting the environment if we can manage to overcome this conflict, which means that our strategy must be backed up by whatever instruments are necessary. However, before we have recourse to inflexible legal bans and requirements, I feel we should devote our attention first and foremost to market instruments and the like.

We can only do that, though, if we have first of all carried out a thorough review of the situation and if we have taken a political decision as to whether or not we are in favour of nuclear energy, what kind of growth we want to see or what form cost-benefit analysis should take. I believe that many organizations which regard environmental protection as a priority issue do not unfortunately have the requisite political courage to come down clearly on these vital issues.

In considering this programme, we must bear in mind that we have perhaps so far paid too little attention to our natural environment and concentrated overmuch on the human aspect. We have been talking about clean water and clean air, but always from the point of view of man and what benefits he can derive from environmental protection. We should, however, see the natural aspect too. Wild plants, for instance, have just as much right to grow and thrive. We must ensure that devastated areas are restored as far and as quickly as possible on the grounds that these are oases which will, in the final analysis, be to the benefit of human beings too.

It is especially incumbent upon us as Europeans to devote special attention to the various aspects of trans-frontier pollution. We are at the moment concerned about the problem of acid rain, which is destroying our woodland. We also have experience of the problem of trans-frontier pollution and nuisances. Even on the small scale of one's own back garden, it is unfortunately accepted practice to put your compost heap right up against the neighbour's fence. On a national level, though, this kind of thing must not get out of hand, as otherwise it would result in the kind of nuisance that no one can reasonably be expected to tolerate. All too often, environmental policy is a mat-

Alber

ter of putting right what has already gone wrong, and that is something we must get away from.

We have also taken into account the North Sea and the Mediterranean in other words, the question of water pollution. We intend to make no specific proposals here, although we have criticized the fact that the environment programme does not contain any such proposals, or at least not many. The Commission takes the view that this should not be done, particularly at a time of economic recession. We take the opposite view; we are absolutely sure that environmental protection will always be an essential issue regardless of the prevailing economic situation.

The only reason why we have put forward no specific proposals is because we do not think Parliament should perform administrative duties. It is up to the Commission to flesh out its action programme, because otherwise it is not worthy of the name. And it is only by including such activities that we can truly speak of an independent environment policy. Only then does the environment enjoy the same status as other basic aspects of our social being, like progress, growth, liberty and security. I believe it is incumbent on us to bestow the same status on environmental protection policy.

(Applause)

President. — I call the Socialist Group.

Mr Collins. — Mr President, it is now nearly 10 years since the Community first embarked on the development of an environment policy. It is easy to see that we have made some progress in those 10 years. Unfortunately, I think, there is also a temptation to feel that the environment is now just another part of the political scenery. There is a danger that we become just a little bit complacent. We have done it all. We have an environment policy, and all is well.

However, although the Socialist Group welcomes this report and the Commission's proposals, I am afraid that we have to make it clear that we are very careful to recognize that we must not overstate the case. While the Commission can rest content that its environment policy has produced important results in a short period, I doubt very much if we can seriously claim that the word 'substantial' can be applied to the results, because if we look at the machinery that we have for monitoring the implementation of policy in the Community, then we have to admit that it is notoriously uneven across the whole of Europe. It is very difficult to be precise therefore about the results that we have actually achieved.

Having said that, there is no doubt in the Socialist Group's collective mind that there is a need for a Community environment policy. The Socialist Group

recognizes that we have to have a common approach to a rational management of the earth's resources and that we have to use this as the basis of an improvement in the living conditions of the people of the European Community. We are absolutely behind the Commission in its work in this respect. We Socialists are concerned with the quality of life and not just the quantity of production and consumption. So far as we are concerned, production should be very firmly in the service of man and not man in the alienated service of production. That is an important political point to make, and while I accept Mr Alber's dictum that the environment is too important to be making small political affrays into it, none the less I think it is very important that we recognize where our priorities actually are.

We welcome the changes brought about in the 10 years in which the Community has been active in this. We are very happy to welcome the new concern with the appropriate scale for Community action. We would also like to see the Commission being very careful indeed that it introduces legislation into the Council and Parliament only where it considers very seriously that this is a matter for European concern and not a matter that can be handled either at local level or by, for example, the United Nations.

Secondly, we are very happy that there is a recognition that environment policy is not just negative and reactive but actually has a creative role and may in fact create jobs, create employment and so act as a valuable tool in the shaping of our economic policy. Thirdly, we are very happy to note that the Commission sees a continuing need for education. For our part we feel that it is very important that we should tell the public, tell the citizens of Europe, of the Community's involvement in environment policy, because frankly I think that that is not always very clear at the moment. Fourthly, we are happy to endorse the continued action on water and air pollution: we are very happy indeed to back that.

Most of all, I think, we are very happy to recognize that the Commission is now in a position to say that it wants to extend environment policy and incorporate it into other areas of Community policy such as industry, agriculture and development and cooperation. I think that is very, very important indeed, and we are very happy to note that the Commission intends to have internal discussions to see how the linkages can be made. In other words we welcome the realization that the environment is, in a way, indivisible, we recognize that it is a political issue that is central to all that we do. It is not a simple problem and, of course, it is certainly not an exercise in looking forward, in planning for our own future.

Mr President, I would like to draw attention to one or two of the amendments. First of all, there are two corrections I would like to make. Amendment No 9 from the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection is exactly the same as

Collins

Amendment No 36 from the Socialist Group. Secondly, in Amendment No 28 we should be referring to groundwater and not freshwater. Freshwater is mentioned at one point and groundwater at another, but in fact it should refer to groundwater all the way through.

The Socialist Group amendments are designed, like some of the committee amendments, to tighten up on the Commission's proposals. It is an action programme, as Mr Alber has said, and if it is an action programme, then we have to be reasonably specific. Reading the proposals we find that they are a bit general and that they need to be tightened up. So the Socialist Group's amendments refer first of all to the need to restore and reintroduce species that have sometimes disappeared. They reaffirm the need to recognize the importance of scale in developing environment policy. We recognize the need for prevention as being much better than cure and we recognize the importance of informing the public of EEC involvement in environment policy. We would like the Commission to have clearer contact with the EFTA countries, particularly in relation to the Stockholm Convention which actually refers to the need to conserve living natural resources and measure that against economic development. We make quite specific suggestions about water quality comparisons, and in Amendment No 47 by Mr Wagner there is a particular reference to the importance of border areas. We comment these amendments therefore to the House.

Finally and in conclusion, Mr President, the Socialist Group reaffirms its concern for the rational planned use of resources. The Socialist Group reaffirms its concern for the quality of life as a priority in the Community and its concern that every citizen and every worker be given the right to a clean, healthy, rich and diverse living environment. We support this report therefore. We gave our approval to the Commission. We congratulate the rapporteur and his efforts in this field.

IN THE CHAIR: MR POUL MØLLER

Vice-President

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

Mrs Schleicher. — (DE) I should like to thank our rapporteur, Mr Alber, very much for his careful work. Only last year, he produced an interim report on the stock-taking exercise on environmental policy in the European Community; in so doing, he made a highly

valuable contribution which, I am sure, acted as a basis for the points covered in the third action programme.

On behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, I should like to welcome this action programme of the European Communities on the environment, and at the same time express my appreciation of the previous two programmes and for all the work that has been put in so far. The Group of the European People's Party attaches great importance to concentrating on certain of the many measures which need to be taken in the interests of environmental protection. In other words, our entire environmental policy must concentrate on certain activities to ensure that developments are pushed in the right direction over the long term. We therefore reject certain amendments which would distract our attention from the main tasks ahead, which would smother any active policy and create the impression that nothing was being done at all.

In presenting the third action programme, the Commission and the Member of the Commission responsible, Mr Narjes, have shown that they are taking their duties in the field of environmental protection seriously. But the fact is that any initiative taken by the Commission and any activity on the part of the European Parliament are bound to come to nought unless the Council at last behaves logically in the field of environmental protection. No matter how fine the words we hear from our 10 governments, it is all no more than hot air unless they are matched by political decisions. My group therefore has a basic demand to put to the Council, which is that it should at long last do something about air pollution. Just to give you one example, the Council has still not managed — after close on 10 years — to stipulate quality criteria for the amount of lead in the air.

It is precisely in connection with environmental policy that we are often confronted with conflicts of interest *vis-à-vis* other policies. It is therefore up to the Council to refrain from putting off decisions as regards environmental policy and to take the necessary political decisions — especially where a conflict of interests exists — to enable us to put the land at our disposal to good use and avert harm to the population in general.

My group takes the view that the conflict of interests between economic and environmental considerations can be solved by way of the market economy once environmental protection is made economically attractive.

A second demand we have to put to the Council is that, once a political decision has been taken, it must be followed through to its logical conclusion. One depressing example of how not to go about things is the decisions taken by the European Council in Venice in 1981 on energy policy. As you will know, these decisions were taken in the light of the oil crisis, but the fact is that no country since then has complied

Schleicher

with the decision taken to develop nuclear energy resources. Given that any source of energy is fraught with certain risks, we must do everything in our power to ensure that the general risks are kept as slight as possible. There can be no doubt that the problem of acid rain destroying our woodland would not be so serious if the Council had matched its political decisions with action.

The final point I should like to make is addressed once again to the Commission. Certain ecologically damaging factors deteriorate very rapidly, and the European Community cannot afford to act in isolation if the tide is to be turned. I would therefore ask the Commission to consider, in concluding or negotiating agreements with entities like the Eastern Bloc or the countries of the Third World, to what extent environmental aspects can be taken into account to enable us to protect the world population from what are already obvious damaging factors.

(Applause)

President. — I call the European Democratic Group.

Mr Johnson. — Mr President, on behalf of the European Democratic Group I too welcome this third action programme by the Commission. I think it does indeed, as previous speakers have said, take the Community's environment policy a stage further. In the few minutes that I have I want to draw the Commission's attention particularly to some points which we think are of outstanding importance.

Amendment No 1 is not an amendment to the action programme itself but to the resolution which the Council will adopt when it approves the action programme. We ask the Council to give an undertaking that it will make available to the Commission the personnel and material resources necessary for the implementation of the programme, in particular through the Environment Fund called for in Mr Alber's report which the European Parliament adopted on 20 November.

I deliberately at this point raise the question of the Environment Fund. As you know, Mr President, it is something which this Parliament, and particularly the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, has been pressing for for some time, and we have had some success. In the 1982 budget, there are five lines — 6610 to 6614 — which, taken together, relate to the Environment Fund, and in the draft 1983 budget, the amounts concerned add up to approximately 5 million units of account. We are most concerned now, though, that the Commission should capitalize on this and produce the draft regulations necessary for the Environment Fund, because this is the only way in which we shall get any flesh upon this framework. Items in the budget are one

thing, but we must have the detailed regulations. I would ask the Commissioner to take this very seriously and produce this year the necessary regulations, so that we can build up this item.

Mr President, there are some points in the document which we have felt particularly needed to be stressed. On the whole we like its tendency. We wanted to make some of the points a little more specific, and I will mention two or three of them as I go.

Amendment No 20 calls on the Commission to come forward with comprehensive studies on the whole question of the exhausts of automobiles. Our amendment relates not merely to the antipollution devices on motor cars: we also want the Commission to study the question of fuels. In particular, of course, we have in mind the possibility of moving, in the long term, towards fuels which have less polluting characteristics.

Amendment No 23 is important. Other speakers have stressed the new emphasis on nature conservation. It is one of the items which figure prominently in the Environment Fund proposals. We support this emphasis on the monitoring or banning of trade in endangered species, and our amendment suggests adding the words 'in goods or products derived from these species'. We believe this is of great importance, and we hope the Commission will recognize this too.

In this connection, I approve of Amendment No 39, which would introduce into this environment programme a position which the Commission has already taken in a written reply to Mr Muntingh. That is that where there is a real danger to plant and animal species, an overwhelming danger, then we have to consider the question of these species having a priority over certain economic and trade requirements. The Commission has already adopted this position as I say, in a written answer, but it is good to have it down in the text of a programme. It is very much the philosophy of the International Convention for trade in endangered species, and I want to see it written in here as well.

There are a few really important matters which are rather topical as well. Amendment No 27 relates to the whole question of the Antarctic. The Antarctic is of course topical because of the Falklands crisis. Everybody knows that people have their eyes on the Antarctic. There is now in New Zealand a meeting in progress on the exploitation of mineral resources in the Antarctic I think it is very important that the Commission, which has already, as you know, acceded to the Convention on the protection of the marine living resources of Antarctica — the Southern Ocean Convention — should now also use its diplomatic influence to join the Antarctica Treaty itself. I am concerned that without the moderating power of the European Community, we may see a random and uncontrolled exploitation in Antarctica which would, I think, be very detrimental to the world. This is a

Johnson

chance to preserve as it is, or at least much as it is, the world's last great wilderness, and I hope we shall find a way for the Community as such to participate in what is now going on within the framework of the Antarctic Treaty.

Much the same applies to the Law of the Sea. We recently had the *débaclé* in New York with the Law of the Sea Conference. We now almost have a free-for-all, with Member States of the Community having, as it were, abstained. Let them please reconsider their position. Let them above all come forward now with a Community regime for the deep-sea bed which will protect environmental requirements.

I congratulate the Commission on this document. I hope the Council on 24 June will not finally adopt it, but will discuss it and give detailed consideration over the next two or three months to the amendments we have proposed.

(Applause)

President. — I call the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Maher. — My compliments to the Commission and my congratulation to the rapporteur, Mr Alber.

However, I do have a criticism to make and perhaps I should start with it. We all know that man, of course, is the great polluter and for that reason I am disappointed that neither in the Third Directive nor in Mr Alber's proposals has any real attention been given to education, particularly of the young, to enable them to appreciate the environment in which they live: a clean environment with clean air, clean water, clean soil, good food, safe products, etc. Frankly, unless we can educate our young people in particular to be more appreciative and more sensitive and more conscious, it will be exceedingly difficult in future to ensure that there is an adequate and suitable environment available to enable us to lead full and happy lives.

I would like to pose a question to the Commission at this stage. Do they intend to take any action in this regard at European level.

Perhaps to reach out to the schools in our member countries with a programme which would in fact highlight the importance of the environment for the future? Frankly if we have to rely upon the policeman or the army to ensure that we are sensible about how we use this earth on which we live, then we are in a sad state indeed. We have got to convince the Community generally — that is the peoples of our various member countries — that the environment is in their hands, that they have to battle against pollution.

I would like to pose that question to the Commission and I would look for an answer from them whether they propose to take any action in this particular field.

Being a farmer, Mr President, I am of course very conscious of the environment and always have been. I believe farmers generally are. But farmers frequently have problems. There is a constant battle to get higher output because many people say that food is too expensive, that the price should be kept down. So farmers desperately battle to increase production so as to maintain living standards. Frequently they use, perhaps unknowingly from time to time, certain materials which may not be 100% safe. In that regard I think there is a need indeed to look very critically at commercial companies who manufacture agricultural substances like pesticides and crop protection, animal protection medicines and so on, to ensure that they are in fact safe before they are put into general use.

Frequently people like farmers are the subject of high-pressure salesmanship to convince them that by using such and such a product they can increase production by 50% or 70% as the case may be, without making known to them what the damaging side effects may be. I think there is a need to take account of that, to ensure that these commercial organizations cannot make quick money just by using the media and advertising campaigns in order to sell their products because they are interested in making money without much reference to the health of the people generally who have to use the products on which these particular materials are used.

Mr President, I would like to make a brief comment on the question of forestry since it is so closely allied to agriculture and important in the context of our rural regions. I am disappointed that we have made no progress so far in relation to reafforestation. I think there is no question that there are many regions in our Community where more trees would help to improve the environment. It could help to make those regions more habitable for people by enabling them to live in a clean and healthy environment. But yet no progress has been made in that particular area so far as the Community is concerned. That certainly is not desirable. Of course I have to mention in passing that there is a very important economic advantage also from the existence of a forestry policy.

Could I mention something else, Mr President. Much of the pollution caused by the ordinary individual, much of the damage to the environment, comes from the materials he uses. I am always appalled by the fact that I can hardly buy a spanner anymore unless it is wrapped in plastic. Now I do not mind having food wrapped in plastic because it is important to keep food clean; but why wrap a spanner in plastic? That plastic has got to be disposed of! Of course very often it pollutes and there is a whole range of products where in fact we could go back to the old ways and sell them in their naked shape. After all, you cannot damage a spanner very easily, so why wrap it in plastic. A few nails — you cannot buy them any more without their

Maher

being wrapped in plastic. Mr President, I think we could make some progress in that particular way.

(Applause)

President. — I call the Non-attached Members.

Mr Eisma. — *(NL)* Mr President, in the short time allowed me I should like to concentrate on two sections of the action programme: trans-frontier pollution, on which a number of my amendments have been approved by the committee — I would mention among others Amendment 18 — and the resources for implementing the programme. First of all, however, I should like to compliment my colleague Mr Alber on his report. We are very grateful to him for coming out so clearly in favour of our proposals for a regulation on trans-frontier environmental effects.

With reference to Amendment 18, I believe that general regulations on trans-frontier pollution are urgently required. They will need to contain a number of rules of practical and procedural application to be enforced in every situation where trans-frontier pollution is threatened. Some have already been drawn up by the OECD and by the UN. Amendment 18 aims to formulate these matters at a European level. There are, admittedly, a number of Directives — I am thinking here of the Seveso Directive and the report on environmental effects, which contain clauses on information and consultation — but these vary greatly and are very inadequate. In addition, these Directives only cover an extremely narrow section of the trans-frontier pollution problem, and this has led us to think of asking the Commission to draw up a framework Directive containing a number of concrete regulations. And a basic principle for cases of trans-frontier damage, and a number of procedural regulations guaranteeing equal legal rights for individuals and action groups on both sides of the border. So, unlike the fragmentary approach of the Commission policy up to now, this would be a comprehensive code for trans-frontier environmental problems.

Amendment 18 calls on the Commission to implement a proposal of this nature and we should like to know whether the Commission is prepared to change its policy on this question.

Point 14 of the draft action programme mentions environmental education in schools. What have we actually discovered in our network of sample schools? Has the Committee on Education been consulted on the matter, or are there plans to do so, as on the subject of information for consumer information? This would be in accordance with the Council Resolution of 9 February 1976 in which the preparation of Council resolutions on future developments in education was expressly assigned to the Committee on Education. This is, then a question for the Commission.

Mr President, I should like to end by commenting on the financial feasibility of this programme. I should first of all like to say in connection with this that we can make more efficient use of manpower and financial resources by cooperating with the Council of Europe. It is in the sphere of nature and the protection of the countryside, on which a number of amendments have been proposed, and in restoring stocks of wild animals and plants, that the Council of Europe has already achieved a great deal, and it would be unnecessarily wasteful to carry out our own separate assessment ignoring one which already exists elsewhere. What I would like to say is this: the Commission can set up a fine action programme and Parliament can add a number of requests, but if the necessary financial resources and staff are not made available, the our efforts will have been in vain. The Directorate-General concerned simply does not have the capacity to carry out the various aspects of the environmental policy adequately, let alone to put new plans into action. In its Resolution of 20 November last year, Parliament requested the setting up of an Environmental Fund as a structural means of covering up the lack of personnel and financial resources. We wholeheartedly reiterate this request.

President. — I call the Socialist Group.

Mr Muntingh. — *(NL)* The third environmental action programme is to be the starting point of the Community's environmental policy for the next four to five years. So it constitutes an extremely important element of this policy, and we have studied it very closely.

We have reached the conclusion that, except for a few flaws which we have attempted to put right with a number of amendments, it is a good programme. If all of its plans are realized, we shall end up in a Utopian situation. What fun to see our colleagues in that Utopia, Mr Sherlock and Mrs Scrivener for example, or Mr Mertens and Mrs Schleicher, or Mr Johnson and Mrs Lenz, or perhaps Mrs Squarcialupi and Mr Berkhouwer, dancing to Commissioner Narjes' tune.

However, I fear reality will be somewhat different, as the forbidden fruit is, at it were, piled high and those involved are already gorging themselves on their way to this earthly paradise. The Commission, for example, which drew up this programme, this passport to paradise, seems to have no intention of making sufficient personnel available to enable the programme to be carried out adequately. This means that it is making a laughing stock of itself, Parliament and everyone who desperately hopes that at last something is really going to be done about these terrible environmental problems, and it is fobbing them off with a programme which amounts to a load of hot air.

The Council is soon to adopt this programme, including, we would like to expect, our amendments, but it

Muntingh

seems to have no intention of making adequate funds available for it. If this is the case then we are all beating our heads against a brick wall, and, like the proverbial donkey, running after a magnificent carrot that we shall never have. And finally the Member States, who, together with the Commission, would have to implement the programme, seem to have no inclination for any form of cooperation, but, rather the contrary. Directives adopted years ago for example, have still not been incorporated into the Member States' legislation. Regulations are not being enforced and the public, the electorate is being kept in the dark. A regrettable example of this is the idea put forward by the French Minister, M. Crepeau, a socialist I regret to say, that the hunting of turtle doves should be realized again, which is totally against the Directive on birds.

If we in the European Community cannot keep our own house in order as far as the environment is concerned, what can we expect when we come to carry out the last point of the action programme, dealing with cooperation with developing countries? My group, I must point out, is very pleased and grateful to offer its complete support to the Commission for being prepared to include this point. But how can we make a serious attempt to get to grips with the huge problem of the total destruction of large areas of the Third World, if we ourselves are not prepared to put our own excellent plans into operation?

Mr President, you will have gathered by now that I am pessimistic, and that on the very day when I should be happy, since the third environmental action programme in itself, and certainly if Parliament's proposed amendments are adopted, is a cause for satisfaction, and something which calls for our cooperation and for our wholehearted efforts. But whether a divided Commission, and indecisive and impotent Council and the nationalist governments of the Member States actually give us the opportunity to make these efforts, is a question which, I am afraid, gives me no cause for optimism.

President. — I call Mr Gerokostopoulos.

Mr Gerokostopoulos. — (GR) Mr President, the texts before the House are encouraging because they constitute further proof that all the Community bodies have correctly grasped how important and wide-ranging the problem of the environment is. It is a problem which concerns not only the protection of human health and of man's immediate environment but also the measures which are essential for the social and economic development of the Community. In the light of these considerations, special emphasis should be given to the Commission's initiative in setting up the action programme on the environment funds for the period 1982-86. The proposals contained in its relevant communication to the Council enable us — unlike what the previous speaker said — to be optimis-

tic both as regards the consolidation of the satisfactory results achieved to date by Community policy in this area and as regards the intensity of the future action which is called for. This optimism is justified by the fact that there are many positive elements in the proposed action programme. I feel it is both necessary and useful to draw your attention to some of these elements which are bound to be regarded as encouraging.

Firstly, the announced introduction of a policy of prevention and the abandoning of the policy pursued so far, which sought mainly to repair damage already done to the environment.

Secondly, the insistence on the 'polluter pays' principle, to which particular importance should be attached by the governments of the Member States.

Thirdly, the stressing of the need to provide special protection for the Mediterranean, which is terribly at risk, and to do so as part of the overall Mediterranean policy which is being set up.

Despite the positive points which I have quoted by way of example, there are at the same time others which might be described either as negative or as omissions. Time does not permit me to deal with them in detail, particularly since this is done in the report by the Committee on the Environment and since the points were also referred to in Mrs Schleicher's speech. However, it would be an omission on my part, let it be stressed, not to praise the work of the members of the committee, and especially that of its rapporteur, Mr Alber, who deserve to be congratulated on the serious and painstaking way in which they drew up their report. With the corresponding motion for a resolution and the amendments to the Commission's texts, the members of the Committee on the Environment have made a successful attempt to fill in the gaps and eliminate the shortcomings in the draft action programme and also to improve its scope. For the information of the House, special mention should be made of some of these — in my opinion — useful and important amendments. I consider the following to be so.

Firstly, the addition to the proposed Council resolution. The purpose of this is, as Mr Johnson has stressed, to get the Council to provide more personnel and financial resources for the implementation of the action programme. At the same time, there is a proposal for a decisive measure by setting up the appropriate financial bodies — environment funds, for example — which were proposed in the Parliament Resolution of 20 November based on the report by Mr Alber.

Secondly, the addition to the second paragraph of point 6 of the proposed programme. It seeks to avoid the risk of the continuation of the environment policy being dependent on the development of the economic situation in the Community.

Gerokostopoulos

Thirdly, the addition to the second paragraph of point 14 of the programme, which provides for the continuation of financial support for non-governmental organizations which work in the environmental field and make a really considerable contribution to environmental protection.

Fourthly, the edition to point 21, which refers to the need to study measures to eliminate pollution from the exhaust fumes of new cars.

I hope, Mr President, that the Council and the Commission will adopt the suggestions and approve the Committee on the Environment's amendments, which seek to make the proposed action programme more effective. In conclusion I should like, if I may, to repeat and stress, as did the committee and its rapporteur, Mr Alber, that unless there is an increase in financial resources and personnel, the action programme will not go beyond the stage of pious wishes.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Papefstratiou.

Mr Papefstratiou. — *(GR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it is to our Parliament's credit that it takes such a lively interest in questions of environmental protection. We must all recognize our obligations towards future generations, since there are extremely grave risks to the very survival of the human race if one considers that in the last 40 years mankind, acting with carelessness, thoughtlessness and superficiality rather than with malice, has done more to destroy the environment than in the previous 2 000 years of human history.

We therefore welcome with satisfaction the comprehensive nature of the report drawn up by Mr Alber on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, and we expect it to meet with Parliament's very broad acceptance.

In my opinion the following are among the most interesting approaches from the practical point of view.

When it comes to adopting measures, where will the main emphasis have to be placed, on prevention or on suppression?

Hitherto suppression has had the lion's share, but this has proved to be the wrong policy. We consider that most attention should be paid to prevention, without of course neglecting the necessary measures of suppression either.

Another point is the effective implementation of the appropriate legislative measures, since there is no doubt that the legislation in all the countries, at least of our Community, has been considerably improved in recent years.

I am basically in favour of the very strict application of penalties — and possibly not only in the form of fines — since, ladies and gentlemen, while we take it for granted that those guilty of common crimes must be punished by imprisonment, why not think in terms of similar punishments for those who commit crimes against the environment in which we live and who deprive present and future generations of the means and quality of life?

Catalogues of wishes and scientific pronouncements on the problems of environmental protection, as well as actions to increase people's awareness of such problems, are admirable, but legislators must also do their duty towards society in this matter.

In Greece over the last seven years a number of sound legal measures have been taken by the New Democracy Party during its period in office, but they have not always been implemented satisfactorily, and I think this also happens in many other countries.

I should now like to draw the attention of the House to three specific points among the many and varied interesting questions concerning the environment.

I would refer to the problems of marine pollution, the spoiling of coastal areas by a mass of tasteless and dangerous constructions which are at the same time sources of pollution, and the problems of atmospheric pollution, which is particularly dangerous for the population, particularly that of big cities, and to which particular attention must be paid.

For all these reasons I appeal in this House, where many millions of European citizens are represented, to the Council of Ministers and to the Commission to adopt effective programmes, even if they are costly, and to ensure that the Community's common policy is fully implemented in all the Member States. After all, we all have a sacred duty and obligation towards future generations to ensure that they will not have to curse us.

(Applause)

President. — I call the Commission.

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to begin by addressing a sincere word of thanks to Mr Alber for his excellent report and to all those Members who have taken part in this debate, a debate which has, in my view, been characterized by an impressive number of interesting, instructive and inspiring contributions.

It is now up to me to try to strike a reasonable balance between the limitations you expect me to set on my speaking time and the answers you expect to all the questions which have been put to me. Perhaps I may

Narjes

begin by pointing out that what we have here is a multi-annual programme, an action programme, which is undoubtedly an ambitious one, but which is not intended to be unrealistically ambitious. It is a programme which requires the commitment of all concerned, including the Council, once the programme has cleared that stage.

Now, the fact is that, to take up Mr Muntingh's example, the Council is not a tribunal of wise men who have been sent from above to direct this Community; I think I am right in saying that there is no-one in the entire Council who does not belong to one of the parties represented in this House.

It is therefore our duty to exert whatever influence we have on the Council's decision-making process, whether the matter at hand be protection of the environment or any other Community business. While it is true that paradise is not just around the corner and the Elysian fields are still shrouded in the distant mists, we must stick steadfastly to our exacting and painstaking task rather than succumb to scepticism as to the unattainability of the goals we have set ourselves. That, after all, is something we owe our children and our children's children on this extremely important — not to say vital — issue. I merely wish to make that point in reply to the kind of scepticism which I can, to be fair, understand.

As I said before, the problem we are faced with here is a topical one and comprises a number of elements. In the final analysis, the issue is a human one; what we are concerned about is the people of Europe, whose interest we wish to arouse and on whose behaviour we must exert influence. Mr Maher is quite right to ask what we were doing to educate the man-in-the-street. Allow me to say first of all, from the purely formal point of view, that this is first and foremost a matter for the Member States. We have no access to the instruments of a European educational policy, but our concern for this problem is reflected in a number of individual measures we have taken, and we are endeavouring to exert some influence on the educational process and on what is taught in schools.

At this juncture, I should like to answer a question put by Mr Eisma. We have a kind of pilot project, consisting of a network of schools in which schools' representatives meet regularly in Brussels to compare notes. The Commission supplies educational material which is tested in discussions with the schools' representatives. We are ready and willing to procure a detailed report for Mr Eisma should he be interested. Another potentially effective educational tool is the use of resources under budget heading 6613, which is intended to finance educational and study projects and thus make for a more efficient educational programme for children, students and apprentices.

This month marks the tenth anniversary of the Stockholm Conference, and the opportunity was taken

recently to hold a world conference on the United Nations' Development Programme in Nairobi. The Community was represented at that conference by the Commission and the Council. The reason I mention this fact is because all the delegations made it very clear — and this shows to some extent how far we have come since the Stockholm Conference in 1972 — that the world can only develop sensibly — in other words, economically acceptably — provided the requirements of environmental protection and good management of natural resources are borne in mind permanently by all concerned and not merely advocated by politicians in their weekend speeches. For that reason, all the delegations said very clearly that they were ready and willing to espouse a voluntary environment policy and undertook to quicken the pace of work that was already in progress and to introduce new projects in the spirit of this programme.

As far as Europe is concerned, I should like to point out in particular that over the last 10 years — in which we have come to regard environmental policy as a political activity — we have done a lot to prepare the ground for specific projects. We have set up administrations and undertaken studies, we have made people aware of the problem and created political institutions, and much more, as Mr Teuber has pointed out. But all that is merely the groundwork for an environmental policy and is no substitute for an effective policy in the true sense of the word!

As I see the problem, the second 10 years must be devoted to drastically quickening the pace and convincing those in positions of responsibility that they have a duty to match their general undertakings with action in every respect and to come up with something concrete to underline their own recognition of the problem and the political priority it has been given over the past 10 years.

I should like to reiterate in this respect that we were given the opportunity in April of this year to organize the third meeting of the Committee of International Development Institutions for the Environment in Brussels, that the Commission has accepted these recommendations and, in particular, has acknowledged that it has a duty to coordinate environmental policy and development policy in the Third World. The Commission intends to bear this in mind not only in respect of the current Lomé Convention, but also by stressing the connections between the two policies more than has hitherto been the case in future negotiations on renewals of the Lomé Convention.

I should like to say to Mrs Schleicher that, generally speaking, we are of course prepared to explore every international negotiating opportunity to the full. Even as regards the Eastern Bloc, we have the first contact, the first joint undertaking, in the form of the joint participation in the Geneva Agreement on long-distance air pollution, i.e. European attempts to combat the problem of acid rain. We have potential partners in

Narjes

East and West and we are prepared to extend this cooperation to other spheres. I just wanted to make this brief reference to Nairobi and our other international obligations.

What we have here is a first encouraging example. We know what has been achieved in Europe, but we also know all too well what is still lacking and where we have to set about putting things right.

I am therefore all the more grateful for this debate. A lot of speakers have referred to the inadequate resources, the inadequate staffing and the underdeveloped political will on the part of the Council — in this case the Council of Budget Ministers. We are particularly grateful for any support of this kind.

I would prefer not to comment in detail at the moment on what has been done on the various points or what we intend to do. There really is not sufficient time to do that. I merely wish to reiterate that environmental policy is, as far as we are concerned, a preventive structural policy. In the normal course of events, this concept of environmental policy will do away with the conflict between economic and ecological considerations to the satisfaction, I believe, of both sides. But this will only be possible provided that the ecological outline conditions are drawn up reliably, legally unimpeachably and in good time, to ensure that we can set some store by them and so that they are not subject to constant short-term change.

Quite a number of proposals for amending or extending the programme have been put forward, and the Commission can, given certain changes in the wording, accept Amendments Nos 1 to 12, 14 to 17, 19 to 23, 26 to 29, 31 to 33 and 46 without question.

I have a few remarks to make in particular on Amendment No 18, one which has been referred to on a number of occasions, and which features the call for a general directive on trans-frontier pollution. We really wonder whether a legal instrument along those lines would be practicable and whether it would be possible to apply such an abstract provision in individual cases, if only because of the problem of ascertaining the source of trans-frontier pollution.

The Commission's policy hitherto of seeking specific individual solutions case by case has not been entirely unsuccessful, if you take into consideration the Seveso directive, the environmental impact testing, the directive on the quality of bathing or drinking water and the provisions regarding dangerous waste. In each individual case, we have made arrangements for trans-frontier problems and the attendant political constraints.

We have so far always thought this to be the most promising way, but that depends on how you view the question of getting such provisions through the Council. Provided the governments concerned realize what

is required and acknowledge that there is a need for something to be done, they are usually prepared to accept provisions along those lines. However, as soon as they are asked to sign a blank cheque and have no say as to how that cheque is to be cashed, and which could give rise to collective lawsuits or other such controversial measures, we have usually taken the view that there would be little prospect of our getting our way in the Council. It is because of the potential political impracticability that we have refrained from aiming for general legislation and preferred to work out specific provisions from case to case, on the understanding that these are in the interests of our common aim and will bear fruit.

Amendment No 13 is concerned with the suggestion that special levies be raised for imports from countries with low environmental standards. I am pleased that this amendment has been tabled, as it shows that this House is conscious of these problems, especially in negotiations with third countries.

However, any levy of this kind is bound to be an obstacle to free trade, and we would be leaving ourselves open here to the charge or protectionism — something which is not in line with the Community's trade policy. I therefore feel that the Commission should bear this suggestion in mind, but should not necessarily make it recommended practice. On the other hand, I would ask you not to be too lenient about wielding this impressive cudgel. That is my frank reply to the potential such an instrument has to offer, but also on the risks which its use would entail.

As to the proposal that green papers should be published in the field of environmental policy, I may say that the Commission has already taken up this idea in other sectors and would have no qualms about doing the same in the field of environmental policy. The only condition is that the material selected for a green paper must be suitable in individual cases too. A green paper must not be used a pretext for doing nothing or as a second-class funeral for an idea that no-one wishes to pursue for a few years.

So I would like to take up this suggestion with certain reservation. Let us not forget the work of the Council of Europe. There are far too few of us for us to allow ourselves the luxury of duplicating work, and for that reason it sometimes happens that the work done by the Council of Europe — as indeed that done by some national Parliament or another — can have the force of pre-decision-making enquiries which we should always take into consideration. I am thinking here, for instance, of the excellent studies produced by the House of Lords, which have often been a help to us in the past.

The Commission hopes that the keynote debate conducted by the Council on the 24th will help us to make progress on this programme too. It would be a source of pleasure to me if, in the second half of 1982, we could

Narjes

get down to discussing the details of future developments in the committee.

(Applause)

President. — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

12. Dangers arising from the use of consumer products

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-207/82), drawn up by Mrs Seibel-Emmerling on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, on the

proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-632/79 COM(79) 725 final) for a decision introducing a Community system for the rapid exchange of information on dangers arising from the use of consumer products.

I call the rapporteur.

Mrs Seibel-Emmerling, rapporteur. — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, this rapid information system has certainly not lived up to its name. I hope, however, that after such lengthy preparations we can finally bring the matter to a satisfactory conclusion — or rather, a beginning — and set up a rapid and efficient system to provide the Member States with information on dangers which could arise from the use of a product or parts of a product.

You may recall, ladies and gentlemen, that this House discussed this matter almost exactly a year ago and at the same time carried out a number of exercises in the rules of procedure, which were still rather new to us at the time.

To refresh your memories, I would ask you to re-read the verbatim report of the sitting of 9 June 1981 — some of it does not make very pleasant and cheering reading. The present Commission report, to which I am tabling three motions for amendments on behalf of my Committee, seeks to establish the most rapid and unbureaucratic system possible to protect and warn people against certain dangers. How necessary such a system can be has been emphatically illustrated of late by the Spanish cooking oil catastrophe.

A very large majority of the Committee welcomes the Commission proposal.

Since the Committee's discussions I have felt sure that the Commission would be willing to accept and comply with our proposed amendments. They aim at providing consumer protection on a broad front, but do

not seek to exclude producers and traders, while allowing their views to be heard. Most of the Committee also agreed that the consumer protection we have in mind should not only cover the people of the Community; established findings should also be passed on to the third countries concerned. The Committee therefore requests the Commission to bear this in mind in future discussions.

My own request — one which, incidentally, the Commission used to be firmly in favour of — that in addition to the rapid information system we also need an effective recall system for dangerous consumer goods, was supported by only a minority of the Committee.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I hope this House will make the right decision today and thus help, if only a little, to strengthen consumer protection in the Community in this important matter.

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

Vice-President

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

Mrs Lentz-Cornette. — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to begin by thanking Mrs Seibel-Emmerling for her report, which certainly cannot have been easy to produce. Indeed, it was a difficult birth for a system which is supposed to be rapid. The European People's Party has finally accepted the Commission proposal on the setting up of a rapid information exchange system thanks to the reassuring comments made to us in committee by the Commissioner, Mr Narjes.

The proposal is to set up a country by country telephone network comprising, in all, ten telephones which will be in contact with each other and with the Commission switchboard in Brussels. Each Member State will appoint a person to take charge of this extremely rapid information system. We are in favour of the system, which will be simple, inexpensive and, as Mrs Seibel-Emmerling has said, completely unbureaucratic.

Time will tell whether it can work efficiently. On this point, I would like to make a number of comments.

Firstly, the proposal covers a very wide range of products including foodstuffs, pharmaceuticals, cosmetics, household appliances, as well as clothes, cars and all other means of transport — in other words, everything which the consumer uses throughout his life to eat,

Lentz-Cornette

cure his illnesses, use his leisure time and travel. The purpose of the system is to provide protection against all the dangers arising from all these products.

However, the range of possible accidents is very wide: perhaps it should be sub-divided into a number of categories.

Moreover, when the adulterated oil mentioned by the rapporteur had led to a number of deaths, it took weeks, months even, for intensive analysis to prove that denatured oil intended for industry was the cause. How much time elapsed and how many people died in Spain before the cause of these fatalities was discovered? In some cases, the harmful effects of a product do not come to light until some time has passed. The same is true in the case of the infantile deformities caused by thalidomide. It is also necessary to wait some time before the pharmaceutical in question is established with virtual certainty.

This leads me to my second comment: such a system can be effective when the harmful effects of a product become apparent quickly and their causes can be rapidly established. It becomes much less effective as the time lag between the accident and establishing its causes increases.

Thirdly, it is sometimes difficult to protect the consumer against damage or injury caused by defective products, because very often the consumer is unaware, for example, whether a car accident is his own fault or is due to a mechanical defect. For if his garage does not inform him of similar accidents which have occurred, how can he be expected to know whether his car has a hidden defect? His guarantee will help him for a certain period, but not indefinitely.

Fourthly, a directive on the responsibility of the manufacturer for damage or injury caused by defective products would make it possible to protect the health and safety of the consumer more effectively. We are aware that such a directive is being prepared and it would entitle the consumer to claim adequate compensation. Rapid information between all the Member States and with third countries where defective products are used would be most useful in such cases.

Fifthly, consumers have a right to information concerning the quality of the products and the safeness of the appliances they use. They must have access to safe products, especially products which do not damage their health either in the short or long term. But they also have certain duties, in particular the duty to inform those around them, and even consumer associations and government bodies, of accidents they have suffered. Manufacturing defects are in many cases established with certainty on the basis of cross-checks and series of similar accidents. In this way too manufacturers can be compelled to withdraw a product from the market and replace it with a safe one.

The safety needed is provided by the consumer association.

Lastly, information held by government bodies can only be useful if it is backed by information from consumers. The information process must be structured both horizontally and vertically if it is to be completely effective in protecting the consumer.

President. — I call the European Democratic Group.

Miss Hooper. — Mr President, on behalf of my group I am also very pleased to be able to welcome this second report by Mrs Seibel-Emmerling. We are aware of the importance which many consumer groups throughout the Community attach to this proposal from the Commission and their belief that it will constitute a further valuable measure of protection for consumers against dangerous products. When this matter was before this House last year, my group was very concerned that the Commission's proposal was an unbalanced and unnecessary one. In the further discussions we have had in committee which have led to the production of this second report, we have attempted to work constructively to produce a more acceptable proposal. We have been concerned with two particular problems.

The first is the need to ensure that any overlap between the system currently proposed for the rapid transmission of information on dangerous products and those systems already in existence, such as the OECD arrangements, does not lead either to the creation of a new bureaucratic layer or the creation of new national machinery to implement it. We felt that, apart from duplicating controls, any duplication of systems might in fact slow down the process of informing consumers of any danger as swiftly as possible, which we regard as being the main object of this measure. We therefore welcome the amendment to the Commission's proposal adopted by the committee which ensures that the Community system will be or can be administered by existing services within the Member States.

The second concern of my group has been the need to achieve a proper balance. Clearly our first priority is and must remain the safety of the public and the assurance that if there is in the words of the proposal 'an immediate and acute risk to the consumer', then information will be transmitted rapidly to enable the national authorities to take the appropriate action. But we must also bear in mind the interests of the manufacturer, the safety of whose product is being called into question and the adverse publicity to which this exchange of information may give rise. That is certainly no reason for withholding the information, but we do feel it necessary to ensure that, wherever it can be done swiftly, the producer, distributor or importer of the product should be contacted by the Member State authorities.

Hooper

We are pleased that an amendment to this effect is also now incorporated into the committee's report. In addition, we also lay emphasis on paragraphs 5 and 6 of the motion for a resolution which provide that the information exchange system should be used only after proper investigation and that it must not become an instrument either of protectionism or of unfair competition.

Mr President, as a group we will be voting in favour of this report and the proposal in the belief that the amendments adopted by the committee take account of the interests of both consumers and manufacturers, interests which we in this group do not regard as being contradictory. We will be giving our support to the introduction of a system which we hope will be an effective one, which we hope will be applied uniformly in all Member States and which we hope above all will be a real step forward in the Community's attempts to protect the health and safety of consumers.

President. — I call the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mrs Scrivener. — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in the previous debate we rejected the Commission's proposal on this system for the exchange of information on the dangers arising from the use of consumer products. We felt that the earlier provisions had certain shortcomings, and that is of course why we approved of the aim of the system in the field of consumer protection.

As we know, there is already an informal information system between the Member States and the Commission in the field of foodstuffs. However, we must not forget the Spanish oil affair, nor should we forget that Parliament unanimously adopted a resolution which I had tabled on the need for the Community to develop a system for the rapid withdrawal from the market of products which can be regarded as a danger to consumer health.

It should of course be possible to examine such products and withdraw them temporarily to ascertain whether they are dangerous or not. We shall therefore be supporting the amendment which has been tabled on this point, if only to ensure that Parliament acts consistently once again.

On the basis of this approach we re-examined the Commission's proposal; we have made a number of amendments which are likely to improve it, and that explains why the Environment Committee has requested that not only producers but also distributors and importers should be consulted in advance, since it would obviously be ludicrous not to involve them. This has in any case always been the position upheld by the Liberal and Democratic Group with regard to proposals relating to consumer protection since, contrary to what some people believe, the interests of con-

sumers do not conflict with those of industry. With this aim in mind, the Community must help producers, in any way possible, to enable them to avoid any mistakes which could jeopardize the health or safety of the people of Europe or to improve safeguards. Preventive measures like this — and prevention is always better than cure, would therefore reduce the hazards to which consumers may be exposed in using consumer products. We have already had a tragic example of this — one which must be used as a lesson.

(Applause)

President. — I call the Commission.

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (DE) Mr President, I shall begin by expressing my warmest thanks to Mrs Seibel-Emmerling for her report, which has provided us with an excellent basis for this second debate. We are very pleased that after last year's debate we can now discuss this matter on the basis of her new report. I regard this as a particularly worthwhile debate, and because of the large measure of agreement it enables me to be fairly brief and thus comply with the wishes of the Bureau. I have already sinned twice today, and I would ask you to see to it that I do not speak too long this time.

I have only the following brief comments to make.

Firstly, the purpose of the proposal is to set up a system for the rapid exchange of information between the Member States and the Commission which would make it possible to identify consumer goods representing an immediate and considerable danger to the health and safety of consumers.

Secondly, the desirability of such a system is stressed by the first and second consumer programme, and our need for such a programme has been dramatically highlighted by the 'olive oil' incident in Spain.

Thirdly, the proposal clearly seeks to create an un-bureaucratic systems. The only equipment used will be a few telexes and telephones to permit a smooth flow of information on a mutual basis, as is normal among good neighbours.

The sole purpose of the proposal — and this is my next point — is to identify dangerous products. It makes no provision for measures, action and repercussions. These remain exclusively the responsibility of the Member States. We cannot therefore lay down any rules on the withdrawal of products as a possible measure to be taken in the event of alarming information.

The system is to operate merely between responsible authorities, and confidentiality must be respect in all cases. Such operations cannot therefore be made known to the mass media. I must also stress that prod-

Narjes

ucts for professional use are not covered by the system and that third countries, at any rate for the time being, are not yet included. Having said that, I do not wish to exclude the possibility of their being covered at a later date.

On the whole, we feel that this resolution contributes towards consumer protection, and we are therefore prepared to accept amendments Nos 1, 2 and 3. As for amendment No 4, it follows from my remark on the separate responsibilities of the Community and the Member States that this amendment falls within the sphere of competence of the Member States. I wanted to make this point clear, but otherwise I would like to repeat my thanks for your comments.

(Applause)

President. — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

13. Air transport

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-286/82), drawn up by Mr Schwartzberg on behalf of the Committee on Transport, on the

proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-461/81 COM(81)396 final) for a regulation applying Articles 85 and 86 of the Treaty (rules on competition applying to undertakings) to air transport.

I call the rapporteur.

Mr Schwartzberg, rapporteur. — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, this report follows on from the report on competition in air transport which, you will recall, I presented on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs in November 1980. Progress in competition in air transport is clearly necessary. But increased competition should obviously be carefully planned, balanced and orderly and should take full account of the characteristics peculiar to this sector and of all the requirements involved.

Foremost among these are the social and regional requirements and the requirements of safety. If it is to be acceptable, the strengthening of competition must remain compatible with the essential requirement to devote attention to safety, the optimum protection of passengers and the quality of the services provided. It should also safeguard the future and the social rights of airline personnel. Lastly, it should take account of the common interest, especially regional development and the tasks which government bodies often entrust to airline companies. With this in mind we requested,

in paragraph 16 of the motion for a resolution contained in my previous report, that the Commission should provide itself as soon as possible with the implementing regulation needed to ensure that the rules of competition are strictly observed by the airline companies. This has apparently already been done. I would like briefly to comment on the need for such a regulation as well as on its contents and application.

Articles 85 and 86 of the Treaty of Rome apply to air transport, as the Court of Justice has repeatedly confirmed, and till now the Commission, with no autonomous powers, depended for the application of the rules of competition in this sector on the cooperation of the Member States. This situation has numerous drawbacks which became apparent, for example, in the Sterling Airways affair, in which, acting solely on the basis of Article 89 of the Treaty, the Commission encountered many difficulties in examining the case. Moreover, there is a danger that cases may arise in the Member States which are not consistent from one Member State to another and which do not take sufficient account of the peculiar nature of this sector.

The motion for a resolution tabled by the Commission is a version which has been modified to meet the needs of the sector referred to by Regulation No 17 of 1962, which the Commission has been using since then to apply its general rules of competition and which provides, in particular, for the necessary powers of investigation, checks and sanctions. For these reasons paragraphs 2 and 3 of the resolution approve the principle of this regulation with, however, some reservations.

The following comments can be made concerning the actual contents of the draft regulation.

Its scope is limited, as is pointed out in paragraph 4 of the motion for a resolution. It applies, in fact, only to air transport companies, whether publicly, privately or jointly owned, whose behaviour suggests an autonomous commercial policy. When the activities of these undertakings, which in most Member States are publicly owned, result from instructions received from government bodies or take the form of particular tasks required by such bodies, the regulation does not prejudice the application of Article 90 of the EEC Treaty. However, when the structural conditions for competition apply, in particular in the fixing of fares and access to the market, the scope of the regulation may gradually widen, as pointed out in paragraph 5 of the resolution.

Similarly, the Commission felt that it should not for the time being undertake to define certain categories of agreements or practices prohibited by Article 85(1) or exempted by Article 85(3). We approve of this graduated approach, because this sector is so complex that if the rules of competition were applied in a heavy-handed and indiscriminating way the competitiveness of European transport companies, on both the

Schwartzenberg

Community and the international markets, could be weakened.

Lastly, there are two provisions which distinguish the regulation under discussion from its model, Regulation No 17 of 1962, on which it is based. These relate to the powers to carry out checks, investigations and apply sanctions.

Thus, with a view to simplification, and in accordance with the letter of Article 87, 2 (b) of the EEC Treaty, undertakings can opt whether or not to notify the Commission of their agreements or concerted practices. Where undertakings wish to give notification of their agreements, Article 5, third paragraph, of the draft regulation stipulates, again with a view to simplification, that if a period of 90 days elapses, this implies exemption on the part of the Commission in order to meet the specific needs of this sector.

For the same reason Article 9 states that any Member State can choose to request a Council meeting to examine, with the Commission, matters of principle relating to the common transport policy which it feels have a bearing on a particular case on which the Commission is to take a decision. This regulation would be of a purely technical nature were it not for the significance which Parliament intends to attach to the widening of competition in air transport.

When the report was being examined in committee, our discussions were concerned mainly with the means of applying this competition policy in air transport. Thus, in paragraph 7, we emphasize the need to take account, in developing the competition policy, of the safeguarding of the social conditions, the quality of service and the safeness of air travel. The Member States can only make progress towards the mutual opening up of their air transport markets if the working conditions and pay of personnel are harmonized. At present these conditions vary considerably from one Member State to another. Without harmonization, we could see the emergence of '£100 airlines'. The same applies to the maintenance of standards of service and of the safeness of air travel.

These considerations, expressed in the report by Mr Hoffmann which was adopted by Parliament, and also in my first report, imply willingness on our part to continue to develop competition in this sector on an orderly basis. The mistrust which we had expressed concerning total deregulation has been sadly vindicated by the collapse of the Laker and Braniff companies. We are now witnessing the very adverse effects of this trend towards deregulation on employment, personnel and the general development of the sector.

We should not therefore confuse increased competition with absolute, complete, indeed cut-throat competition which would not take account of the real interests of passengers, personnel, and the common interest, in particular regional development. In its opi-

nion, the Transport Committee expressed the same concern, and as far as the Legal Affairs Committee is concerned, we have mentioned in paragraph 6 of the motion for a resolution its wish that Council should adopt this regulation soon and, if necessary, by a qualified majority, in accordance with the provisions expressly stated in Article 87 of the EEC Treaty.

Lastly, paragraph 8 points out that if the extension of the competition policy is to be effective, the Commission will require increased resources.

Such is the scope of this regulation. It is the first phase in the application of a policy on competition in air transport which, as pointed out in paragraphs 1 and 9 of the motion for a resolution, considers the needs of the sector, will benefit users and will help undertakings to improve their competitiveness.

I hope that this report, which was adopted by a very large majority of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, will meet with your approval.

President. — I call the Socialist Group.

Mr Key. — Mr President, I think this is a very timely debate because for most of us in this House who spend a large part of our lives on aeroplanes, aeroplanes like the poor of the world unfortunately are always with us. We have, however, got to note, as Mr Schwartzenberg did, that a number of these airline companies have gone bankrupt in the last few months, in many cases because of excessive competition. But despite its vital importance to the Community, air transport is something we do not often have much chance to debate in this House. This is why I believe that it is important for us to use this opportunity in such a way that our efforts stand at least a sporting chance of being translated into future action.

I welcome Mr Schwartzenberg's speech today. It was a considered speech explaining the problems of the airline industry. But I have serious reservations about the motion which is before this House to be voted on I hope in an hour or so. I feel that if this resolution is adopted unamended the Council will look at it, they will look at Mr Schwartzenberg's report, they will look at the Commission's proposal, they will nod very wisely, they will sigh very deeply and then just pass on to another item, as they do on so many transport matters. Why is this? I think it is for the very simple reason that the Commission's proposal is based on a very false premise. We are told that this is a mere procedural matter. That must mean that it seeks to determine the means by which effect can be given to an already agreed policy. But where is this policy? We do not have a common transport policy or a common air transport policy within this Community.

Not that one cannot be found. On the contrary, the Treaty of Rome refers to it quite specifically and it

Key

calls for a common transport policy. Depending on how you read the Treaty you may come to the very perfectly valid and logical conclusion that one of the things such a policy might be supposed to embrace is the principle enshrined in the Treaty's competition rules. However, you may not necessarily accept this vital link between the policy and the competition rules. I accept that there are those who would argue that this is a rather partisan approach. However that may be, the House will surely want to satisfy itself that these competition rules, much admired by certain sections of this House, are merely a matter of a procedural application. Can they in practice be applied? The answer is they cannot unless every air service's agreement entered into by Community governments with each other or with third parties is to be rendered illegal. The simple fact is that competition rules as they stand in the Treaty are totally incompatible with the concept of air space sovereignty and with the means that governments have adopted to give expression to this concept over the last 40 years. This House is, therefore, being led up a blind alley.

The shortcomings of the European air transport system are not hard to define. The Commission enjoys no monopoly in wanting to put them right. Some of them can be laid at the door of the airlines. Some, indeed, far more than most people seem to imagine, can be laid at the door of member governments. Some could be solved by the interjection of greater competition, greater freedom of the airlines to innovate with their fares and quality of service, free entry into the market place. That is what it is all supposed to be about, this common market, or so we are told. At present, so far as air transport is concerned, there is no such thing and as long as governments of the Community maintain total discretion over how their air space is to be used, commercially as well as militarily, there is no way in which the Treaty can be applied, procedurally or otherwise. In order to apply the principles of competition to air transport the tenet of national air sovereignty must be relinquished.

We are in this House to further the objectives of this Community. We surely want to remove the fetters on it. All this proposal will do is bind us still further. Given our priorities we must tell the Commission that they must get to the heart of the matter, not tinker with it sympathetically at this moment. The resolution adopted by this House must demand that. I therefore recommend to this House that they accept all the amendments proposed therein.

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

Mr Franz. — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we have long had cause to regret the fact that air transport is not subject to the rules on competition in the EEC Treaty. A socially committed market econ-

omy can only function with competition in all areas. Without competition, a market economy cannot be social. We therefore need more market economy and more competition in air transport.

But competition of course requires certain basic conditions. There must be equality of opportunity among airlines. This would involve harmonization of Community taxation, air safety controls and airport taxes. Social, regional and safety requirements must be taken into account.

The most important thing, however, in my opinion is to fight the undesirable practice of subsidies to air transport which distorts any type of competition. We dealt with the same problem this morning in the debate on steel. We have watched it happening for years: subsidies are, and it has to be repeated over and over again, one of the greatest enemies of competition and they are responsible for many unfortunate developments in Europe. Considerable maintenance subsidies have prevented the demise of unprofitable airlines which have not kept up with progress. This has meant that competitive airlines have often been unable to make the profits they need to finance the modernization which will safeguard jobs in air transport in the long term. Subsidies have led to distortion of competition in air transport in the European Community. They are detrimental to entrepreneurial freedom of decision, efficiency and readiness to take risks which are vital elements of the market economy. When it comes to individual business they reduce adaptability and their effect on the whole economy is to impair the control mechanisms of the market economy and reduce economic productivity and flexibility. If we do not take more decisive action against subsidies in air transport, our competitiveness in air transport may well decrease.

For Europe with its meagre resources in raw materials and energy, world free trade is vital. How else would we finance our urgently needed imports of raw materials and energy? Just because of the great importance that world trade has for us, we must have the best air transport possible. The increasing importance of air freight also means that we need to have the most modern and efficient airlines in the world which can compete effectively with the best non-European companies. Increased competition can help us to do this.

According to the Treaties it is the task of the European Community to guarantee internal competition and world free trade. We must constantly take action not only to defend competition — the very basis of our economic and social order — but also to improve it. Air transport cannot in principle be excluded from this even if, and I repeat this, many of the conditions for full competition in air transport, for instance the abolition of subsidies, still have to be met. It will not be easy but it will not stop us demanding that the right action should be taken.

Franz

The EPP Group therefore supports Mr Schwartzberg's report.

President. — I call the European Democratic Group.

Mr Moorhouse. — Mr President, we shall certainly be giving our firm support to the motions for resolution tabled by Mr Schwartzberg in what we feel is an excellent report. It is one which is admirably brief and very much to the point.

I think most of us could agree with him that there is a real need for a gradual and balanced increase in competition in the air transport sector as part of the natural development of a common transport policy to which Mr Key has referred. Obviously, we must ensure that safety is in no way impaired and we must look after the interests of all those who are working in the industry today.

Let me also, Mr President, pay tribute to the legal opinion of Mr Janssen van Raay which, as one has come to expect of him, is an important contribution to analysis of this complex and involved subject.

Now, Mr President, this proposal as Mr Schwartzberg himself has said, is of limited scope and merely a first step. But it is also a very necessary step for it cannot be right, surely, that IATA, the International Air Transport Association, should forever and a day determine what is good or bad for Europe and the air traveller. To leave it to them to determine air fares, who flies where, what facilities we get and so on and so forth, cannot be right. I am not saying IATA does not have a useful function. What I am saying is that we cannot allow and should not allow a conspiracy — and I use the word advisedly — to flourish indefinitely anymore than we are prepared to countenance international monopolies and cartels. And that is an issue that, quite clearly, the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs was quick to grasp.

In saying all this in what may appear to be a somewhat critical vein may I, however, welcome the presence unofficially at least through you, Mr President, of so many representatives of IATA and of the airlines who are here for this debate and add that we look forward to having a constructive debate with them in the months and years ahead.

I have just touched on the principle. But what, for instance, of the airfare situation in Europe which is an issue that worries and bothers so many of our constituents, not only in the United Kingdom but in Denmark and, I suspect, in Greece and in Italy and Ireland, certainly the far-flung countries?

Rightly or wrongly, Mr President, people generally feel that scheduled airfares are too high. They resent it and that is the consequence of part of the system that we are living with today.

Not only are they high but there are all kinds of anomalies. Why, for instance, is it, Mr President, that one can fly from Dublin to Strasbourg via London for £140 return yet it costs £196 return from London to Strasbourg on the same plane? I am talking now about the scheduled flights on the Monday morning — Dublin/London/Strasbourg £140 from Dublin to Strasbourg and £196 from London to Strasbourg. Or again, Mr President, did you and my colleagues know that it is cheaper to fly first class return — and I realize that we do not often do this — from Amsterdam to New York? In fact, it is much cheaper to get on the plane at Amsterdam and fly all the way to New York than it is to get on the plane at London.

Now that is what they call a cross-border saving in the terms of the airlines' jargon. But those two examples strongly suggest to me and, I feel, to Members of the House that airline fares are priced according to the perception of the airlines of what individual national markets will take. An analogy has been drawn by one of our colleagues with the motor-car price variations we have within the Community from country to country. I think there may be an interesting analogy to be explored there.

I hope I have said enough, Mr President, to you and to the House to indicate that there is scope for improvement on behalf of the air traveller within the Community and we certainly will support the excellent report by Mr Schwartzberg.

President. — I call the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Leonardi. — (*IT*) Mr President, the motion for a resolution we are looking at today attempts to extend the field of application of the rules on competition to air transport. To some extent, this proposal is laudable, because we might, as a result, obtain better service and cheaper flights within Europe.

Nevertheless, we must be careful to avoid the mistake of tackling genuine problems with the wrong solutions. The truth is that we cannot overlook the fact that if air fares in Europe are higher than elsewhere, costs in Europe are also higher than elsewhere, as a result of, amongst other things, the shorter journeys flown by our airlines and the high staff costs. There is no doubt that these difficulties cannot be overcome, as Mr Schwartzberg pointed out in his report, by 'full-blooded' implementation of the rules of competition and a policy of deregulation: we have already seen in the United States what negative effects that can have.

The Commission's proposal, therefore, opts for a prudent and gradual approach, but it does not appear to take adequate account of the special situation of airlines in Europe.

Leonardi

As regards the general criteria, we must bear in mind that in the majority of the Member States the airlines consider, rightly or wrongly, that the international agreements at present in force on air transport, which are based on bilateral and multilateral agreements, are incompatible with the introduction of Community legislation on competition. They fear that the only result that would be achieved would be to plunge the present, admittedly far from perfect, system into crisis, which would only favour the economically most viable airlines to the detriment of the weaker ones, with the resulting negative effects that we can easily imagine.

So, in our opinion, the only way to deal with the present situation, which undoubtedly has certain serious drawbacks and which in some respects cannot be allowed to continue, is to look at the idea of applying the rules of competition within the framework of a Community transport policy, such as we have called for on several occasions but which so far does not exist. Only in this way could something positive result from a policy of competition and the implementation of the rules of open competition, within prescribed limits.

We support the Commission's efforts, which are mainly confined to putting forward rules of procedure. However, we believe that action of this kind is not enough, precisely because there is no general field of reference. Such a field of reference cannot, of course, be prepared for by attempting to implement the rules on voting by a qualified majority at meetings of the Council of Ministers, because the necessary political will, which is at present lacking, cannot be created by procedures of this kind. In a word, though we appreciate the efforts that have been made, we believe that they are not appropriate and that they do not take certain particular circumstances into account. For this reason we shall abstain.

President. — I call Mrs Nikolaou.

Mrs Nikolaou. — (GR) Mr President, it is well known that in all the Member States air transport is largely State-controlled, and this is of course no coincidence. The operation of national airlines serves the vital interests of the Member States. Competition rules can only be applied to this sector if it done gradually and with the constant objective of abolishing very specific practices which are highly damaging to competition. On the other hand, the present regulation does not clearly stipulate its field of application. It seeks simply to bring about the transfer of powers relating to the implementation of competition rules from the national governments to the Commission, thus giving the Commission the right to decide in each case which agreements and which practices are forbidden and which are exempt under Articles 85 and 86. This is also why this regulation is almost exclusively of a procedural nature. Of the 22 articles it contains, only two

concern the actual substance of the question. It is true that the air transport sector has peculiarities which certainly make it very difficult to delimit strictly a regulation's field of application. Furthermore, detailed information is needed about the agreements and practices used nowadays, as well as thorough knowledge of the way in which the air transport sector works.

These problems, however, cannot be solved simply by increasing the Commission's powers, as the regulation does and as is also accepted by the Schwartzberg report. We have reservations both on the legal basis and on the field of application of the regulation. The amendments we have tabled to the report relate to these specific questions. In conclusion, we should like to stress that the regulation in its present version is damaging mainly to the national airlines of the small Member States and jeopardizes their survival. Furthermore, the implementation of this regulation may create something similar to the American 'deregulation', a system which, as you know, is being abandoned even by America. For this reason, the Greek Socialists have reservations as regards the position they will adopt in the vote on the Schwartzberg report, and our attitude will depend on what happens to the amendments we have tabled.

President. — I call Mr Herman.

Mr Herman. — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, my Group supports and shares the extremely well-founded opinions expressed by the rapporteur. I would just like to make two very brief points.

Firstly, competition is not an end in itself but should only be planned or established if it ensures a better distribution of the elements of production which result in benefits to the consumer.

It is questionable whether certain agreements in air transport improve the distribution of resources any more than unbridled and uncoordinated competition. We must therefore take account of the aim to benefit the consumer before embarking on a given course which might produce the opposite result.

The second point I would like to draw attention to is the considerable amount of work which the Commission still faces if it is to harmonize the conditions governing competition. In air transport, in fact, there are enormous differences in operating conditions which stem from the sovereign rights of the various Member States. There are landing dues, handling and the way in which companies are financed and subsidized; operating conditions differ radically from one airline to another, and this renders the wholesale application of the rules of competition totally ineffective, or at any rate discriminatory and unfair.

For these reasons, while we support the general policy and the Schwartzberg report, we shall be tabling

Herman

two or three amendments to take account of the points I have just mentioned.

President. — I call Mr Martin.

Mr Martin. — (*FR*) Mr President, the French Communists and Allies have already had occasion to express their disapproval of plans to apply the rules of competition provided for by Articles 85 and 86 of the Treaty to air transport.

I have observed that frequently, when this House votes in favour of extending the rules of competition to air transport, the Council of Transport Ministers refuses, by a very large majority, to commit itself to such a measure in view of the harmful effects of such a move. I also note the difficulties now facing the advocates of unbridled competition. Stark reality, in particular the disorder and waste caused by deregulation, have forced the supporters of liberalization to pay at least lip service to the need to curb competition.

In the very first paragraph of the motion for a resolution contained in the report by our colleague, Mr Schwartzberg, two opposing ideas are expressed in a single sentence — the desire for increased competition, which is seen as a necessity, is immediately countered by concern for orderliness and balance in its implementation. But the motion fails to specify how such a balance can be ensured, and the fundamental requirement — the so-called interests of consumers — makes it impossible to strike such a balance.

The particular features of the sector referred to in the motion, whether we consider the close interrelationship between air transport and a whole range of geographical, energy, economic, ecological or social constraints, prevent us from considering the overriding commercial aspect of the sector and from regarding fares as its most important feature.

While it is artificial to examine this problem without considering the role to be played by this sector — leaving aside all the infrastructure — it is dangerous to plan an effective transport policy without considering the other economic and social objectives which have to be pursued. Liberalization, by attaching overriding importance to individual consumption, makes it impossible to consider the general needs which a modern and economic transport system must fulfill.

Today — and this will apply even more in the future — the increased strength of government organizations makes it possible to create conditions favouring properly controlled competition to provide a satisfactory service at the lowest possible cost. Such a policy must be based on the role of the State in ensuring the coherence of the networks, especially the national and international air traffic networks.

Having learned from the experience of America, where liberalization has wrought instability and the disruption of their own network, we believe, as French men and women and as Europeans, that it would be to our advantage not to abandon the means of organizing and running our network to ensure that airlines of varying commercial viability have a real chance of compensation, as well as the guaranteed stability provided by a public service.

What some people are proposing is in fact quite simply the freedom of the fox in the hen-house — this we do not accept.

For all these reasons we shall again not be voting for the motion for a resolution to apply the principles of competition to air transport.

(*Applause*)

President. — This debate will now have to be adjourned as it is time to move on to the votes. The debate will be continued when the sitting resumes this evening.

I call the rapporteur.

Mr Schwartzberg, rapporteur. — (*FR*) Mr President, please forgive me if I raise a point of order and put a question. If there are only a couple of speakers left for this debate, personally I should be quite happy if the debate were closed now; otherwise, of course, the vote will have to be put back to Friday. We all know from past experience that the Chamber is hardly crowded on Fridays. If there are only a few Members still down to speak, I should be very grateful if you could let the debate run on for another five or six minutes so that we can close it now.

President. — Mr Schwartzberg, I appreciate your concern, which is quite legitimate. However, there are a fair number of Members still down to speak and the Commissioner will also need a few minutes to say what he wants to. As a result, I really must stick to the agenda drawn up by the House.

IN THE CHAIR: MR DANKERT

President

14. *Votes*¹

*

* *

*After the explanations of vote on the Hopper report
(Doc. 1-307/82)*

Mr Hopper. — Mr President, I asked if I could speak for one reason only. In the preparation of the two interim reports and the final report I have become acutely conscious of how much we depend upon our staff, the staff of the secretariat and the interpreters who are the unsung heroes of this Parliament, and I wish to express my gratitude to them.

(Applause)

*

* *

*Before the vote on the amendments to the Michel report
(Doc. 1-281/82)*

Mr Pannella. — (FR) Mr President, I wish to withdraw some amendments. Perhaps you will allow me a few seconds to explain why.

President. — That depends on the number of amendments you are withdrawing.

(Applause)

Mr Pannella. — (FR) You are being rash, Mr President, because that could make me withdraw them all.

All I wanted to say, Mr President, that once again I feel I have been placed in an impossible position. The fact of the matter is that a fortnight ago I tabled a series of amendments which were acknowledged to be — and I was grateful for that — quite consistent in their thinking. Even Mr Michel has just acknowledged this fact. Now, however, I am sorry to find that the rapporteur and thus the committee as well are going to come out against all the amendments I tabled. If you ask me, Mr President, this is not a very parliamentary way of doing things and personal vendettas are neither democratic or right where human relations are concerned. I do not want to have to ask the Members to go against the opinion of a rapporteur who says straight off that all the Pannella amendments ought to be withdrawn. I am therefore going to withdraw them, Mr President, and leave the field clear for all the other amendments which have been tabled here in Parliament.

¹ See Annex.

President. — I call Mr Wawrzik.

Mr Wawrzik. — (DE) Mr President, could you possibly tell us how much all this nonsense has cost?

(Applause)

President. — Mr Wawrzik, as a Quaestor you are in a better position to work it out than I am.

Mr Wawrzik. — (DE) I merely wanted to put it on record.

President. — That was what I thought.

I call the rapporteur.

Mr Michel, rapporteur. — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should not like there to be any misunderstanding among us and I also want to say that between Marco Pannella and myself there is no difference of opinion on the objective that has to be sought and resolutely pursued, and I mean the saving of human lives. I should also say that we are all in agreement on campaigning against malnutrition, ignorance and exploitation. If there are any differences, they are about how to go about it.

As for myself, if I said that I could not go along with the amendments which Marco Pannella tabled, it was not because he does not agree with the work I did on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation, of which he is a member anyway. We even got together to draw up a certain number of proposals and guidelines. If I am rejecting his amendments, it is primarily because what he has tabled constitutes another report! You only have to look at them to realize it.

I said that the debate would cover all the proposals from the ACP countries and those we aim to draw up in agreement with them. Let me add that the Socialist Group, like the Group of the European People's Party, has decided not to table any amendments to this motion for a resolution because we want to see some progress in the direction that has already been indicated. Consequently, although I have decided to reject the amendments tabled by Mr Pannella — in as much as the decision depends on me — I should also like all the other amendments to be rejected as well.

President. — I call Mr Irmer.

Mr Irmer. — (DE) Mr President, I just wanted to say that I am withdrawing Amendment No 160. It is somewhat abstruse. In the case of my other amendments, Nos 157, 158 and 159, I am sorry but I cannot

Irmer

withdraw them as they serve to update the Michel report. They in fact refer to unanimous decisions by Parliament in a recent sitting.

President. — I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (FR) I just want to say, Mr President, that Mrs Bonino's amendments will have to be withdrawn as well, because otherwise I imagine you are going to have some problems.

By way of closing, let me say that Mr Michel's words seem to give me satisfaction in a roundabout way. What I mean is that he is not rejecting amendments because of the person who tabled them. What he has decided to do — although I am not sure if it is the best idea — is to reject all the amendments. I feel that I have gained satisfaction to a certain extent.

As for Mr Wawrzik's question, it smacks of soapbox oratory and runs counter to the spirit in which we are all trying to work here.

*
* *

Before the vote on the amendments to the Rabbethge report (Doc. 1-202/82)

President. — I call Mr Cohen.

Mr Cohen. — (NL) Mr President, before we go on to the vote on this resolution and this decision, I should like to ask you to apply Rule 85(1) of the Rules of Procedure. I would submit that this whole report should be sent back to committee on account of what Mr Pisani said this afternoon. He told us that this proposal which we are discussing now is in fact only part of a much broader and more extensive Commission policy and that new Commission proposals will be on the table very shortly. It would be better in my view if the whole matter could be considered together. That is why I am asking for this report to be referred to the Committee on Development and Cooperation.

President. — I call the rapporteur.

Mrs Rabbethge, rapporteur. — (DE) As rapporteur, I should like to ask the Commission for its opinion.

*
* *

Before the vote on the Commission action programme — Alber report (Doc. 1-219/82)

President. — I call Mr Collins.

Mr Collins, Chairman of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection. — Before we proceed to this point, Mr President, I think it is in order for me to ask the Commission whether or not it has been able to reconsider the views expressed earlier on the speech that was made in the House by Mr Narjes. I refer in particular to Amendment No 39, which the Commissioner said he could not adopt. Has he changed his mind?

President. — Mr Narjes, I think that Mr Collins has made a procedural error. We must first vote on the action programme, and then this question can be asked of the Commission. So we first proceed to the vote on the action programme, and then we come back to Mr Collins' problem.

Mr Collins. — In that case the Commissioner has even longer to think out a reply.

President. — That is why I proposed it, but it is also according to the rules.

*
* *

After the vote

President. — I call the Commission to reply to Mr Collins' question.

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (DE) I am sorry but I am not able to go along with the proposed wording here, because in the first place the EFTA agreement that is referred to does not exist in this form, and the concepts of protection and survival are not defined in the way we need. I could accept a new version, but not this one.

President. — I call Mr Collins.

Mr Collins. — Mr President, I would like Mr Narjes to clarify what he means by the EFTA Agreement, because the Stockholm Convention itself makes it perfectly clear that special derogations are in order where endangered plants and animals are involved. It is a question simply of taking the Treaty and our justification for an environment policy and making it compatible with our discussions with the EFTA countries. We already have these discussions with EFTA countries, and it is a question simply of making these discussions come together on this particular point.

President. — I call the Commission.

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (DE) The Stockholm Convention which has been alluded to is not an EFTA agreement. It is an international declaration from 1972. It is not an agreement to which one can become a signatory but a declaration, accepted by all those at the meeting then, on the ten years of environmental policy which have now come to an end.

President. — It would have been better if this matter could have been cleared up during the debate.

Mr Collins, I think it would be useful to try to solve the problem, because there is clearly some misunderstanding which makes it impossible, for me at least, to understand what your problem really is.

Mr Collins. — The problem was in fact cleared up in debate, and I am only sorry that this was not communicated to the Commissioner. It was cleared up in debate in the committee, and the various spokesmen in the committee who took part in this discussion made it absolutely clear that they were referring not to the Stockholm meeting of some 10 years ago but to the Treaty which set up the European Free Trade Association. I have forgotten the number of the article, but there are special derogations there where endangered species are involved.

However, the real point here is the way in which this particular amendment deals with the relationship between giving special consideration to endangered animals and plants on the one hand and economic policy on the other. It is a fairly clear point. It was made here during a debate today. It was also made clear in committee. I am sorry that Mr Narjes is unable to agree to this. It is a point, I think, that the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection and this Parliament will continue to make and will continue to make fairly strongly. At any rate I hope that has cleared it up.

(The sitting was suspended at 8.15 p.m. and resumed at 9.30 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR: MR VANDEWIELE

Vice-President

15. *Air transport (contd)*

President. — The next item is a continuation of the debate on the Schwarzenberg report (Doc. 1-286/82).

I call Mr Clinton.

Mr Clinton. — Mr President, this draft regulation sets out to advance competition, and it is difficult not to be completely in favour of competition. Even to qualify one's enthusiasm for competition may seem reactionary. We are dealing here, however, with an essential public utility, i.e., civil aviation, and my own country, being an island on the periphery of the Community, has a very keen perception of aviation as a vital public service. We cannot therefore give an unqualified endorsement to the idea of competition in this area.

The Association of European Airlines, comprising over 20 of the main airlines of Europe both publicly and privately owned, has this to say: 'Competition is not an end in itself, it is a means to an end. If stability, dependability, quality of service and controlled growth of a given industry are the objectives, excessive competition may not be the best way to achieve the required goal.' Excessive competition, or opening up the industry to the possibility of excessive competition, will do great harm and bring into Europe the United States' disease of instability, price wars, bankruptcies and cancellation of services, particularly to smaller communities, with disastrous results. Our main concern with this draft directive is that unfriendly and doctrinaire regulators could use it to prevent the established multilateral machinery of coordination from working satisfactorily, machinery which has been built up over the years to monitor and develop civil aviation in the interests of the consumer and of the wider public. Unfortunately, the Schwarzenberg report expresses commitment to the idea of competition *per se* and fails to recognize the complexity of aviation as an international public utility requiring certain exemptions if it is to function adequately.

We note in particular the stark contrast between the Commission's proposals in relation to aviation and its proposals in relation to sea transport, where explicit sanction is given to fare fixing and capacity determination by the carriers themselves and without the surveillance by governments which safeguards the public interest in the case of aviation. The draft regulation and the report of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs seem to elevate to supreme status the competition articles of the Treaty, but there are many other significant and relevant articles which seem to be ignored.

Article 2, in defining the very task of the Community, gives pride of place to harmonious development of economic activities, a continuous and balanced expansion, and increase in stability. Article 74 says that transport matters shall be part of the common transport policy, but this has not yet been defined. Article 75 says that transport regulatory measures should take account of the standard of living and employment in certain areas and also speaks of the need for enterprises to be given time to adapt. Unani-

Clinton

mous Council decisions are also provided for. Article 78 says: measures taken within the framework of the Treaty in respect of transport rates and conditions shall take account of the economic circumstances of carriers.

These provisions of the Treaty are not reflected in the draft regulation, and even when we come to the competition articles of the Treaty the draft regulation is selective and discriminatory. Article 85(3) provides that exemption from the competition rules may be laid down for agreements which improve production or distribution of goods or which promote technical or economic progress. Such exemptions seem appropriate for a multilaterally coordinated industry like civil aviation. Article 90(2) provides that certain undertakings are not to be hampered by the competition rules from performing their assigned tasks. But that is just the threat which the draft regulation poses for air transport undertakings.

In viewing the Schwartzberg resolution, we note that the concluding plea of the Committee on Transport for evolution and protection against damaging the system was not adequately taken into account. However, I am glad to note that important amendments, including some by my colleague, Mr O'Donnell, have been tabled to the report, and we would strongly recommend that those which attempt to ameliorate the drafts in their present form and reflect the thinking of the Committee on Transport should be endorsed by Parliament.

Finally, I would say this. Air transport is an essential public service particularly for Ireland. In the interests of temporary consumer benefits or doctrinaire beliefs in free market forces, pressures are being mounted which threaten instability and crisis. I believe Parliament should resist these pressures.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Adamou.

Mr Adamou. — *(GR)* Mr President, in connection with the topic under discussion today I should like to talk about the Greek national airline, Olympic Airways.

Despite the unstinting efforts by staff, the performance of the airways cannot be considered satisfactory at present. The company is stagnating because of bad management, constantly-changing policies and government interventions. When Greece joined the Community and when Community regulations on air carriers entered into force, Olympic Airways was in danger of liquidation. The first attempt to implement these regulations occurred on 15 December 1981, at a meeting of Transport Ministers in Brussels. Discussing interregional airroutes, three Ministers demanded that

aviation companies of the Member States of the Community be allowed to operate domestic flights within Greece. In practice, this would have meant overwhelming competition in Greece, resulting in the bankruptcy and dissolution of Olympic Airways. This decision was prevented, thanks to the veto of the Greek Government, but now this subject is back on the agenda. The Commission directive on transport charges for regular air-services will have the same result as far as Olympic Airways is concerned. The aim of this directive — if it is implemented — is not to bring air transport charges down by creating an effective European air network unfettered by national restrictions, but rather to create unfair competition in Greece. If foreign air companies are allowed to operate charter flights on regular routes even to provincial towns within Greece, this will have catastrophic consequences for Olympic Airways.

The Greek Communist Party is categorically opposed to any extension of the rules of competition to air transport in general and to the fixing of transport charges by the Community in particular. We insist that international transport charges continue to be fixed on the basis of decisions by the IATA based on the principle of unanimity and the right of veto. We believe, therefore, that if air transport charges are allowed to be fixed within a Community framework and the procedures provided for are implemented, if restrictions are imposed on agreements concluded by sovereign Member States with third countries and, finally, if Member States are forbidden to subsidize their air carriers, then this will have catastrophic results for the Greek national airline.

We shall therefore vote against Mr Schwartzberg's report.

President. — I call Mr Lalor.

Mr Lalor. — Mr President, I want to make it clear first of all that unless the Schwartzberg resolution is substantially altered by amendments in the morning, I shall be unable to support it. The resolution says that there is a need for a gradual and balanced increase in competition in the air transport sector. I question that contention and I reject it.

When we last had a major debate here on air transport over 12 months ago, we had Members waxing eloquent in castigating national airlines and alleged cartels, while Laker was paraded as all that was ideal in highpowered, progressive, effective, exemplary and utopian airlines. All others were challenged to compete with him. What has happened? Since then Laker has gone with the wind. Gone with the wind! Yes, taking with him Braniff in the US and leaving pretty well all the other airlines floundering around in his wake. Pan Am, the world's most experienced airline, has had to sell its headquarters and dispose of its hotel chain in

Lalor

order to survive. At home we are told that British Airways have lost two hundred million pounds. Sabena showed annual losses of \$ 53 000 000 . . .

(Interruptions from the European Democratic Group)

I presume I shall get extra time, Mr President, to deal with the interruptions . . .

(Laughter)

Somebody says it is a pleasure to listen to me, and I wish they would!

(Laughter)

El Al dropped \$ 45 000 000 in 1981. We have just heard about the difficulties Olympic Airways have in Greece. Our Irish airline, Aer Lingus, has had to borrow itself almost out of business in order to survive. I realize that that seems to be a contradiction in terms, but that is the situation.

The Commission proposal for this Council regulation is based on Articles 85 and 86 of the Treaty, without adequate reference to Article 84(2), which states that 'the Council may, acting unanimously, decide whether, to what extent and by what procedure appropriate provisions may be laid down for sea and air transport'. My colleague, Mr Clinton, has dealt with sea transport. Now the drafters of the Treaties built in this important provision immediately before drafting the rules on competition, Articles 85-90. Here we had recognition by those farseeing fathers of ours, who even then could see what the Commissioner and some others of us cannot see now some 20 years later, that international civil aviation was not only an extremely complex industry but was already heavily monitored in the interests of the public and of the Community by numerous instruments of international law and conventions.

Mr President, I respectfully submit that the draft proposal from the Commission supported by this resolution is simply suggesting change for the sake of change. It seems to me that the Commission is anxious to make a gesture by pandering to the ever-vocal consumers' lobby, which in this instance, of course, includes all of us MEPs. It has succeeded with the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, which sees the proposal as benefiting airline users and generating greater productivity among airlines. I disagree. The Commission should not make regulations on competition or other rules for air transport until there is a common policy for all EEC transport, as indicated by Articles 2 and 74. Then we would have a yardstick to go by, but only then.

(Applause)

President. — I call the Commission.

Mr Andriessen, Member of the Commission. — *(NL)* Mr President, it is perhaps a coincidence that the transport policy of the Community has already been debated on several days this week. Last Monday I spoke here on the subject of air transport, and I consider myself privileged to be called upon again to speak in this Parliament on a proposal which I believe is very important, although not everyone in this House seems to share that view. Whenever the subject of transport is raised, people say that the field of action is so vast and the area which the Commission is prepared to tackle so small that the two cannot stand comparison. And yet, Mr President, with your permission, I wish to stress its importance; the serious attention paid by the committees of Parliament to the proposal under discussion shows too that it is an important one.

May I begin, Mr President, by expressing my gratitude to all the Committees of Parliament which have dealt with this issue and to the rapporteur, Mr Schwartzberg. Although nothing happened for a long time about Community transport, we now see that the Commission has taken initiatives in many areas, not least of all in air transport. I am prepared to defend these modest contributions of the Commission against the plethora of wishes expressed by many, although not all, Members of this House. I can well understand parallels being drawn between air and sea transport, but I would add immediately that these two sectors are totally incomparable. I can equally well appreciate the disappointment that no greater progress has been made in a Community transport policy than is the case today.

Mr President, there are a number of specific proposals, and the Commission is extremely pleased about that. I shall confine myself at the moment to those proposals under discussion at present in this House. The Commission is highly pleased at the almost general approval of its proposal. Mr President, it is fallacious to believe that the rules on competition in the Treaty are not applicable at present to air transport. The ruling of the Court has shown that they are. What we are trying to do here is to bring the Community's influence to bear on air transport. The reason why no derogations are admitted in certain sectors is that the Commission believes the rules on competition should be applied gradually in this highly complicated sector.

That does not mean to say that the Commission will not issue specific instructions at a given moment as to what does and what does not constitute a derogation. It does mean, and this seems to be in line with the view of the Member who urged caution, that the rules on competition must be applied gradually in the field of air transport. In this sector, much importance is paid to the opinions of this House.

We agree that competition in air transport must be expanded. We cannot persist in having nearly all other sectors of economic activity in the Community being subject to Community law on competition but air

Andriessen

traffic falling without that ambit. That may be in the interests of the governments, but not in the long run of society or of consumers. The Commission will take action in this area as it does in other spheres of economic activity. This is how the Commission can make a valuable contribution to the development of an air transport policy with fair opportunities for expansion.

In this matter the Commission does not intend to differentiate between private and public undertakings. The step we are taking here today is a first step, some people think a modest step; others, it would appear from the debate, believe it is already going too far. But in the Commission's view it is at any rate an important step towards gradually introducing the rules on competition into this sector.

Our regulation is admittedly limited. The relationship between governments and airlines is extremely important here, and the Commission must gain as much information as possible on this relationship. We are aware that many governments want to retain the right to approve or reject air fares. This does not simplify our task. We are in the process of analysing the results, but are still awaiting clarification on some aspects of the relationship between governments and airlines on fixing air fares. Nevertheless, I intend to draw up an interim report on this subject in the coming months and shall, of course, keep Parliament informed.

The resolution quite rightly points out the need to establish structural conditions for fair competition in the sector of air transport. The problem is that in this sector there are bilateral contracts between countries which lay down that only one carrier per country may operate on a specific route. I think this is a problem we shall have to concentrate on in the future, and I think it particularly desirable that the Commission should examine the questions of access to the market and freedom of services in air transport in application of Articles 61 and 84(2) of the Treaty, for which my colleague Mr Contogeorgis bears the main responsibility.

Mr President, may I at the end of my statement in this debate make a few general points arising directly from what I have just said? The Commission has to date submitted two directives to the Council, one on interregional air transport, the other on air fares. Both are aimed at applying the policy on competition to air traffic. So far the Council has not given a very positive response. Indeed, there is even a danger that in the present discussions the directives are being stripped of their very essence. It has appeared that some Member States have in these talks strongly urged maintaining the *status quo* and have asked for far-reaching exemptions for tariff agreements, pooling contracts and what have you.

Mr President, it is quite impossible at the moment to predict the outcome of the interim report I mentioned. I confirm, however, that despite all the difficulties in

our path, the Commission will remain active in the months ahead. Specific proposals have been made this evening, particularly concerning ways of applying the regulation under discussion. The Commission intends to produce very specific proposals when it has gained more insight into this whole matter, but at the moment this is unfortunately not yet possible.

My final word, Mr President. The Legal Affairs Committee has made a number of points on the text of the regulation. The Commission recognizes the validity of a number of these points, and I can inform you that in the near future a revised version of the regulation will be printed in the *Official Journal*.

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

Mr Pearce. — Mr President, just in case there was a possibility of a slight mistranslation earlier on I wonder if, for the sake of clarity, I could have it confirmed to me that the reason the gentleman gave why Mr Buttafuoco was not present to make the speech which he was due to make was that he could not afford the air fare to come here.

President. — Mr Pearce, that was not a point of order.

I call Miss Forster.

Miss Forster. — Mr President, the Commissioner has made a very important statement which I personally welcome. May I put two brief questions to him on what he has said?

This is a most important industry and I feel that this whole question of competition should be . . .

President. — You can put your supplementary questions in writing, and the Commissioner will surely be prepared to answer them in writing; but we cannot open another debate. I hope that everyone agrees on this.

The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting-time.

16. Market for electronic products

President. — The next item is the report by Mr Herman, on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, on the state of the market for electronic products in Europe and on the consequences for employment (Doc. 1-189/82).

President

The debate also includes the following oral question, with debate, by Mr D'Angelosante and others to the Commission (Doc. 1-259/82):

Subject: Outlook for Siemens-Elettra plants in Italy.

Does the Commission not think it should use the direct and indirect instruments at its disposal and intervene as a matter of urgency to prevent the multinational firm Siemens-Elettra, which has violated the undertakings given and disregarded the damage its attitude could cause in one of the economically most backward regions of Italy, from rejecting the favourable proposals made to it by the Italian Government to prevent the closure of its ACE branch plants in Sulmona?

How does the Commission plan to control the tendency of this company to reduce and eventually cease its activities in Italy regardless of the effect this would have on the economic and employment crisis and to prefer speculative investments in areas of the world where cheap labour is available?

I call the rapporteur.

Mr Herman, rapporteur. — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the report it is my privilege to present to you was unanimously accepted in our committee, with the exception of one abstention. This says much for the consensus that was made possible by the cooperation and the mutual understanding of my colleagues, to whom I wish to express my gratitude.

As has been the case for all previous technological innovations, the spread of the use of microprocessors will have a favourable effect on economic growth, on the quality of life, on social progress, and, in the long term, on employment, even though in the short term the number of jobs lost will probably exceed the number of jobs created. The deep concern felt in this regard is due to three factors: the first is that the progress has been tremendous and the cost decreases without precedent, which was not the case for earlier technological discoveries. The second factor is that the favourable effects on employment may be felt in other places and at other times than the other favourable effects linked to the spread of activities connected with these new technologies. And the third factor is that the numerous studies made, which have excited considerable interest, have contributed towards the development of this anxiety. These studies, however, point in different directions; for each one there exists another supporting the opposite view, and for this reason it is necessary to be very cautious in this matter.

It is certain that the favourable effect on employment which will result from the spread of these technologies can only be felt in Europe if three conditions are met. The first is that Europe must acquire technical mastery

of the production and marketing of the whole data-processing line, and this implies coordinated efforts of research and the creation of a European market in data-processing, which is far from being the case today. Despite the repeated efforts of the Commission, despite support from this Parliament, the Council still seems unable to formulate a policy in this area. The second condition is the following: since the jobs created are not of the same quality and nature as the jobs lost, a considerable effort of adaptation, mobilization and recycling of the workforce will be indispensable. The third condition is that the gains in productivity which will result from the spread of information technologies should be distributed in the form of reductions in working time rather than in the form of direct or indirect wage increases.

But another thing is equally certain. This is that any policy which would oppose the progress of data-processing through the fear of losing jobs or the desire to retain jobs already existing would be suicidal for the European economy and fatal for employment in the long run.

We have no choice. The United States, Japan and the countries of South-East Asia will not wait for us.

I would like now to make some brief observations on the four amendments which have been tabled on my text. I have no objection to Amendment No 1, presented by Mrs Theobald-Paoli; on the contrary, I am very favourably disposed towards it. On the other hand, Mrs Dury's Amendment No 2 is absolutely unacceptable, considering the difficulties already encountered in the spread of technological progress. We must not subject this progress to further conditions; in particular, it should not have to depend on negotiations which might be used as a means of exerting pressure to obtain a whole series of other objectives.

Amendment No 3 is not very important in itself: when we talk about using the gains in productivity to the advantage of the consumers, it is clear that this means reducing prices. Consequently, this is almost a tautology, but I am willing to accept Amendment No 3.

On the other hand, Amendment No 4 proposes a procedure which, on the level of practical application, is completely impossible. For this reason I can only recommend the rejection of Amendment No 4.

President. — I call the Committee on External Economic Relations.

Mr Rieger, draftsman of an opinion. — (DE) Mr President, as draftsman of an opinion on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations on the state of the market for electronic products in Europe and on the consequences for employment, I should

Rieger

like to make a few short remarks which of themselves will convey nothing new to the House or the Community but which demonstrate the need for a concerted effort in this field.

The motion for a resolution underlying this report was primarily dictated by alarm at job losses in the electronics sector. This alarm can be attributed to the existence of a significant trade imbalance between the Community and Japan which has not heretofore been effectively tackled. Whilst there is nothing new in all of this, it should be noted that the already considerable deficit in bilateral trade with Japan worsened in 1980-81, and the figures involved are nothing short of horrifying. The Community's negative balance of trade with Japan finds its corollary in the employment statistics and, in particular, in certain branches of the electronics sector. Some of these have been very seriously hurt, and this was the point of departure of the motion for a resolution.

In forming its opinion, adopted unanimously with one abstention, the Committee on External Economic Relations made a thorough examination of the course of action open to us and firmly reiterated its opposition to protectionism. We consider that the European electronics industry must evolve a positive strategy to counter the Japanese challenge. At the same time, however, we realize that the Treaty has given the Community the means to protect its economies in certain preordained circumstances. Article 113 sets out the characteristics of the common commercial policy based on uniform principles, while Articles 108 and 109 provide a safeguard clause in the event of a balance-of-payments crisis in a Member State. To these must be added the safeguard measures contained in GATT, particularly Article 19.

I do not intend to go into detail on the effects this has on our attitude towards, for example, Japan and the United States but rather to point out the opinion of our committee on the Community's trading relations with Japan. Sir John Steward Clark's report for our committee treats these trading relations in some considerable detail.

Our committee deems it essential that national governments coordinate, to a greater degree than has heretofore been the case, their trade policies as far as possible to ensure that the Member States at last speak with one voice in their dealings with Japan. Furthermore, we see the need for European industry to develop effective measures in the field of research and development in order to respond to the Japanese challenge.

We are determined, even when faced with this difficult and, at times, catastrophic situation for certain branches of the electronics industry, to comply to the letter with the GATT rules in force and will strive to ensure that they continue to be the basis of our trading relations, particularly with our principal trading partners. A Community industrial-technological strategy

could, in our opinion, then have positive results, thereby leading to an improvement in the employment situation in the electronics sector.

(Applause)

President. — I call the Socialist Group.

Mr Seal. — Mr President, speaking in general on behalf of the Socialist Group, I may say that we support this motion. But there are one or two points which we feel are not so good. It may be that they have lost something in the translation.

I think that the Member States of the Community, as the report indicates, must produce their own electronics, or at least be in a position to do so. As the USA and Japan increase their leads, our dependence upon these two countries increases, and this gives them an advantage, not only in the fields where electronics are a major component but in those where they are only a sizeable minor component.

Machine tools provide a good example. More and more machine tools are computer-controlled, and unfortunately Japan sells to Europe most of the electronic controls for machine tools. But it sells them to us at a price higher than that at which they sell them to their Japanese producers of machine tools. This gives them an advantage, not only in electronics but also in machine tools; and this is something we must consider.

As we become more and more dependent on electronics, we shall, unless we improve, become more and more dependent upon Japan and the United States. We have already seen the problems caused by dependency with our dependency on oil; and there are many areas where we are falling further and further behind the United States and Japan. Here we must make efforts either to capture the market or at least to be able to produce.

There are other areas where we have our own distinctive competence, and it is here that we must make a supreme effort to retain our technological lead and keep in advance of the USA and Japan. If we do not, we shall be handing over our producing processes and our jobs to the Japanese and the Americans.

As I said earlier, Mr President, I think this report has its deficiencies. The title indicates that it is about the state of the market for electronic products in Europe and the consequences for employment. To me it is no good merely calling for a response from the Community. We have done this time and time before, and nothing yet has happened. The Commission must spell out the action that needs to be taken. Leaving the response to what we call the good sense of private companies does not work. We have seen in the United Kingdom that it does not work. We have to plan our

Seal

production and we have to plan our trade. Member State governments and the Commission must ensure that any gaps in our production in electronics are met, and this will not necessarily be done by leaving it to private companies. What we require are publicly-owned companies to fill these gaps.

Now in Japan — and I have just come back from a visit to Japan — there is a very close relationship between the government and industry. They work together on planning ahead, and they keep to those plans. Japan is an example of detailed planning in a capitalist society, and it is only now that they are beginning to experience some of the problems that capitalist controls bring. In the United States, the gaps are filled either by the government handing out defence contracts or NASA handing out space-race contracts. But in Europe we have nothing: there is only the French Government beginning to plan systematically the growth of its electronic industry. Therefore, weakly calling upon the Community to respond, as this report does, is useless. Let the Commission produce plans and then persuade the Member States' governments to support them! Mr Herman's vague suggestion in this report, 'Making a reality of the Common Market', which is something we have not done, I agree, 'will achieve a European response' is not acceptable.

The report is entitled 'Europe': it is not entitled 'EEC', and this suggestion to me is pie in the sky, as we say in the United Kingdom.

I would also like to point out that paragraph 5 — and Mr Herman has acknowledged this to some extent — is to me very badly written, and whilst I know of Mr Herman's concern from talking to him in the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, I feel that Mrs Théobald-Paoli's amendment must be accepted.

I cannot, however, agree with the report that we need greater anti-monopoly legislation, and this is contrary to Mr Herman's own idea of a Community response. We are competing against massive firms in the United States and Japan, and competition among many small European firms will solve nothing. In addition, in some fields — and one of these is telecommunications — the industries must be national industries, they must be publicly owned. Let me say to my comrades over there from the United Kingdom that the Tory Government's attempts to split up the Post Office side of telecommunications is stupidly doctrinaire and can only result in the industry going to the Japanese and to United States firms.

With these reservations, Mr President, I will support the report. But I warn the Commission that they are going to have to work much harder and they must come up with the goods if we are going to keep a European foothold in our electronics industry.

Let me turn to the employment side. The effects on employment of advanced technologies I have eluci-

dated many times in this Chamber, and they are well documented in the parliamentary records. I would just say that I feel that this report is not to my mind the proper occasion to debate the problems of unemployment: that falls within the competence of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment.

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

Mr I. Friedrich. — (*DE*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I welcome this report by our friend Mr Herman for its accuracy, honesty and appropriateness.

I share the view that the citizens of the Community have the right to demand that the Community speak with one voice on this matter. It is a fact that Member States individually have neither the capacity, the know-how nor the possibilities of responding effectively to such a challenge.

However, I cannot repress a wry smile when Mr Seal talks about the awaited salvation from State-run or nationalized companies. My dear Mr Seal, in what position do the British nationalized corporations, having competed so successfully, find themselves? Where is Austin? Where are all the nationalized British corporations? Where are the successful companies to be found? Are IBM, Volkswagen and Mercedes nationalized? Those are the successful modern companies at the summit of technology and progress. Personally, I cannot think of a single example, not even in Eastern Europe, of a massive monopolistic State-run company at the height of progress!

In the Federal Republic, indeed in the Community generally, we have the highest standard of living and the most comprehensive social-security system in the world. But this much is clear: we can only maintain this standard of living by having at our disposal the most sophisticated technology available. It is equally certain that this standard of living cannot be maintained with a 35-hour working week, the highest production costs in the world and an outdated technology.

What is needed is the fresh air of competition, which brings forth effort, but not only from top management. It goes without saying that a top management is necessary and that it must quite naturally be prepared to put in more than a forty-, fifty- or sixty-hour working week. Efforts must also be made by the middle-range posts, the engineer and the employee. To take the whip only to the top management in an effort to double output will not get us very far.

Everyone has to chip in and, my dear Mr Seal, the theory of the French Socialists that with the dawn of the socialist epoch in France, may be seen the beginning of paradise on earth has been the most glorious disaster on earth.

Friedrich

Who ever believed the fairy-tale that money was to be distributed amongst people and we would say to them: work less and welfare will be showered upon you from above? For success the gods demanded exertion. No pains, no gains. The false prophets who advocated throwing money to the masses, thus bringing forth welfare of itself will, within the coming months, be dashed against the rocks in the greatest shipwreck of all times.

It will not end with the second devaluation of the French franc. We can await the third before the end of this year. Where does that leave socialist theory? It will be carried on *ad absurdum*! You must give Margaret Thatcher a little more time. Earlier today in the Latin American Committee . . .

(Protests)

. . . I spoke somewhat differently, there were also some friends present. But I can assure you of one thing: Mrs Thatcher's unflinching steadfastness really hurts! It reminds one of a schoolchild who is forced to work by his teacher and whose parents do not adopt the *laissez-faire* attitude. If the State encourages its leading citizens in the same way we shall have a chance, after a certain time-lag, of success as a result of these measures. But for a politician to adopt a *laissez-faire* attitude and say, 'Citizens, we shall do everything you desire' would be the worst thing we could possibly do for him, for a year later, he is the one who will have to foot the bill, not the country's rulers.

(Protests)

Ladies and gentlemen, we in the Federal Republic, as you are aware, have a powerful ecological movement. Without venturing to comment on the philosophy and attitudes of such movements in the other Member States, I can say that ours is resolutely opposed to modern technology, which they hold responsible for the present unemployment. This attitude is disastrous!

The ecologists should have been in favour of technology, given its low consumption of raw materials, its environment-friendly and radiation-free characteristics. The only way of stabilizing and guaranteeing employment is, if at all possible, with the aid of the most sophisticated technology.

I congratulate the rapporteur, Mr Herman, on this report. It would be a commendable measure on its part if the House adopted it unanimously.

(Applause)

President. — I call the European Democratic Group.

Sir John Stewart Clark. — Mr President, I should like to compliment Mr Herman on his fine report, and Mr

Friedrich on his very fine speech. I support the motion for a resolution.

I would like to concentrate this evening on the challenge which we face in adapting our industries and our schools to the new technologies. The widespread introduction of microelectronics has been described as a third industrial revolution. Like all revolutions, it involves change. It arouses fear and uncertainty, all the more so because it affects peoples' lives at every point — during their education, their training for work, the kind of work they do and where they work. If introduced successfully, it may change society's whole attitude to work. If not introduced successfully, then Europe will find itself undercut by its competitors who have adapted, and serious unemployment will follow.

There is no reason, however, why this change in our industrial habits should be feared, provided that we realize the importance of training. Without a massive effort to re-train the workforce, Europe will be unable to respond to the challenges of modern technology. Without a coordinated approach to training in all its aspects, Europe's hopes in this field will be disappointed. The timing of the industrial change in which we find ourselves in crucial. The degree to which we can recognize what is happening about us as a result of microelectronics and to which we plan for change will be crucial to our future prosperity. Both management and unions still really need to be convinced of the long-term gain in company profitability and the benefits to the lives of the working population which are likely to accrue from the new technology. If they are to conclude the radical technology agreements necessary for industrial adaptation, they have to be convinced that there is a real possibility of early voluntary retirement, longer holidays and fewer working hours; but always in return for increased productivity.

May I turn now to training, which is the hub of the issue. The single biggest block to our expansion in microelectronics today is the critical shortage of suitably skilled labour and of suitably skilled teachers to train and re-train that labour. The European software industry alone estimates that it is short of many thousands of computer programmers and systems analysts. This manpower shortage is contributing to the erosion of our competitive advantage, and it must be redressed. At a time of rising unemployment, this is a dreadful waste of opportunity.

We ask the Commission to speed up the process of bringing together representatives of industry, the unions and teaching faculties to work out a European programme for training staff and workers in industry. A systematic survey should be made to establish the need for skilled electronics engineers and software programmers and to agree on the extent and methods of training which should be carried out.

The Social Fund is not being properly exploited and seems to be mainly aimed at semi-skilled and non-

Stewart Clark

skilled workers but not at specifically trained technicians. Increased emphasis must be given in the Social Fund to the new technologies, and we cannot forget that most young unemployed and school-leavers are bereft of even the most basic computer-oriented skills. We must therefore ensure that all those colleges of further education involved in training young people to work in the electronics and related industries have the most modern equipment available.

In addition, we must ensure that the curricula of such colleges are geared to the impact of new office technology on business and commercial education.

Could the Commission not usefully sponsor a study project in this area in an attempt to find what is needed and with this information stimulate the preparation of common standards for technical qualifications at this level? If common professional standards for the microelectronics industry and its associated industries are not arrived at in the very near future, they will become progressively harder to establish as each country starts to set its own.

Mr President, we see a widening technology gap with the USA and Japan, which can only be closed by having sufficient top scientists and technicians available in Europe. We need more institutes of higher education and universities to specialize in microelectronics working in conjunction with the major employers in the area. This will ensure that the skills acquired are also geared to industry's needs.

The Community should consider creating a centre of excellence in Europe similar to Silicon Valley. We should establish a European Institute of Technology where scholars and scientists from all over the Community can come to study and work. I believe Mr Narjes has some sympathy for this recommendation.

Mr President, there must also be early changes in traditional school curricula to include the understanding of the microelectronic age. In addition to this, there is a basic requirement for the use of computer-assisted learning. This has to be increased and speeded up in all schools. There are far too few secondary schools today with a microcomputer installed.

Finally, I would suggest two further solutions. Firstly, there should be school computer centres in each town throughout the Community. Secondly, we must have a systematic campaign for recruiting industrialists to train existing teachers in computer science and electronics at night schools. Unless we tackle this whole question of training, Mr President, we shall fail. It is vital to the future of Europe, to employment and to technology.

IN THE CHAIR: MR NIKOLAOU*Vice-President*

President. — I call the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Leonardi. — *(IT)* Mr President, we are in favour of the opinions expressed by Mr Herman in his report, at least in general terms, and we shall therefore vote for the corresponding motion for a resolution.

Certainly, this discussion, which has been pursued in this Chamber for years, is always interesting. It would be well, however, to arrive at some practical solutions; otherwise we shall be saying the correct things, but running the risk of repeating them too often.

There is no doubt that technical progress favours social development; however, it must be controlled, and prevented from working for the advantage of the few and to the detriment of the many. It is certain that workers who are laid off because of technical innovations introduced into the companies must face the problem of where they can go on working and supporting their families. Therefore it is all very well to pronounce in favour of technical development; it is necessary, however, to ensure that this development is directed towards the common interest.

Personally, I should have liked to add certain considerations on industrial democracy, for workers' control of the aspects of technical progress undoubtedly poses problems of industrial democracy, which can in their turn be favoured by the growth of electronic and computer technology. Therefore we should see these problems from an overall viewpoint, in their social context and thereby also in connection with the problem of the consensus for technical progress itself, which poses, as I have said, problems of industrial democracy.

We have always been opposed to the defence of acquired positions which are contrary to technical progress; these positions are contrary to the interests of the workers, and, at a certain point, they turn into pure demagoguery leading to the defeat of the workers instead of to their victory. Industrial democracy is therefore essential — as I have already said — for solving the problem of the control of technical progress, and it is the only way to ensure that this progress works in the interests of the majority and not in the interests of only a few.

Another argument which I would have attempted to bring out more clearly is that for our countries technical progress, particularly in the electronics sector, should be dealt with at the Community level, and I would have been more explicit in saying that all the attempts formerly made and still being made today in the individual countries to deal with these problems on

Leonardi

the national level lead to certain failure, to a waste of resources and a waste of time.

Here we must be aware of the greater difficulties, difficulties which are raised here in Parliament. In fact, when practical problems must be faced, an attempt is always made to defend short-term and local interests. I would also like to say that the Commission, on the subject of technical progress, has written many pages and made extensive proposals, in general terms, without dealing with precise sectors and problems of technical progress. For example, in the field of communications or computerized machine tools or robotization, we could ask the Commission for development programmes on the Community level, specific and detailed programmes which would lay down objectives and means suitable for their attainment.

Only in this way can we go forward and break out of the vicious circle of general declarations which have been made by the dozen both here and in the old parliamentary chamber, and come nearer to specific objectives.

It is certain — as has been mentioned by other speakers as well — that the development of these technologies can only take place on the Community level, but it will require a close collaboration among the governments and therefore also between the Community governments and the companies. I will not, as Mr Friedrich did, discuss the question of whether these companies should be public or private ones. The essential point is that all means should be employed in order to attain these objectives.

I therefore call upon the Commission, in the wake of Mr Herman's report, to deal with specific problems and sectors and to indicate to us the means to be used for this purpose.

President. — I call Mrs Théobald-Paoli.

Mrs Théobald-Paoli. — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I too have just returned from Japan. I went there twice in three months, and I could say much about what I learned there. I have no time for this, however, since I have but four minutes to speak. This is why I will table a motion for a resolution during the week — it is nearly ready — in which I will furnish the general outline of the proposal made at the Versailles Summit which I would like to see adopted at European level.

I would nevertheless like to make a brief remark in parentheses, for I am worried about Mr Friedrich's health. I am afraid that he will suffer a heart attack because of the French nationalizations, and I want to reassure him, for the state of the technologies, data-processing and computer science, was exactly what was worrying us. All these industries were in the hands

of private companies which none the less benefited from public funds in the form of sizeable subsidies. We know what condition they were in despite this aid; they were clearly incapable of meeting any sort of challenge. Today the public, nationalized sector will take up the challenges. This is my hope. Mr Friedrich — I believe he has gone to the infirmary — can be calm; all is well.

I come now to Mr Herman's report, which I personally much appreciated, I found it a trifle lacking in certain respects, but this is not Mr Herman's fault, for he did not have the means to carry out a complete analysis of the effects on employment. Also, the facilities I suggest in my amendment were aimed at saving time. I warmly thank Mr Herman for having accepted this amendment, which gives us means which at present are not available to us.

I am aware that the American and Japanese initiatives in public and private investment pose a threat to employment. This necessitates the immediate application in Europe of a vigorous policy in the sector of electronic and information technologies. Such an industrial policy should be to the overall benefit of the Member States, and not involve solely the restructuring of sectors experiencing difficulties. In order to do this, I believe we must move in two directions: first, towards a more coherent legal and Community environment. The profound differences existing among the national markets have incontestably hindered the development of European undertakings in this sector.

Secondly, conditions should be created for a competitive supply, both on the European and on the world market. This implies a large-scale effort of research. In a motion for a resolution, I myself proposed that the Community earmark 3% of its budget for research. Since innovation in these sectors is extremely rapid, as you know, it is necessary to encourage the companies to pool their efforts, an action indispensable for ensuring increased profitability.

In order to succeed, we must be guided by one important consideration: employment, for there can be no technological progress against a background of unemployment, which tends to create a climate of pessimism and encourages attitudes of withdrawal and suspicion.

In fact, the new technologies can lead to the creation of employment, not only through the production of new industrial goods, but also through the services associated with them — distribution, engineering, consultation, training, leisure-time activities. Indeed, the real question is not the loss of jobs in the sector of electronics or data-processing because of extra-European competition; it is rather the more general issue of job substitution, which must be carried out in a swift and orderly manner.

This substitution cannot be only quantitative. It will include a large-scale transformation in content and

Théobald-Paoli

organization, and it will also lead to a further reduction in working-time.

This is why an increased effort in training and professional mobility is needed. This effort must be applied on a priority basis to engineers and technicians who are called upon to develop these new techniques, and to the young unemployed. It must make possible the conversion to the new technologies and thus facilitate professional mobility.

The new technologies should also be used to improve living and working conditions. Electronics and information technologies are a powerful tool for the automation of dangerous or repetitive tasks. The new possibilities in communication implicit in these techniques can open up other fields as well. What is ultimately at stake here is the appearance of new conditions for exchanges and dialogue.

The new world centre of information technology and human resources in Paris was created with this in mind. The Socialists believe that if Europe is able to attain the position it ought to hold in electronics and data-processing, if it can apply the policies which will prevent the rejection of these techniques, it will be able to play an important part in the new civilization of communication which will give rise to a true cultural flowering in the future.

President. — I call Mr Fernandez.

Mr Fernandez. — (*FR*) Mr President, electronics can be the basis not only for job-producing industrial growth — which is often forgotten — but also for a new way of working, a new relationship between man and the machine.

We believe indeed that the work of a skilled worker whose task is dehumanizing and reductive must disappear. Electronics makes this possible through automation, or what is today called robotization.

The construction of flexible workplaces, for example, that is, a high degree of automation in a cycle adaptable to production, can free the worker from subjection to repetitive tasks and enrich his work. Seen from the standpoint of economic growth, this robotization can, thanks to electronics, be a creator of jobs, and particularly of skilled jobs.

This should permit the modification of the criteria of economic management and the substitution of the criterion of economic and social effectiveness for that of financial profitability through the exploitation of labour; for, if electronics can free man from repetitive and dehumanizing tasks, it can at the same time increase competitiveness, and this, let us note in passing, contradicts the idea which maintains that competitiveness is linked to the level of wages. Similarly, the

higher level of qualifications should permit an increase in wages.

We are convinced that technological innovation and the development of the use of electronics can be the central element of a policy aimed at overcoming the crisis. The problem of the necessary social changes must also be clearly stated, particularly the question of the relationship between man and machine, that of workers' rights within the companies, and that of working and wage conditions.

It will be clear that I regard Mr Herman's report as far from being adequate on this complex of issues. He fails to make it clear that innovation and electronic development presuppose growth and resistance to austerity.

For this reason we cannot vote in favour of this report, even though it takes into account the need to increase aid for research and acknowledges the reality of American and Japanese domination in the sectors concerned. This domination, in our opinion, calls for the development of these sectors and for protection against excessive imports from the United States and Japan.

Finally, while we believe it necessary to coordinate the national efforts, it is evident that the development of electronics and the creation of jobs in this sector must be supported by the national efforts and the industrial policies of each member country.

President. — I call the Commission.

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (*DE*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to begin by congratulating Mr Herman on his circumspect and responsibly-constructed report on such a vital matter. On behalf of the Commission, I would like to extend our warm thanks to Parliament for the latter's support for the Commission's introduction of new information technology.

At this late hour, I would like to leave aside a whole host of fundamental questions which were raised earlier this evening. Being of a purely political nature, they should be debated by the House in the manner provided for. I would add, however, that it would be wrong to assume that the Japanese and the American electronics sectors are bereft of competition.

Quite the contrary. In Japan, once the pre-competitive stage of coordinated research effort has come to an end, a fierce round of competition is unleashed among Japanese competitors to find the optimal product-price mix for the market-place. In the United States, while it is true that Federal Government procurement through the NASA, the Pentagon, the Academy of Science, etc., is very considerable, there exists, as with Japan, a

Narjes

fiercely competitive private-enterprise sector. Any analysis by potential competitors in Europe which failed to take full account of these aspects of the Japanese and American markets would have serious shortcomings.

The motion for a resolution on the state of the market for electronic products in Europe and on the consequences for employment is practically identical on all points with the ideas and recommendations of the Commission. We are advocating the necessity for national governments to coordinate their policies in this sector and to evolve a long-term Community policy of research and development. In so doing, we are trying to introduce a pre-competitive phase in Europe by creating an area of cooperation using the economies of scale afforded by the Community's size. Using the Community dimension corresponds to paragraph 2 of the motion for a resolution, that is, making a reality of the common market itself.

The Commission has no illusions about the extent of the American and, ever increasingly, of the Japanese inroads into the information technology sector of the market, despite Europe's impressive intellectual achievements in this sphere. The profitability of this Community sector was clearly insufficient to finance the essential long-term research and development programmes, the prerequisite for new products and services.

It is worth noting here that a range of Community-sponsored programmes are currently under way aimed at reversing the trend, even if the resources committed to such efforts have so far been limited. A Commission-sponsored project for a four-year data-processing programme received Council approval in 1979. This was followed, in December 1981, by the Council's approval of a Community microelectronic programme — the first ever with a strategic aim. The Commission is currently elaborating, in close collaboration with the Community electronics industry, a coordinated long-range research and development programme, the so-called 'ESPRIT' programme. It will cover all appropriate areas of information technology and should pinpoint clear, strategic objectives, in particular, the consolidation of European competitiveness.

The Commission would like to see national government procurement contracts being thrown open for tender by the Community information industry instead of being reserved for national industry. The Community is heavily handicapped at present — and this may partly explain some of the unresolved issues raised in the House today — by a situation in which national sectors as widely diverse as the postal service and the ministry of defence steadfastly resist any liberalization on their procurement policies.

They would prefer to go under individually than cooperate in assuring the survival and expansion of a Community electronics industry in world markets.

The Commission will continue its efforts to prevail upon the Council to adopt its recommendations on telecommunications, which foresee a liberalization of Member States' markets within the Community. National procurement policies contravene the Community long-range data-processing programme. The Commission is aware of the necessity for appropriate supervision of the trend in commercial relations within the information industry between the Community and third countries. At present, however, the means at its disposal are limited. The danger of an ever-increasing tendency towards protectionism is particularly pronounced in the information and related branches of industry.

Most of the larger industrialized Member States provide an extensive range of subsidies, thereby accentuating the danger of protectionism. A coordination of these measures at Community level would, however, limit this danger. For this reason the Commission intends to coordinate national commercial policies in both the long-range data-processing research programme as well as its microelectronics programme. Furthermore, the Commission believes that existing competition rules obviate the need to introduce new measures to prevent unfavourable developments for the Community and its consumers.

As to the consequences for employment and the social sector of the introduction of microelectronics, the Commission reported to Parliament during the debate in plenary sitting on Mrs Salisch's excellent report on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment.

In this connection, I would like to reiterate the Commission's conviction that the introduction and widespread use of these new technologies affords the best long-term guarantee for employment in the Community. It is, in any event, quite certain that to ignore them would result in an inexorable and definitive loss of competitiveness for Community products on world markets.

In the short term, the introduction of new technology will result in a net job loss within the Community, not least attributable to our sluggish rate of economic growth. Numerous employees will be bereft of the skills needed to take advantage of the new jobs created in the microelectronics sector. A considerable effort will have to be made in vocational and professional training to prepare young people adequately for the new jobs created and to re-train older workers. These difficulties are surmountable and should not be used as an argument against the introduction of this new technology.

I would especially like to draw Sir John Stewart Clark's attention to a report which the Commission presented to the Council a few days ago. It is entitled 'Professional training and the new information technologies: Community initiatives, 1983-87'.

Narjes

I would be only too happy to forward him a copy, as I am sure he will find a great number of answers to the very pertinent issues raised by him. Similarly, Mrs Théobald-Paoli should find answers to many of hers. Some of the innumerable problems resulting from the introduction of these new technologies, such as retraining and the initial loss of productivity arising therefrom and impairment to competitiveness, would be so much more severe and durable in the long run if the Community failed to introduce this technology.

Mr Herman's excellent report correctly notes that, to be effective, the introduction of these new electronics technologies should be based on a social consensus. In connection with the conclusions reached by Mrs Salisch's Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, the Commission is redoubling its efforts in the following spheres, to name but a few: increasing the cooperation between professional organizations and trade unions, combating unemployment while creating new jobs as a result of the new electronics technologies, and sponsoring the necessary schemes of training and further education in the aforementioned sector.

It would be illusory to expect these measures to provide an exhaustive answer to the internal and external challenges of these new technologies. They should really be seen as part of an integrated Community-wide policy to provide economic growth and restore a suitable employment level.

We would, however, warn against hard and fast ideological standpoints and point out, in particular, the considerable difficulty of providing up-to-date information on the information-related side of the electronics sector in view of the rapid pace of technical innovation in both the hardware and software sectors. This whole sector has been estimated to undergo change at the rate of four times per year. Faced with such a dynamic situation, government is incapable of providing solutions. These should be left to private enterprises which, possessing the most up-to-date facts and, in touch with the market, are able to observe and analyse these developments and take decisions in consequence. It would be a serious misjudgment to think that civil servants with their limited training in these new and constantly-evolving technologies could ever exercise such purely entrepreneurial decision-making skills.

President. — The debate is closed. The vote will be taken at the next voting-time.

Before proceeding to the Rieger report, I should like to inform the House, and particularly our British colleagues, that General Galtieri has resigned.

17. *Inward-processing relief*

President. — The next item is the report by Mr Rieger, on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, on the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-974/81) for a regulation on inward-processing relief arrangements (Doc. 1-316/82).

I call the rapporteur.

Mr Rieger, rapporteur. — (*DE*) Mr President, on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, I submit the report on the proposal from the Commission to the Council for a regulation on inward-processing relief arrangements. The report was adopted unanimously by our committee. I would welcome the House's emulating our committee in adopting unanimously our motion for a resolution. The regulation on inward-processing relief arrangements would be a new and important instrument of trade policy and would result in a notable improvement in the operation of the common commercial policy pursuant to Article 113 of the EEC Treaty.

The committee believes that the rather technical nature of the Commission's proposal for a regulation conceals an event of considerable political significance. In its explanatory memorandum to the proposal for a regulation, the Commission stresses that the latter forms part of a multiannual programme for the attainment of the customs union and represents, in addition, a contribution towards the establishment of Community customs law. Because of its importance amongst the various customs procedures, the Commission selected inward-processing arrangements as a pilot project for the implementation of the above-mentioned multiannual programme.

Essentially, this involves the transformation into a proposal for a regulation of the principles set out in a Council directive of March 1969, although certain aspects have been dealt with in greater detail and account has been taken of the extent to which the customs union has been attained.

In short, the main object of the proposal for a regulation is to ensure that goods may be imported under the inward-processing arrangements without incurring liability to payment of import duties and can be exported outside the customs territory of the Community free of export levies after processing. To achieve this, the 20 articles of the Commission's proposal cover the following main points:

- definition, criteria for approval and implementation of inward-processing relief arrangements, and
- a 'committee procedure' as well as transitional provision.

Rieger

It is important to mention that Article 1(3) provides that inward-processing relief arrangements will also be used for the processing of import goods subject to commercial policy measures.

The products covered by inward-processing arrangements are very varied, ranging from salmon and cod to wool and paper. It is difficult to assess the importance of inward-processing arrangements, which varies according to the Member State concerned. Generally, however, one can say that a considerable proportion of Community trade is affected by inward-processing arrangements. In addition, one may estimate that on average the value of imported goods is doubled by processing and that the proportion of total external trade of the Community accounted for by inward-processing lies somewhere between 15% and 20%.

Consequently, we may consider the proposal for a regulation as part of the Commission's overall programme for attaining a customs union. Parliament has repeatedly expressed support for the Commission's programme and has urged the Council to delegate more power to the Commission in customs matters.

We welcome the fact that, pursuant to Article 155 of the EEC Treaty, this regulation delegates appropriate powers to the Commission to carry out such customs procedures as are economically important. We stress our awareness of the considerable importance of inward processing for external trade, particularly with regard to the employment situation in the Community.

Our committee dealt quite extensively with the committee on customs procedures having economic implications, referred to in Article 16. It shall, pursuant to Article 17, supervise the implementation of the regulation. Our discussions led us to the conclusion that the functioning of this and other committees should be subjected to a thorough inspection, the outcome of which should be published.

I would ask you, on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, to adopt this report. We extend our thanks to the Commission for its initiative and wish them every success in their efforts to obtain adoption by the Council of the report. I hope the Council will take up the matter as quickly as possible and, in so doing, make a very useful contribution to relieving a difficult employment situation in the Community.

(Applause)

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

Mrs Phlix. — *(NL)* Mr President, honourable Members, I have little to add to the excellent report pre-

sented by Mr Rieger, and in view of the late hour I shall be very brief. The Group of the European People's Party is in principle very much in favour of a customs union. This proposal for a regulation from the Commission to the Council represents a new and significant step towards achieving that customs union. We are also highly pleased that no new bureaucracy is being proposed here but that the existing administration is to be used. We are convinced that this is an extremely important initiative for Europe and her citizens and shall therefore vote in favour of the motion for a resolution from our colleague Mr Rieger.

President. — I call the Commission.

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — *(DE)* Mr President, I would like, at the outset, to congratulate Mr Rieger both on his excellent introduction and on the report itself, and to thank the draftsman of an opinion and to convey to the House the Commission's gratification on seeing that its proposal for a regulation has found an unequivocal and broad consensus.

This type of customs procedure is of considerable importance in the Community's trade relations with third countries. It establishes a definite connection between Community imports and exports and, in so doing, reflects a fundamental Community shortcoming in external trade. I am referring to our position as an industrial processing region with limited raw-material resources. As such, it is essential for the Community to facilitate the import of products which, after processing within the Community, are to be exported at competitive prices to third countries. I would go so far as to say that there would be less of a danger of protectionism if all parties concerned adopted this Community approach.

The object of the proposal before the House is essentially that of transforming into a proposal for a regulation the principles set out in the Council directive of March 1969 concerning inward-processing relief arrangements, thereby moving a step closer to the attainment of the multiannual programme for a customs union. The Commission attaches particular significance to the Committee's plea to the Council for the delegation of additional power to the Commission in customs matters, for which it extends its thanks. The Commission is also of the opinion that it is superfluous to deploy the full legal machinery of the Community, including Parliament, on such matters which the Member States could best deal with by simple administrative arrangements.

The fact that this is too often the case contributes to the cumbersomeness of the Community decision-making machinery, which is so often bemoaned. In addition, it reinforces the public's widely-held view that Council, Parliament and Commission busy themselves all too often with trivialities.

Narjes

But let us not underestimate this. We are dealing with the delegation of powers in a fundamental matter concerning relations between Member States of the Community. Individual discussions have been taking place for years as to the practical means of supervising such a delegation of power, and during these discussions the idea, already referred to on several occasions, of a 'committee procedure' as a sort of routine solution has, unfortunately, been reinforced. Once used in one individual case, such a routine solution could not easily be subsequently questioned. I fully agree with the opinions of the House, and of the rapporteur, that rather than opting for a routine solution, it would be desirable to investigate thoroughly, once and for all, the individual Member States' relations with the Community as a whole. Here is a golden opportunity for the Political Affairs Committee to undertake an in-depth survey, because it affords the possibility of making practical progress without modifying treaties. It would contribute towards making the Community more efficient and more effective.

In this sphere, one should examine the more interesting thoughts which have been expressed on the reform of the present Community procedures. I include the idea that the committee procedure, if it has to be retained, should be exclusively consultative. In any event, the Commission is quite prepared to convey fully to the House its experiences with the management committees, and suggestions for alternative measures.

(Applause)

President. — The debate is closed. The vote will be taken at the next voting-time.

18. *European coastal charter*

President. — The next item is the report by Mr Harris, on behalf of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning, on a European coastal charter (Doc. 1-302/82).

I call the rapporteur.

Mr Harris, rapporteur. — The report which I have the honour to present is rather a modest one. Yet it deals with a very big subject: how we can best give our help on a Community basis towards trying to safeguard one of the greatest assets of Europe, and that is its coastline. I say it is a modest report because it really gives the backing of the Parliament to a very comprehensive document which is not ours. The document I refer to is the European Coastal Charter, which was drawn up by the Conference of Peripheral Maritime Regions of the EEC. I would warmly congratulate the Conference for all the work it has done on this subject over quite a

long time and with help from the Commission's environmental services. It is because this document, the Charter itself, is so comprehensive, that my report commending it can be rather brief and, as I say, rather modest. That report which I present now was passed unanimously by the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning in one sitting. I think that is a measure of the agreement between the members of that committee on the excellent work done by the Conference in drawing up the charter.

Now what does the charter try to do? It really tries to point the way to reconciling a very big conflict — namely, the conflict between the need for proper economic development in areas which are sometimes remote, sometimes regions like Greece which are heavily dependent on tourism (my own constituency, being a rather remote coastal area, is also heavily dependent on tourism) and the needs of the environment. Those areas badly need to create jobs in other sectors as well. Yet, of course, there is also the need to protect the environment because without that environment those areas would lose their ability to attract tourists. So there is an inherent conflict here. It is a conflict which has exercised the minds of planners and academics, particularly in the northern part of Europe, for quite a long time. Yet northern Europe cannot afford to be smug about this subject, because if we have anything to pass on to other parts it is a result of the mistakes which we have made in northern Europe. We hope very much that Greece and countries like Spain and Portugal, which, we hope, are to join us in the Community, will not make the same sort of mistakes that countries like my own made some years ago. One of the main purposes of the charter is to try and achieve better coordination and dissemination of the research and of the expertise which has now gone for some years into just this sort of problem. One of the attractive features of this is that it can be done at very little financial cost to the Community. It really does need a great effort to have better coordination. That is essential. But I am certainly not advocating the spending of vast sums of money. The expertise is often there, it is just a question of making it more widely known and more widely available.

A very important point in the charter is the recognition that this work cannot be done simply by bureaucrats, let alone by politicians. It does require an effort by the public at large, and that means that we have a role to play in stimulating public interest in this sort of issue. I believe that interest has grown remarkably over recent years. There is an increasing awareness — and let us be thankful for it — of the need to protect our environment and particularly our coastline. But I believe we could do more in this regard, and the Charter suggests that perhaps consideration should be given to having a European year of the coast so that we can focus attention on the many issues which are dealt with in this document.

Then, of course, the Community itself has a very important role to play in many areas of importance.

Harris

This House has rightly exercised its mind over the need to have greater safeguards on shipping, greater controls, above else, on pollution at sea and in coastal areas. This takes up a lot of the Charter by drawing attention to what has already been done and the need to do more and to have more effective safeguards.

This, I believe, is a good time to bring the Charter to the attention of the House in this way. Later this year Ministers from the European countries will be meeting in Madrid to look at this sort of issue, and the real purpose of the report of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning to the House today is to give the backing of this Parliament to the Charter and to draw it to the attention of the Ministers when they meet in Madrid. If you like, we are giving a political push towards, I believe, a very worthy objective. It is in that spirit that I commend it to the House and I hope that it will be passed unanimously tomorrow.

Perhaps I might, in conclusion, mention one or two of the amendments which have been tabled. I am very grateful to the members of the committee who have tabled amendments and in particular I refer to one by Mrs Fuillet, who is a very valuable member of our committee. She quite rightly, I think, draws attention in dealing with coastal matters to the need to have a joint solution to fishery problems. I fully endorse the sentiments of her amendment; indeed, I hope that those sentiments will reach absolute fulfilment before long in negotiations on the common fisheries policy. I accept her amendment, but I believe she has tabled it to the wrong part of the report — for technical reasons — and I hope, with your permission, Mr President — I give you notice of this — that it could, when it is considered tomorrow, be taken in a rather different part of the report without altering the substance of the amendments.

With those few words, Mr President, I commend the report most warmly to the House and again offer my congratulations to the Conference of Peripheral Maritime Regions, which has drawn up the charter. I hope that in this way we shall be able to do our bit in Parliament towards protecting what we all want to protect, that priceless heritage, the coastline of Europe.

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

Mr Bournias. — (GR) Mr President, I should like to thank Mr Harris, the rapporteur, very cordially for mentioning Greece and its tourism. I should like to say that we are endeavouring to save Greece's superb tourist potential from a number of domestic exploiters and unscrupulous entrepreneurs but also from certain less desirable categories of tourists. I should like to congratulate Mr Harris on his report, which he presented with such modesty.

Mr President, it is only natural that a Greek Member should take part in a debate on the European Coastal Charter, since Greece is a Community country which, as you well know, with the exception of its northern borders is surrounded on all sides by the sea and by small and large islands. I should like to thank the political group to which I belong for allowing me to speak on its behalf on this topic. It was no coincidence that this Charter was adopted in its final form on the Greek island of Crete in October 1981, and I entirely approve the ten main points of the charter contained in the second chapter. I shall not mention them here because time is short. I should only like to say that I am the last person in the House to disagree with the opinion of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection that the North Sea and the Mediterranean are being turned into a dump for refuse, 75% of which comes from the land and 25% from the sea.

In Greece, in addition to the provisions of Article 24 of the new 1975 Constitution, which made it obligatory for the State to protect the natural environment, a series of legislative measures have been taken and all the international Conventions designed to prevent sea pollution have been ratified. Recently, Greek ship-owners launched an initiative to protect the marine environment and were supported by the State, by ship-workers' unions, by international organizations and above all by Greek shipbuilders, who, by sacrifices and financial contributions on every ship built, have contributed about 100% above the cost.

I am sure that this most recent attempt in Greece will meet with complete success, because the persons behind this project believe that the protection of the marine environment should become a matter of public concern and are doing everything within their power to bring this about.

Finally, on behalf of our Danish colleagues and of Mr von Hassel, who is absent, I should like to ask that Amendment No 5, by Mr von Hassel and Mr Pöttering, be adopted and that the Community protect the shores of the North Sea so as to avert the danger of damage from storms.

President. — I call the Commission.

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (DE) Mr President, I should like to begin by congratulating the rapporteur and the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning on its very interesting report on the European Coastal Charter. The report represents a significant political initiative on the part of the House. In that respect I fully agree with the rapporteur.

For some time now, the relevant departments of the Commission have been working on an outline of a

Narjes

global action programme for the European coastal regions designed to guarantee the coherence of action deemed to be necessary in this sphere. The close collaboration with the Conference of Peripheral Maritime Regions was of immeasurable help. The European Coastal Charter, before the House today, is in many ways an expression of the common interests shared by the CPMR and the Community.

The Commission fully endorses the attached motion for a resolution. The delicate balance between the economic development of coastal regions on the one hand, and the preservation of the natural ecological equilibrium, on the other, is becoming increasingly endangered, for a number of reasons. The natural ecosystems of coastal regions must be protected against the detrimental effects of industrialization and urbanization, whilst at the same time guaranteeing the economic development of these regions with a view to combating unemployment and stemming the exodus of young people.

The Commission is especially pleased that a first action programme has been added to the Charter. I can only echo the sentiment, expressed in the report and reiterated today by the rapporteur, of wishing to see a reconciliation, through integrated action at Community level, of the apparent conflict between environmental protection and economic development.

Indeed, I can state that the Commission, in close collaboration with the Secretariat of the CPMR and, in particular, with reference to the four new environmental-protection lines of the 1982 budget, is working on the coordination and attainment of certain pilot projects such as 'Operation coastal impact'. This covers the areas enumerated in paragraph 8 of the motion for a resolution, namely, knowledge, planning and control.

Finally, a word on the opinion of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection. The Commission considers the inclusion of an ecological compatibility clause in regional and agricultural policies to be of great importance. The adoption by the House of this motion for a resolution would immeasurably encourage the Community as a whole to continue its efforts in this field. I would add that, realistically, the achievement of the various objectives is dependent upon the provision by the Member States of the necessary administrative and budgetary means, as outlined in paragraph 9 of the motion for a resolution.

President. — The debate is closed. The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

President. — The next item is the report by Mr Nord, on behalf of the Committee on Budgets, on the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-262/82) for a decision with regard to a contribution to the European Coal and Steel Community out of the general budget of the European Communities (Doc. 1-313/82).

I call the rapporteur.

Mr Nord, rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President, last week, on Tuesday 8 June to be exact, the Council approved the extension of the quota regulation for the production of a number of steel products. This regulation is part of the Community policy to expedite the restructuring of the steel sector. It was started in October 1980. Shortly afterwards, on 24 June 1981, it was supplemented by a social contribution in the form of temporary social aid under Article 56(2)(b) of the ECSC Treaty. The total programme covers 212 million ECU, of which 50 million are provided by contributions from the Member States to the ECSC budget. The delays which have arisen between the agreements to grant these sums and the actual availability of the money have shown once more how unsatisfactory *ad hoc* sums are as a method of financing multiannual requirements. And so it happened that an agreement was reached at the end of 1981 between the Council and Parliament that an amount of 62 million ECU be included in the general EC budget for 1981 as an EC contribution to the ECSC budget. At the same time, an amount of 50 million ECU was included in the draft budget for 1982 for the same purpose. The Council is expected in the draft 1983 budget to take over the Commission's proposal in the preliminary draft to add a further 50 million in the general EC budget for 1983, so as to cover the total requirement of 212 million.

This should have been the end of the affair as far as the European Parliament is concerned. However, according to Article 205 of the EEC Treaty, the Commission must implement the budget and thus transfer to the ECSC the amounts written into the budget. The Council, however, does not agree and considers — and is here unfortunately followed by the Commission — that an additional legal basis is necessary for the EEC to be able to spend these sums. It is admittedly agreed that there is no difficulty in the ECSC receiving these sums, as Article 49 of the Treaty stipulates that the ECSC may receive gifts. But according to the Council — and again, unfortunately, according to the Commission as well — there are difficulties in spending this amount without an additional separate legal basis. On 28 June 1979, the Commission submitted its first proposal along these lines to the Council. In 1980 and 1981, new and revised proposals followed. These led to a Council decision on 23 February 1982 whereby the 62 million ECU in the 1981 budget were transferred to the ECSC. A new proposal is now submitted to us on the 50 million in the 1982 budget and the 50 million proposed for the 1983 budget.

Nord

I would point out that this proposal, contrary to the decision of 23 February 1982, leaves it to the budgetary authority to determine the exact amount of the transfer. But that is just a detail, for the main issue is that in the opinion of our Committee on Budgets and in line with the view adhered to so far by Parliament, this whole proposal is completely superfluous. That is why, in the resolution presented to you by the Committee on Budgets, paragraph 1 repeats for the umpteenth time the principle that the budget forms a sufficient legal basis for the transfer of budget funds to the ECSC. Paragraph 2 recalls that there is absolutely nothing to prevent the ECSC from receiving gifts, and paragraph 3 states that we do not wish at the moment to instigate a major conflict, as the problem of the additional legal basis is dealt with in the concertation programme of the three Presidents on the classification of budgetary expenditure.

We hope that a formula will be found in that forum to avoid such discussions and conflicts in the future. That is why we have no wish to start a conflict now, but the Committee on Budgets strongly wishes to reiterate our standpoint. We believe that this is the only correct standpoint and we have never really heard any convincing arguments from the other side. We have only ever heard that they disagree with us, without any very convincing explanation.

Mr President, the Committee on Budgets is by no means against the social aspects of the Community programme. It merely considers it superfluous to ask for another Council decision for it and believes the decision of the budgetary authority to use these amounts for the ECSC budget sufficient to transfer the said amounts from the EC budget to the ECSC budget. The result of the proposal from the Committee on Budgets is, Mr President, that you are being asked to reject the proposal from the Commission to the Council because it is a superfluous proposal and we have no need of it.

President. — I call the Commission.

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (DE) On behalf of the Commission, I would like to thank the rapporteur for his effective and concise presentation. We appreciate the rapidity with which Parliament has dealt with this matter, and I aim to be equally brief by limiting my remarks to the essentials.

The Commission's overriding concern at present is that of placing at the disposal of the European Coal and Steel Community the means to finance special aid to relieve the plight of workers in these sectors. Legal considerations have led the Commission to the unavoidable conclusion that such a measure is conditional upon prior Council approval, pursuant to Article 235 of the Treaty of Rome. The sums in question are still listed under heading 65 of the general budget.

At its meeting of 8 June 1982, the Council gave a very positive reception to the measure. In compliance with the obligation to consult Parliament prior to the reaching of a final decision and its formal enactment, I have come before the House to sound out its opinions. However, in view of the evident misgivings and doubts expressed in the House today as to the necessity of a specific decision from the Council, the Commission would be happy to accept the solution contained in the committee's motion for a resolution, in which Parliament leaves to the Council the responsibility for taking a new decision on this question should it consider this necessary. This would confirm that the responsibility for the implementation of budgetary decisions on the granting of aid lies solely with the Council.

President. — The debate is closed. The vote will be taken at the next voting-time.

(The sitting closed at 11.45 p.m.)¹

¹ For the agenda for the next sitting, see the Minutes.

ANNEX*Votes*

(The Annex to the Report of Proceedings contains the rapporteur's opinion on the various amendments and the explanations of vote. For a detailed account of the voting, see Minutes)

Amendment No 1, by Mr Barbi and others, seeking to replace the motions for resolutions on Lebanon (Doc. 1-343/82, 1-348/82, 1-354/82, 1-357/82/rev., 1-358/82 and 1-361/82): adopted

*

* *

Glinne and Charzat motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-358/82): adopted

After the adoption of the resolution

Written statements

Mr Brok. — *(DE)* I voted for the amendment by Mr Barbi and others on the understanding that on the basis of the progress of the motion and your statements there would be a split vote on paragraph 3. I hereby declare that I am not in favour of the first part of paragraph 3. I wish this to be noted in the minutes.

Mr Calvez. — *(FR)* Following the events which marked the vote on the urgent motion on Lebanon, I wish to say that if there had been a split vote I should have voted against paragraph 3.

Mr Goerens. — *(FR)* If there had been a split vote on the motion for a resolution on Lebanon, I should have voted against paragraph 3.

Mr Mart. — *(FR)* If there had been a split vote on the motion for a resolution on Lebanon, I should have voted against paragraph 3.

Mrs Martin. — *(FR)* I beg to inform you that if there had been a split vote on the motion for a resolution on Lebanon I have voted against paragraph 3.

Mrs Moreau. — *(FR)* I wish to confirm that I intended to vote against paragraph 3 of the motion for a resolution on Lebanon.

Mr Nordmann. — *(FR)* Following the events which marked the vote on the motion for a resolution on Lebanon today, Thursday, 17 June 1982, I wish to announce that I am against the adoption of the third paragraph of the text of the amendment seeking to replace the motions for resolutions.

Mr d'Ormesson. — *(FR)* I beg to inform you that since it was not possible to obtain a split vote — contrary to the Rules of Procedure — on the compromise resolution by Mr Barbi and others on Lebanon, I was unfortunately obliged to vote against the whole motion

since I could not feel it in my heart and conscience to condemn the Israeli army, as paragraph 3 of the resolution does.

Mr Prag, Mr Seligman, Mr Moreland, Mr Johnson, Mr Hord, Mrs Veil, Mrs Scrivener, Mrs Ewing, Mrs Nielsen, Mr Nordmann, Mr Normanton, Mr Marshall, Mr Cottrell, Mr Blumenfeld, Mr Forth, Mr d'Ormesson, Mr Israël, Mr Provan, Mr Patterson, Mr Janssen van Raay, Mr Schall, Mr Calvez, Mr Hutton, Miss Roberts, Mr J. D. Taylor, Mr Hart, Mr Goerens and Mrs Martin. — We, the undersigned Members, believe that the voting which took place this morning on Amendments Nos 1-343/1, 1-348/2, 1-354/2, 1-357/2, 1-358/9 and 1-361/2 on the situation in Lebanon did not permit a proper representation of the views of this Parliament.

We, the undersigned Members, are totally opposed to paragraph 3 of this resolution condemning Israel, and greatly regret not having been given the opportunity for a separate vote on this paragraph as had been requested beforehand in writing.

Mrs Scrivener. — (*FR*) Following the events which occurred this morning, I confirm that if there had been a split vote I should have voted against paragraph 3 of the urgent motion for a resolution on Lebanon.

*

* *

Calvez motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-347/82): adopted

*

* *

De La Malene motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-353/82): adopted

*

* *

Moreau motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-345/82): adopted

*

* *

Travaglini motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-350/82): adopted

*

* *

Langes motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-321/82): adopted

*

* *

Brok motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-332/82): adopted

*

* *

Hopper report (Doc. 1-307/82): adopted

The rapporteur was:

- *in favour* of Amendments Nos 22, 30, 33, 35, 37 and 43;
- *against* Amendments Nos 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 26, 28, 29, 31, 39, 40, 44, 46, 48, 49, 50, 51, 53, 55/rev., 57 and 58.

Explanations of vote

Mr Gerokostopoulos. — (GR) Mr President, I shall vote for the motion for a resolution contained in the report by Mr Hopper, but I feel I must state my reservations on the text before us, since it has not given sufficient emphasis to certain extremely serious matters, to which I should like to refer.

Firstly, the Mandate is more wide-ranging and can only be put into effect if its three chapters are developed at the same time together with an attempt to bridge the development imbalances within the Community.

Secondly, it is urgently necessary to reinforce the rules of Community preference, the implementation of which is currently giving rise to many doubts about the correctness of the policy which the Community is pursuing in certain areas.

Thirdly, there is an equally pressing need for the presentation and adoption of direct and specific measures to tackle the problem of the Mediterranean countries, a problem which will become even more acute with the future enlargement of the Community, to which we naturally have no political objection. Enlargement will create unbearable pressures mainly in certain southern regions, where even now the efforts to adapt require restructuring measures and reforms for which they are not sufficiently prepared.

Fourthly, ways and means of partially tackling this problem and of bridging the gulf between the North and the South were proposed by this House with the adoption on 7 February 1982 of the report by Mr Pöttering, which proposed, among other things, the setting up of a development fund for the Mediterranean regions.

Mr Bord. — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, much has occurred since 1981 when the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs asked Mr Hopper to draw up the report on the mandate of 30 May 1980. With tenacity, realism, intelligence, Mr Hopper has tried to adapt his report to the changing realities, but in spite of his praiseworthy efforts this has proved difficult. To such an extent that our representatives on the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs requested that an act be passed stating that the mandate of 30 May was completely outdated, that the Council exonerates the Commission from continuing to execute it, and that accordingly there was no longer any need to discuss the report. The Commission rejected this proposal and, after many vicissitudes and delays, Mr Hopper's report has finally been presented and submitted today to the vote of Parliament.

By force of circumstances, and in spite of the efforts of its author, the report is too general, mixing agricultural problems, budgetary problems and other Community issues.

Mr President, this report has one positive aspect, namely the will to develop new Community policies in line with the initial objectives of the mandate; an economic policy, industrial and energy strategies, a technological policy, some of which have been adopted,

in particular by the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs. We welcome this. However the most significant amendments, Mr President, and particularly amendment No 1, have been rejected and we regret this.

Furthermore we wish to draw the attention of our fellow members, and also of the Council and of the Commission, to certain as yet unofficial but nonetheless disquieting information whereby preparations are underway for the planned negotiations next autumn on budgetary contributions. The contribution keys envisaged appear completely unacceptable. We wish to express, now, Mr President, our total reservations with regard to any proposals along these lines which might be presented by the Commission to the Council.

Mr Nyborg. — (*DA*) I very much regret having to vote against this report since, firstly, it strikes me that, as has already been mentioned, considerable time has passed since the mandate of the 30 May was issued. Secondly, I must admit that Mr Hopper has done a major piece of work. However, his nationality shines through and he should basically be regarded as the wrong person for work of this kind. Finally, I should like to say that I am tired of constantly having to discuss the British contribution to the European Community. If one has agreed to certain rules of play, one must observe them, and not insist that one joined on the wrong terms.

Mr Fernandez. — (*FR*) Mr President, the Hopper report opposes the principle of 'fair return'. That is a good thing, but it does not rule out the possibility of new blackmail on the part of Great Britain.

According to the agreement of 30 May 1980 the EEC should take over 65% of the British budgetary deficit. In reality the other Member States have taken over 84% of the deficit in 1980 and more than 100% in 1981. Great Britain has enjoyed an additional gain of 1 000 million ECU more than agreed under the mandate. In 1982 it was reimbursed 850 million ECU and, while this sum is lower than that demand by it, it is still far too much.

It is time to demonstrate greater firmness in the face of the exorbitant claims of Great Britain, so that it shows more respect for Community principles.

We do not accept that France should pay for the major part of the reduction in the 1982 contribution as certain information would appear to indicate.

The other problem concerns that of foreign policy. The Community must defend the commercial, agricultural, monetary and financial interests of Member States on the basis of existing common policies.

Furthermore the report does not take sufficient account of employment problems, and more specifically of what we stated in our amendments. For these reasons, Mr President, the French Communist and Allies Group will not vote in favour of the Hopper report.

Mr Protopapadakis. — (*GR*) Mr President, I shall vote for the Hopper report because, with things as they stand at the moment, this is the best anyone can do.

However, I would express serious concern that, apart from the fact that the report leaves unsolved many problems to which other speakers have referred, it also leaves open a wound which threatens the future of our Community. This wound is the disagreement which exists between Parliament, the Commission and the Council on the questions with which the report deals.

There are many problems confronting Europe. But how can we hope to achieve a united Europe when we institutions, whose mission it is to serve this European unity, occupy ourselves with a never-ending dispute which has turned into a childish squabble between us, instead of cooperating constructively to solve the problem of Europe?

With this reservation I am in favour of the Hopper report and hope that peace is quickly restored to Parliament's relations with the Commission and the Council before it becomes necessary for an arbitration body to intervene.

Mr Bonaccini. — *(IT)* Mr President, let me endorse what other Members have said in congratulating Mr Hopper for the assiduous and able manner in which he performed his work.

However, I would just like to say that we have missed an excellent opportunity. We could have had a debate on a proposal by Mr de Ferranti on the subject of paragraph 32 but the opportunity has slipped by without any discussion.

Our opinion of the Hopper report cannot be divorced from a more general opinion on the attitude of the Council and the Commission with regard to the whole issue raised by the mandate of 30 May and on the conclusions which the Council has thought to reach. It is for this reason — and not with the idea of criticizing Mr Hopper's work — that we shall be abstaining in the vote, another reason being that we do not feel that the battle is over for the revival of the Community and of the policies which were being requested with the mandate of 30 May.

Mr Alavanos. — *(GR)* Mr President, the Communist Party of Greece disagrees profoundly with the report by the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs on the 30 May Mandate. This report is based on the motion that the crisis in the Community can be tackled by means of a new substantial shift of political and economic power from the national level to the supranational bodies of the Community. Something of this kind would be particularly negative for my country, which is already faced with the grave consequences of its entry into the Community.

I should like to refer in particular to the points in the report.

Firstly, the call for the decision-making procedures to be made more effective. This seeks to deprive the Member States of their right of veto.

Secondly, the 'increase in own resources', which involves transferring a larger amount of national resources from national to Community administration.

Thirdly, the setting up of a new body at European level to develop Community procurement policy, which further limits the Member States' right to intervene in their economic development via the policy of State supplies.

Fourthly, the enlargement of the Community to include Spain and Portugal, which will aggravate the problems facing the agricultural economies in the Member States.

Fifthly, the call for stricter discipline as regards State aids, which goes against the countries with less developed economies, which are obliged to create a favourable basis for the development of their national production.

It is clear that the measures provided for in the report are diametrically opposed to the feelings of Greek workers on the way in which the negative consequences of Community membership should be tackled. They are also diametrically opposed to the measures proposed by the well-known communication from the Greek Government to the EEC concerning certain protective measures for Greek industry and exemptions from the rules on competition.

*

* *

Beumer motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-216/82): adopted

Explanations of vote

Mr Schwencke. — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, even if the President of the Council of Ministers, Mr Tindemans, and the President of the Commission, Mr Thorn, have tried to dispel our Committee's misgivings about the European Foundation, the overwhelming majority of our Socialist Group cannot approve the present plan for the European Foundation.

We remain convinced that a directly elected Parliament cannot accept any new European institution which does not guarantee the full participation of Parliament. We have only vague promises that the European Parliament will be involved in the programme of the Foundation. As long as this is not mentioned in the Agreement establishing the Foundation we must adhere to the principles stated in our motion for a resolution which we ask you to support: firstly, this is an agreement between the ten Member States — not an agreement on the basis of Article 235 — which excludes our participation; secondly, there will be a danger that the Foundation could duplicate work on cultural policy done by the Parliament and the Council of Europe; thirdly, no attempt will be made to benefit from the Council of Europe's experience of cultural policy since it is not represented on the 40 member Council of the Foundation.

The Committee's warning still applies: the contribution to the financing of the Foundation, being non-compulsory expenditure, should not be guaranteed as long as the rights of the European Parliament in this Foundation are not guaranteed. I therefore ask the House to support Mr Beumer's motion for a resolution as far as possible.

Mr Forth. — I am unable to support either the report or the idea of a European Foundation. We have a term in the English language, 'quango', which indicates a useless public body which serves no function whatsoever. This Community is already overburdened with many quangos, usually with the name 'foundation', which perform no identifiable task whatsoever but cost a lot of public money and I am disappointed that the people of this House have not shown greater imagination in finding better uses for public money than to set up things called foundations with ill-defined tasks to produce unread reports out of which no result will come whatsoever.

My second objection is this: it really is time the Community started to demonstrate its value by its actions, not by setting up bodies which are dedicated to telling everybody how good the Community is. And until this House learns to distinguish between actions and words. I, for one, will be quite unable to support this kind of move and for that reason. Mr President, I shall vote against this report to signify my complete lack of support for this concept of the foundation.

*

* *

Michel report (Doc. 1-281/82): adopted

The rapporteur was:

— *against* all the amendments.

Explanations of vote

Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli. — (IT) Mr President, we are pleased with the Michel report because it is what it was supposed to be, the follow-up to Parliament's vote on the Ferrero report. This report, then, rounds things off and is not something completely new. We are therefore happy that a large number of amendments have been withdrawn, even though some of them in fact seemed interesting and worthy of attention.

This fact aside, we still have one major concern. The fact is that we are fighting a losing battle when it comes to hunger, whether you look at the basic structure of the problem or the actual situation. On the general issue of development we are also at a crossroads. I am afraid there is going to be no way out unless something is done about the basic facts. These basic facts are primarily the issue of hunger, which runs counter to every development model, good or bad. Life comes first, of course. Secondly, there is the bad showing of the model followed in the last ten years. A new development policy is being worked out in fact. Thirdly, resources are inadequate. And finally, there is no coordination between bilateral Community action and multilateral action outside the Community.

As another member of the group said earlier, what is needed is a new political course, which for the time being is not apparent. We have to be frank about it — there are no signs of any new course. In our view, it should be based on the realization that if survival for the developing countries means physical survival, then in the case of the developed nations it means social and political survival. This, Mr President, Mr Commissioner, is the thinking behind the vote in favour by the Italian Members of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Romualdi. — (*IT*) Mr President, while the Members on the right of the Italian political spectrum are aware of the paramount need to tackle the problems of hardship which are still the scourge of entire regions in the Community — let me quote Ireland and southern Italy as examples — at the same time we cannot fail to be aware of the dramatic scale of the problem of hunger and underdevelopment in the world, and we shall be voting for the Michel report. Hunger in the world is a humane and political problem, because the repercussions of this struggle are political as well as humane.

This debate has again confirmed my belief that the struggle against hunger is more of a problem of will and organization than of resources. This is true not only in the case of development cooperation but also in the case of immediate and urgent food aid which is needed — as Mr Pannella says — to avoid a holocaust of five, ten or twenty million men, women and children who are dying at the moment. To win the race against death, which Mrs Focke talked about yesterday, it is not enough to allocate funds and to supply wheat, rice, milk, butter, fruit juices or medicines. We need organized distribution, means of transport, equipment, and bodies of willing and able people who are ready to do all this.

Mr C. Jackson. — Mr President, there is much merit in the Michel report, and my group believes it is of major importance that the House and the European Community does all it can to defeat the scourge of hunger and starvation in the world.

It is not often that I come to Mr Pannella's defence, but today I was appalled that two groups decided that because Mr Pannella had tabled a considerable number of amendments no amendments from any source would be supported, regardless of merit. I believe that raises an important issue of principle. That Mr Michel, as our rapporteur, should reject all amendments is not. I believe, a proper exercise of his function as rapporteur. I cite in particular Amendment No 159 by Mr Irmer, which was a direct reflection of views already expressed by this House. The result is that this House is in effect not producing a report as good and as well considered as it would have done had the two groups done their duty, if I may put it like that, in considering the merits of these important amendments which have been lost and which, I believe, would otherwise have been supported. I refer particularly here to one, on which we had a roll-call vote, relating to the vital issue of population increase.

In our view, this House has a duty to consider amendments. It is the practice of this House to consider reports in committee and then present them to the House, where, as we all know, important reports and other reports are, as a matter of practice, amended and thereby frequently improved. Because of this, Mr President, my group will not vote for the Michel report. We shall, instead, abstain.

Mr Glinne. — (*NL*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Socialist Group supported the compromise on the Michel report in the Committee on Development and Cooperation. The Group did not therefore submit any amendments itself because the resolution in question was an excellent description of the aims of a policy to combat hunger. For this reason it also voted against all the amendments tabled.

Mr Alavanos. — (*GR*) Mr President, as has appeared from the speeches by many Members, the dreadful problem of mass hunger is directly linked with the reform of the terrible international distribution of labour, world trade and more generally the radical reorganization of international economic relations.

We, the representatives of the Communist Party of Greece, consider that without profound social changes it is practically impossible to achieve a real solution to the problem of hunger within historically acceptable time scales. This view is completely based on the lessons of history, on the enormous progress made towards solving both the problem of nutrition and similar problems by peoples such as those of the present-day Soviet Union, China, Cuba, Vietnam and Ethiopia — in addition to the price they paid and are still paying as a result of the legacy of colonialism and the hostile attitude of the developed capitalist countries.

This position of ours is not a reason, of course, for not voting for the Michel report, despite the fundamental reservations we have as regards both its logic and the effectiveness of the measures it proposes. After all, the report by Mr Michel has been a positive exception during a part-session which has produced plenty of extreme reactionary resolutions, such as those on EEC-USA relations, Afghanistan and the basic tolerance towards the mass murder committed by Israel against the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples.

Mrs Poirier. — (*FR*) Mr President, as we said yesterday the fight against hunger is undeniably an emergency measure to save lives, attack the roots of the evil and promote the deep structural reforms which this immense human problem calls for.

We regret that our debate could not be as extensive as necessary, even though we had previously envisaged a major debate on all development issues, a debate which is moreover still necessary.

I also regret some reactions from the gallery and some individual behaviour, particularly when such a serious subject calls for gravity, restraint and I will even say reticence.

As regards Mr Michel's report, in our opinion it does of course contain some elements worthy of interest, but it is inadequate as regards content. Let me just quote two main points: the action by the Community and the Member States of open global negotiations within the United Nations on the one hand and secondly, the Communities's attitude in the negotiation of product agreements. During this debate it was stated often that the EEC's attitude in its relations with the developing countries should change. We welcome this new demand.

Since our amendments to this effect were not adopted, we cannot vote in favour of the report and we will abstain.

Mr Pannella. — (*FR*) Mr President, the press and public opinion must not be misled by the dubious intrigues which Parliament has been subjected to during these few days by the other institutions. In paragraph 4 the report denounces the lack of implementing decisions to carry out Parliament's proposals and resolutions.

Mr President, by these exaggeratedly cautious decisions we assume responsibility for millions of deaths and make ourselves the accomplice of a policy of death. This lack of implementing decisions is a breach which should be denounced. The Michel report is content to regret it.

Thus, Mr President, I will abstain, while making it clear that Parliament points an accusing finger at the other two institutions and proclaims their very grave responsibility in this matter.

Mr Irmer. — (*DE*) Mr President I will vote for this report but I have great sympathy for Mr Jackson's view. What we did with the amendments today was irresponsible. None of the spokesmen of the Groups read them or considered whether they were good or right.

The recital states 'Having regard to the annual report of the Court of Auditors of the European Community for the financial year 1979'. I proposed that 'and 1980 and the special report' should be added. We devoted a lot of time to these reports here in April at a very productive meeting. We tabled motions on this point which were unanimously approved.

Now the honourable Members simply refuse to include this because they maintain it is really a technical improvement! I think that this type of behaviour is irresponsible. We run the risk of making ourselves look ridiculous. I will nonetheless vote for the report because I agree with its content.

Mr De Goede. — (NL) Mr President I entered my name on the list of speakers yesterday. Yesterday's debate on combatting world hunger revealed differences of opinion but fortunately also agreement. Agreement on the need to offer greater help than at present. Differences of opinion as to how such aid should be structured in the long and short-term. We supported the amendments aimed at increasing and extending aid. It is essential to have a more structured approach than occasional food aid. We would have liked even more appeals to the Commission and Council to be included in the Michel report. It is most regrettable that such appeals are so necessary. Mr Pisani may rest assured that this report is not Parliament's final word on the matter. We will support Mr Michel's report. Thank you very much.

Rabbethge report (Doc. 1-202/82): adopted

The rapporteur was:

- *in favour* of Amendments Nos 3, 4, 9 and 12;
- *against* Amendments Nos 2, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 and 19.

Explanations of vote

Mrs Squarcialupi. — (IT) Mr President, as rapporteur for the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, I wish to say I welcome this Commission proposal which directs research towards the developing countries. There are imperfections, of course, and these have been pointed out. The funds which have been set aside are laughable when compared with the needs, but we must look on this proposal as a first step and we welcome the commitment which was voiced by Mr Pisani of the Commission. Technology has to match the needs of the developing countries and it must be mastered as soon as possible by these countries. For example, we should see to it that effective substances are found to boost productivity, food productivity, but at the same time must not be harmful to health. I am talking about pesticides. Many of them are carcinogenic and there has been a lot of talk about this. The problem has to be tackled from both the scientific and the political angles so that we can avoid the continual dilemma of whether to feed the starving or make do without substances which are definitely harmful.

Research needs technology right away but first of all we have to make professional training a number one priority so that research to benefit the developing countries is carried out by those involved, so that there is no brain drain or waste of the intellectual resources which these countries vitally need for their own survival and progress.

By way of conclusion, let me say that the Italian version needs to be checked as it contains several errors.

*

* *

Alber report (Doc. 1-219/82): adopted

The rapporteur was:

- *in favour* of Amendments Nos 10, 17, 18, 36, 38, 41 and 46;
- *against* Amendments Nos 34, 35, 37, 39, 42, 43, 44, 45 and 47.

Explanations of vote

Mrs Squarcialupi. — *(IT)* Mr President, my explanation of vote would undoubtedly have been different if I had not heard a surprising view to the effect that local authorities have nothing to do with us. Just one week ago I was at a Community conference, attended by the relevant Commission officials, on refuse disposal in the Ten Member States of the Community. It is up to local authorities — at municipal, provincial or regional level — to arrange for the disposal of household and industrial waste. In short, it is their job to deal with the cleaning and the conservation of the environment in the area for which they are responsible. When Mr Alber said that this matter was none of our business, I must confess to being absolutely amazed, especially as I know that Mr Alber is greatly concerned by these problems. I am talking about the day-to-day routine at local government level. It is not central government which keeps the streets clean; this is the job of the local authorities and I think that, where this is concerned, they ought to have been given more attention in this resolution of ours. Although the amendment in question was rejected, I nevertheless give my support to the Alber resolution dealing with a Commission programme which, to my mind, deserves the utmost attention.

Mr Skovmand. — *(DA)* We in the People's Movement against the European Community intend to vote against this report, not because we are opposed to action in the environmental sector — indeed, quite the reverse is true, but because we are uneasy about the form of environmental policy advocated by the European Community, since we are afraid that it would result in the quality of the environment in Denmark being lower than it would otherwise be.

The Commission has two main interests in the environmental question. Firstly, they are concerned that no technical barriers to trade should come into being and secondly they are concerned that the Commission should have as much say as possible regarding the policies of the individual countries.

We have our doubts about both of these interests, since they have a stifling effect on the environmental authorities in the individual countries and the entire environmental debate, and because a bureaucratic machinery has been built up which at best considerably slows down any efforts to set in the environment, and in certain cases even forms an obstacle to absolutely essential measures.

This is true, for example, in the case of lead emissions from motor vehicles which result every year in brain damage to a large number of children, and which both could and should have been banned long ago. But thanks to the European Community, this has not been done, nor are the Member States at liberty to impose such a ban off their own bat.

The report before us will only strengthen this bureaucracy and its influence and for this reason we must oppose it.

SITTING OF FRIDAY, 18 JUNE 1982

Contents

1. <i>Approval of the minutes:</i> <i>Mr Prag; Mr von der Vring</i>	272	<i>Weber; Mr Normanton; Mr Petronio; Mr Protopapadakis; Mr Sherlock; Sir Peter Vaneck; Mr Boyes; Mr Purvis; Mr Natali (Commission); Mr Radoux; Mr de Courcy Ling; Mr Pintat</i>	274
2. <i>Privileges and immunities of Community officials — Report by Mr Lega (Doc. 1-321/82):</i> <i>Mr Lega; Mr Dalsager (Commission)</i>	273	4. <i>Repayment or remission of import or export duties — Report by Mrs Lenz (Doc. 1-320/82):</i> <i>Mrs Lenz; Mr Natali (Commission)</i>	285
3. <i>Community energy strategy — Report by Mr Pintat (Doc. 1-303/82) and Oral question, with debate, by Mr Purvis, Mr Seligman, Mr Moreland, Mr J. M. Taylor, Mr Kellett-Bowman, Mr Prout, Mr C. Jackson, Mr Dalziel, Mr Price and Mr Beazley, to the Commission (Doc. 1-349/82):</i> <i>Mr Pintat; Mr Petersen; Mr K. Fuchs; Mr Seligman; Mr Veronesi; Mr Eisma; Mrs</i>		5. <i>Adjournment of the session</i>	285
		<i>Annex</i>	286

IN THE CHAIR: MR DANKERT

President

(The sitting opened at 9 a.m.)

1. *Approval of the Minutes*

President. — The Minutes of Proceedings of yesterday's sitting have been distributed.

Are there any comments?

I call Mr Prag.

Mr Prag. — I think, Mr President, it is right that I should bring to your notice in connection with the statement on page 3 of yesterday's Minutes and the

voting on the resolutions on the situation in Lebanon that if the vote on paragraph 3 had been taken separately that vote would have been reversed. That, I hope, will appear from a written statement signed by 28 Members concerning the way they would have voted on paragraph 3 if they had had the chance to do so. I think it is important that I should make this statement because the result of the vote is here recorded: 106 Members voting for the resolution, 90 against. I can assure you that that vote on paragraph 3 would have been reversed and that will appear from the written statement with the signatures which I have given to the Secretariat for insertion in the Report of Proceedings.

President. — Thank you, Mr Prag. I note what you have said.

I call Mr von der Vring.

Mr von der Vring. — *(DE)* Mr President, I cannot let this remark go uncorrected. The vote would not have been reversed if it had been taken separately.

President. — Mr von der Vring, I have noted Mr Prag's statement.

(Parliament approved the Minutes)¹

2. Privileges and immunities of Community officials

President. — The next item is the report by Mr Lega, on behalf of the Committee on Budgets (Doc. 1-321/82), on

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-1005/81) for a regulation amending Regulation (EURATOM, ECSC, EEC) No 549/69 determining the categories of officials and other servants of the European Communities to whom the provisions of Article 12, the second paragraph of Article 13 and Article 14 of the Protocol on the Privileges and Immunities of the Communities apply.

I call the rapporteur.

Mr Lega, rapporteur. — *(IT)* Mr President, this motion for a resolution, presented for urgent debate, concerns a proposal for a regulation applicable to Community officials who have terminated their service following a procedure for permanent cessation of their duties, a procedure approved by Parliament at its sitting of 10 April 1981.

This proposal, which we have limited to a maximum of 25 A3 officials — while the Commission would have liked to extend the procedure to cover all Community officials — was adopted in order to allow the Commission to recruit Greek officials.

With this proposal, the Commission seeks to grant to officials who have terminated their service exemption from national taxation by extending, through amendment of the Staff Regulations, the privileges and immunities provided for in the appropriate Protocol.

It seems to me that this measure is a logical outcome of what we have already established. I therefore urge Parliament to adopt the opinion of its committee, which is in favour of extending immunities and privileges to the above mentioned number of officials.

President. — I call the Commission.

Mr Dalsager, Member of the Commission. — *(DA)* Mr President, the motion for a resolution on which Par-

liament has been asked for its opinion is related to the motion for a resolution on certain measures for the termination of service of certain Community officials in consequence of the enlargement of the Community, on which Parliament delivered its opinion in April 1981. The Commission decided to amend its proposals in the light of Parliament's opinion. According to the proposal on the termination of service, Parliament, Council and Commission can adopt measures to terminate the service of a limited number of A3 officials following the accession of Greece. This termination of service will take place on a voluntary basis, and the officials affected will receive a monthly allowance equal to 70% of their basic salary, and at the same time still be covered by the social security provisions.

The proposal before us today concerns the taxation of this monthly allowance. Under Article 13 of the Protocol on the Privileges and Immunities of the European Communities, salaries, remunerations and emoluments paid by the Community are exempt from national taxes. The same protocol defines the groups of Community officials covered by the exemption. Our proposal aims at ensuring that officials whose service has been terminated and who receive a separation allowance will be exempt from national taxes. It is therefore a routine proposal of a technical nature. Moreover, Parliament adopted a similar regulation regarding termination of service in 1968 and in 1973.

Finally, I wish to stress the urgency of the matter. The Council is unable formally to adopt either this proposal or the regulation itself on termination of service until Parliament has delivered its opinion. More than 15 months have elapsed since the accession of Greece, and there is an urgent need to hire Greek officials in A3. Finally, the regulation which provides derogations from the normal Rules to enable Greek officials to be recruited expires at the end of the year.

President. — The debate is closed.¹

3. Community energy strategy

President. — The next item is the report by Mr Pintat, on behalf of the Committee on Energy and Research (Doc. 1-303/82), on

the communication from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-1065/81) on an energy strategy for the Community: Nuclear aspects.

The debate also includes the following oral question, with debate, by Mr Purvis, Mr Seligman, Mr Moreland, Mr J.M Taylor, Mr Kellett-Bowman, Mr Prout, Mr C. Jackson, Mr Dalziel, Mr Price and Mr Beazley to the Commission (Doc. 1-349/82):

¹ For documents received, membership of committees, petitions and Procedure without report, see the Minutes of Proceedings of this sitting. For reports without debate and the votes taken at voting-time, see Annex.

¹ For the vote, see Annex.

President

Subject: Contracts to import coal from third countries

1. Will the Commission state what negotiations have been or are taking place with third countries on contracts to import coal into the Community?
2. What plans do the Commission have for further discussions on contracts for importing coal?
3. Does the Commission intend to put forward proposals for Community private or public investment in coal transport infra-structure and coal developments in Canada, USA, Australia or South Africa?
4. What rôle the is being played by EEC commercial energy companies in assuring the adequacy and security of imported coal supplies, and is the Commission satisfied with the scale of such arrangements?
5. Will the Commission ensure that negotiations with third countries will not be to the detriment of the Community's coal industry?

I call the rapporteur.

Mr Pintat, rapporteur. — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in its communication to the Council on an energy strategy for the Community, the Commission has summarized very well the problems posed and the means deployed by the Community to meet them. The section of the study entitled 'The nuclear aspects' is particularly important, because it deals with an alternative to oil consumption for the generation of electricity immediately available.

The shortfall shown by the European programme in relation to estimates (50% of the target fixed in 1974) now leads us to assess the external consequences of the cost of energy produced for the balance of payments and employment. We must therefore take advantage of the brief respite afforded us by the state of oil supplies to launch new European programmes and thus be enabled to meet, in the best possible conditions, the next oil crisis.

True, the anti-nuclear movements have played their part, but the delays or cancellations affecting numerous nuclear projects can also be attributed to a lack of political will and of clearly stated and sustained choices.

The lull we have been experiencing in the oil sector should be used energetically to launch programmes and thus prepare Europe's energy future. These new European nuclear programmes will have to be followed closely, and the Commission's announcement that it will increase the rate of publications on outline programmes on this subject has been greatly welcomed

by our committee. We propose updated publications every two years.

The launching of new nuclear programmes also involves recourse to the reprocessing of irradiated fuel, a vital stage in the nuclear-fuel cycle; industrial mastery of the reprocessing of fuel from light-water plants has already been demonstrated.

The various international anti-proliferation agreements concluded by the Commission are very satisfactory, particularly those concluded with the UN's International Atomic Energy Agency.

Likewise, the efforts made by Member States at national and Community level, as well as by other countries, with a view to improving safety have been very effective, since more than 200 high-power reactors have operated for over 10 years without a major radiation accident. There have also been good grounds for satisfaction in the results obtained from radio-protection and the monitoring and protection of the environment.

In conclusion, we welcome being presented with such a document by the Commission which sets out all the efforts made to develop this energy. This is the moment for countries such as ours to reflect on the vital need to launch new important programmes in this area. What we are experiencing is, I repeat, only a brief respite on the oil market, a temporary phase of high production which must be put to good use. Everyone knows that what we want is a renewal of economic expansion in our countries and that energy consumption is proportional to economic expansion. The fight against unemployment necessitates the production of abundant and cheap energy. That is the aim of this report, which, once again, we warmly welcome.

President. — I call the Socialist Group.

Mr Petersen. — (DA) Mr President, although there is a divergence of views within the Socialist Group on nuclear energy, we are unanimous in totally rejecting the Pintat report.

It is quite simply a bad report, particularly as it takes the form of an uncritical and biased plea on behalf of nuclear energy. For that reason, we have decided that it would be futile to table amendments, since we reject the whole report as it stands.

The Socialist Group also unanimously rejects the Commission's communication on which it is based, since it contains a whole series of unacceptable points. I shall confine myself to mentioning some of them. To begin with, we do not agree with the Commission's statement that the construction of nuclear power-stations in the Community is 50% behind the target set in 1974. The Commission states that it regrets this. We

Petersen

feel that one should rather ask whether this statement can stand up to closer examination. Many things have happened since 1974. There was the crisis, which had a considerable impact on energy consumption. There were also energy-saving measures, and if one takes these two things into account the 1974 figures have been bypassed by events. Moreover, the Member States do not share the Commission's view, even those Member States which are in favour of nuclear energy.

Secondly, I should like to point out that the Commission makes a blanket statement that electricity produced by nuclear power-stations is cheaper than that produced by coal-fired stations. This is an extremely bald statement which will not stand up to closer examination; moreover, the Commission puts forward no valid argument nor any proof whatsoever to justify its claim. There is an element of truth in the claim if one is simply considering running costs, but investment costs must also be taken into account. If, in addition, one takes into account the lifespan of nuclear power-stations, the security problems, accidents and the future dismantlement of the stations, will one arrive at the same figures? Taking all these factors into consideration, one is forced to conclude that the Commission is making an uncritical propagandistic statement when it says that electricity produced by nuclear power-stations is cheaper than that produced by thermal stations.

Moreover, we know that France, which is the country that has constructed the most nuclear power-stations, grants enormous investment subsidies in this area. Therefore the price paid in France is a political price; in fact there is no way it could be anything else.

Then there is the problem of storage, which the Commission merely touches on as though it were already solved. But this difficult problem has not yet been solved, although the Commission prefers to ignore it, just as it ignores the problems of reprocessing and breeder reactors.

In short, we feel that on this difficult topic the Commission has produced a facile communication which gives a very superficial analysis of the problems involved. Moreover, Mr Pintat goes beyond the positions adopted by the Commission. In fact, even more than the Commission Mr Pintat puts forward no argument to justify this new impulse, which, he claims, should be given to the use of nuclear power-stations. It would be difficult to convince the adversaries of nuclear energy that such a programme is justified.

Turning to the Pintat report, I should like to say that Mr Pintat states that it is absolutely necessary for countries without hydrocarbons to develop an extensive nuclear programme. As everyone knows, four Community countries do not have nuclear power-stations — namely, Greece, Ireland, Luxembourg and Denmark. We in Denmark are grateful to Mr Pintat for his advice, but we want a solution to the problem

of storing nuclear waste before embarking on a nuclear programme — if in fact we ever do so. There are three alternatives to building nuclear power-stations: massive recourse to renewable energies, energy-saving and the use of energies which are currently being wasted — namely, waste heat. If Parliament and the Commission took a genuine interest in renewable energies, it would be possible to point the way towards a Community energy policy. There is still a lot to be done in the area of energy-saving, as Denmark has shown. The Committee on Energy and Research recently visited Denmark and was able to see for itself that the recovery of energy in the form of heat is highly developed and will shortly supply 40% of urban heating.

In paragraph 2 of his resolution, Mr Pintat stresses the possibility of switching from oil to electricity where heating is concerned. That is something I would not recommend, since it is uneconomical to use electricity for heating, in view of the fact that the efficiency factor is only $\frac{1}{3}$. As the Committee on Energy observed at Århus, in Denmark, the development of a heat-recovery system would give an efficiency factor of $\frac{2}{3}$.

In my capacity as a Danish Social-Democrat, I should like to make a number of remarks on the Pintat resolution. Mr Pintat calls for the creation of a European network: I should like to point out to him that Denmark already cooperates with other Scandinavian countries in this area — namely, Norway and Sweden — so that such a proposal is totally superfluous where Denmark is concerned.

Mr Pintat states that the Commission should take measures *vis-à-vis* the Member States to encourage them to prospect for uranium. I believe that the Commission is intelligent enough not to wish to intervene, even to try to intervene, *vis-à-vis* Member States, and in particular Denmark, even if uranium is found in Greenland. Indeed, an agreement between Greenland and Denmark stipulates that uranium deposits shall be jointly exploited and that any decision shall be taken by both parties.

A little further on, Mr Pintat says that Euratom loans should be increased. An increase from 1 000 to 2 000 million ECU is, in his view, insufficient. I should like to point out again that four Member States do not have nuclear power-stations. That is why I see no reason for increasing the amount.

Finally, Mr Pintat wants to see a Community contribution to information on nuclear energy and safety. No, Mr Pintat, that is something we should leave to the political parties and to the governments of the national States! In any case, one cannot make any contribution to this sort of information if it is based on such fragile foundations as those proposed by the Commission, which Mr Pintat has not only taken over but extended in his report.

Petersen

The Socialist Group is willing to discuss, on a scientific basis, the use of nuclear energy as a possible solution for those countries that wish it. However, on the basis of the position put forward by the Commission and by Mr Pintat, there is no ground for trying to give a new impetus to nuclear energy. For that reason, we are totally opposed to Mr Pintat's report and to the Commission's proposal.

IN THE CHAIR: MR LALOR

Vice-President

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

Mr K. Fuchs. — (*DE*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, unlike the previous speakers, I strongly support, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party the Pintat report and the Commission communication on nuclear energy. I wish to congratulate Mr Pintat for his precise, clear and unequivocal report, which can really help us to reach a decision on this difficult question. In particular, he has avoided indecisiveness and half-heartedness. From a political point of view, both are important, since they lead either to immobility or illusion and neither offers any guidance for the future. The Pintat report and the Commission communication set out clearly the rôle which nuclear energy can play in solving the energy problem.

It also lays down the essential conditions. The European People's Party shares this view. We insist that we must not allow ourselves to be misled by the momentary oil surplus, that we should, under no circumstances compromise the future of energy supply by failing to face up squarely to the problem of nuclear energy simply for the sake of a quiet life.

Nuclear energy cannot, of course, solve the energy problem, but neither can this vital problem be solved without nuclear energy. We are concerned that, for lack of political will, only 50% of the target set out in the programme will be achieved. The most pressing need in the energy sector is to invest much more money than in the past; and this applies to nuclear energy. The report, therefore, rightly calls for the doubling of Euratom loans. An amendment by our group seeks to go even further.

More information, along the lines of that given by the Commission, is obviously necessary, and there is clearly a need to compare energy sources. There is no need to shy away from this. What we need to do is to identify not only the conditions but also the advantages involved in the use of nuclear energy.

Safety is clearly the first priority. It is the first rule. The Commission states that it is a *conditio sine qua non*, and I should like to point out that during the years that it has been considering nuclear energy, the European Parliament has placed particular emphasis on this aspect. This is borne out by the fact that most of the report is devoted to the research and development programme, and in committee the EPP Group submitted a further amendment on this point.

We also wish to examine the effects on the environment, but in my view nuclear energy holds far fewer dangers than, for example, coal and oil. Clearly we must take economic factors into account. If we wish to combat unemployment, we must begin by making our economy more competitive. At the moment it is not competitive and as a result, jobs are at issue. When Mr Petersen says that he doubts whether nuclear energy is cheaper, I am obliged to reply that undertakings know how to choose between alternatives and they do not choose the most expensive, but inevitably opt for the alternative which offers better competitive advantages. This is enough to show that nuclear energy is superior to other forms of energy.

Our countries can build up the uranium stocks required for the future. This would be of great value to us in a crisis situation. To this end, however, I believe that the Euratom Treaty must be revised. As provided for in Chapter 6, it must be adapted to the current situation and current structures.

But world uranium reserves are finite: therefore they must be put to the best possible use. This means recycling, since 97% of it can be reused. It also means improving technology. Fast-breeder reactors are up to sixty times as energy-efficient as ordinary light-water reactors. It would be a disaster not to continue the progress in the direction of high-temperature reactors. Moreover, the reprocessing and combustion of nuclear fuels made possible by fast-breeder reactors greatly reduces the problem of finally disposing of nuclear waste.

From a technical point of view, the problem of final disposal has been solved. What is lacking is the political will. I believe that the Commission's proposal and the Pintat report open up the proper road for the future.

Nuclear energy can make a decisive contribution to one of the foundations of our energy programme — diversification. Future progress depends on having a variety of alternative sources of energy. Taking all these factors into consideration, the Group of the European People's Party welcomes the Commission's proposal and will vote for it.

(Applause)

President. — I call the European Democratic Group.

Mr Seligman. — We all in this group welcome Mr Pintat's excellent report, and we have no further amendments to make, because it is a very clear, comprehensive and powerful report. Since the first nuclear power-station was built in Britain at Calder Hall in 1956, the world has experienced 2 000 nuclear power-station-years of nuclear power and it has built over 260 nuclear power-stations, and during that period not a single person has lost his life as a result of a nuclear reactor accident. This is because, of all methods of producing energy, nuclear power is the most safe, the most studied and the most well-engineered energy that exists. Every nuclear power reactor is built according to the Russian-doll principle: that is to say, the core of the reactor is separated from the outside environment by a series of barriers. It is defence in depth.

That is why opponents of nuclear power have got it wrong. They are doing a great disservice to their fellowmen. If they have their way, we shall enter the next century with a major deficit of energy and people will die, not from radiation, but from hunger, cold and even from a possible energy war. That is why we welcome the initiative taken by Viscount Davignon for the Commission to enter more positively into the nuclear scene, and we welcome his intention to bring up to date Chapter 6 of the Euratom Treaty. Chapter 6 has never worked properly, and bureaucratic control under that chapter can hinder the free movement of raw materials and supplies, particularly in a rapidly changing market situation such as has occurred in recent months.

Chapter 6 specifies equal access. Well, we do not know really what this means. Does it mean that everyone has to purchase on exactly the same basis? This would be a restraint on competition. We prefer the word 'non-discrimination' to 'free access'. The Commission has tried to revise Chapter 6 three times in the past and failed, so we must make sure that the Commission has success this time. We must get rid of bureaucratic monopoly in nuclear supplies.

With regard to nuclear safety, this Parliament has already made its position quite clear in the Fuchs resolution on the 1990 objective and in the Lizin resolution and on many other occasions. We all want increased safety in nuclear power and in waste disposal, but we do not want more Community regulations. We do not want more socialist bureaucracy strangling progress. We want safety to be the responsibility of the operating authority in each case. If we have more regulations the operator can just say, 'well, I followed the regulations to a T, but something went wrong. It is not my fault. This is what we did. It is your fault for getting the regulations wrong'. This is what happened at Three Mile Island: the operating utility blamed the Nuclear Regulating Authority for not covering the situation in their regulations. We do not want the American situation to be duplicated in Europe. We want safety to be squarely placed on the

shoulders of the operating company or authority, as it is now.

Finally, the opponents of nuclear power say we do not need any more electricity at this time, we already have spare capacity. Well, as Mr Fuchs said, this is a temporary situation due to world recession and electricity demand is bound to pick up.

What we do want, of course, is cheaper electricity, Mr Petersen says that cheapness of electricity is pure propaganda. Well, I know it is not, because my group only last week visited the North of Scotland Electricity Authority and there we saw the daily cost sheets of that authority. It was quite clear that one of their oil-fired power-stations was costing 2.4 pennies per kilowatt-hour. One of their coal power-stations was costing 1.8 pennies per kilowatt-hour. Their Magnox reactor, Hudson B, a nuclear reactor, was costing 1.2 pennies and their advanced gas-cooled reactor, their latest one, was costing 0.79 pennies per kilowatt-hour. There is the proof: three-and-a-half times cheaper than oil! That is practical experience, so this is not propaganda. That is why France and Japan are pushing ahead as fast as they can with nuclear power.

Mr President, finally, our friends the Green People may not know it, but they are sabotaging the standard of living and future prosperity of their fellow citizens. By depriving Germany, for instance, of nuclear power to meet their energy requirements, they are forcing them to become dependent on imported Russian gas supplies. Whether the Green People know it or not, they are the unwitting tools of Communist imperialism, and I hope that the Socialist Group opposite will not join them in that effort.

(Applause)

President. — I call the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Veronesi. — Mr President, we Italian Communists have voted for and supported the motion for a resolution and the report presented by Mr Pintat in the Committee on Energy and Research. We hereby confirm that support.

This support is the fruit of a conscientious examination and deep reflection: we leave absolutely nothing to chance. It is important in this debate not to lose sight of the general background. In the year 2000, the world population will have increased by a further 2 billion people. There will still be a great deal of hunger and poverty and, if we are to be consistent with all we have said in the past few days, we must prepare to help those people towards emancipation and development.

Energy is the fundamental starting-point for carrying out these tasks and solving these problems. All sources

Veronesi

— *all* without exception, both renewable and conventional — must be rationally used if we wish to face the problems we say we want to solve.

That is why — whether we like or not — we feel that a fundamental rôle will be played by nuclear energy. The prudence, skill and sense of responsibility with which the technology has been carried forward are sufficient grounds today for looking towards an implementation of these programmes.

Countries are very different one from another, but the general situation in the world makes it absolutely essential to have a large-scale strategy which is geared to the future and which provides guarantees against energy shortages.

We are under no illusions as to current trends on the traditional fuels market, this being a purely temporary phenomenon. We shall be confronted with new tensions and we shall encounter serious difficulties in dealing with problems of energy production in our countries.

I should like to conclude with a methodological observation, which I address to the Commission. It is important, if at all possible, that these debates on energy and the various energy problems should be taken together. Conducted separately, the overall character of the problem dealt with is always lost sight of. We have already discussed security of supplies, waste products, alternative energies, coal; we have dealt with all these questions! We must not lose sight of this general background, against which we have condensed all the exigencies for a sound and sensible exploitation of energy resources in Europe and throughout the world.

Convinced of its value, we therefore confirm our intention to vote for the Pintat report — offering our congratulations to Mr Pintat — and we shall vote for the motion for a resolution.

(Applause)

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

Mr Eisma. — *(NL)* Mr President, we are certainly less enthusiastic than the rapporteur and Mr Fuchs, Mr Seligman and Mr Veronesi about this proposal from the Commission. I shall not take more than 3 minutes to explain this attitude.

We are not in favour of the construction of fast-breeder reactors for a number of reasons, including political, safety and economic considerations. We are opponents of the 'plutonium economy', and this means, in our view, that energy from nuclear fission is no solution in the long term. With conventional light-

water reactors, the uranium is used up after 30 or 40 years. Over the long term, our efforts should be directed towards meeting our energy requirements from the sun, light and nuclear fusion.

As we have already pointed out in the debate on the budget for research into nuclear fusion, some months ago, we have far fewer objections to nuclear fusion. For the short term, Mr President — that is to say, in the next 30 to 40 years — the energy shortage must be offset by coal, processed natural gas and savings. Savings are indeed possible — up to 30% if we are really determined. Conventional nuclear plants can make a contribution, but they are not strictly necessary, although some say that they are cheaper. At all events, so long as the problems with the disposal of radioactive materials and the safe dismantling of old plants are not solved, we feel there is no justification for building new nuclear plants.

The saying 'with time comes counsel' is dangerous here — if not for us, then at least for our children and grandchildren. We do not agree, therefore, with the policy as set out in the Commission's communication to the Council on the nuclear aspects of an energy strategy for the Community. A less considered document on the subject of nuclear energy I have not read for a long time. The steadily increasing protests by the people against the construction of new nuclear plants have clearly escaped the Commission. We should therefore vote with conviction against Mr Pintat's enthusiastic report.

President. — I call Mrs Weber.

Mrs Weber. — *(DE)* Mr President, I should like to begin by dealing with what Mr Seligman said. I find somewhat cavalier the statement that, without nuclear energy, the Russians will be able to export Communism to Germany through the gas-pipes! I wonder where many of the countries represented in this Chamber buy their uranium. I have heard it rumoured that there are deposits even in South Africa.

We in Europe have for too long been presented with this kind of report on nuclear energy which in cavalier fashion simply sweeps under the carpet actual and possible problems. I regard this as an enormously dangerous way of proceeding, particularly when dealing with people, who, initially, are not totally opposed to nuclear energy but who sincerely and intelligently ask how the problems involved in the use of nuclear energy can be avoided and where one can reach a responsible and intelligent decision.

It is precisely these views which make it difficult to arrive at a correct decision. Such triumphalist reports, which simply ignore every problem which not only the European public but also scientists have been discussing for thirty years, make it impossible even for those

Weber

who were originally in favour of nuclear energy to reach a decision.

Where are safety questions, such as hair-line cracks and Harrisburg, mentioned? These are irrefutable facts. Where are health problems mentioned? Where is any attempt made to deal with continuous exposure to low-level radiation, which, even in the Community, is being studied? Where is the whole environmental problem, the heat-pollution of water, the influence on climatic conditions, the effect of radiation? What about profitability?

Surely you are not trying to hoodwink us into believing that nuclear energy is cheaper? If nuclear energy were really so ridiculously cheap, why are the Member States increasingly shifting the enormous cost of research to the Community? As Mr Petersen has pointed out, these costs are not included. Shutting-down costs are not included, nor are the research costs. Even the French do not include them. I regard as suspect this way of dealing with so important a problem.

Turning now to the last problem, which the supporters of nuclear energy take less seriously than those who are opposed to it. I am still convinced that it is necessary to elicit the support of the people of Europe for the task of ensuring energy supplies and in particular for acceptable energy supplies. This way of proceeding is the worst possible way of persuading people to accept a particular form of energy supply. You cannot ignore the fact that at least 30% of the population is against nuclear energy . . .

(Protests)

. . . Yes, that is the question which always arises, whether one should take advantage in this way of the majority one has or believes that in a democracy one should respect the will of the minority. That is what democracy means to me. As far as I am concerned, democracy also means that, when a large minority has serious reservations concerning the future of our society, one should at least consider their wishes and take them into account when making political decision. I believe that as long as the people of Europe do not accept nuclear energy to the extent that is democratically desirable, one should abandon such triumphalist reports. For that reason, I support Mr Petersen's statement that a report of this sort should be categorically and decisively rejected.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Normanton.

Mr Normanton. — Mr President, the Pintat report merits the unanimous endorsement of those Members who have been elected to this House with the sole

object of serving the best interests of those who elected them, as well as their children and their children's children.

In connection with energy, safety, as I see it, means freedom from injury to health and damage to the environment. Security means, as far as I am concerned, freedom from interruption or the threat to interrupt the certain, assured, constant availability of energy at the lowest practical cost to the user. We should never forget in this House that, like freedom in a democratic society, public and politicians alike, or rather too many of them, tend to take for granted the energy available to us in its many forms today. Like freedom, we only appreciate the value of energy when it is no longer available to us, or when we have to pay an exorbitant, intolerably high price for it.

The rise in oil prices which broke in 1973 and its devastating impact on the lives of every man, woman and child for whom we were elected to this House could have been anticipated and, I believe, mitigated, had governments of Member States — all Member States of the Community — acted in a responsible and timely fashion in the matter of nuclear power for electricity generation. The fact that we didn't is, I believe, a very serious indictment of political leadership, or rather the lack of it, in this field. Had programmes for the construction of nuclear power-stations right across Europe been only 15% greater in number or faster in rate of completion, then three million more men and women would today be employed and the monetary recession, in which we limp from one crisis to another, would have been significantly smaller. Nuclear electrical power is the cleanest, safest, cheapest and most reliable means of generating power, however one may assemble and compare the available statistics.

In only one of our Member States has government displayed vision, judgment and resolution in turning from words which mean nothing to deeds, which mean in its case the initiation of a programme for the construction of nuclear generating stations on a scale unprecedented in European industrial history. Its aim is to turn its economy into one which is far less dependent on imported oil and therefore political blackmail in respect of price or supply. France deserves the applause of every Member of this House for the benefits which its nuclear programme will bring to this Community as a whole. The French economy and those millions who are engaged in it will reap as rich a harvest in the form of increased competitive capability as France has reaped over many years in the field of agriculture.

This, I believe, is the salient point of political importance to be read into the Pintat report. It is also the main point being made by the Commission in its policy paper that is before us.

Last week, Mr President, accompanied by Mr Cluskey and Mr Irmer I visited the Community's Joint Research

Normanton

Centre at Ispra. It is here that Mr Pintat's plea for increased study of and attention to ever-higher standards of safety is being followed up for the benefit of all the citizens of Europe. We also met there and had discussions with the staff working on the Super Sara project. The Joint Research Centre is faced with a great challenge. It has a great opportunity to restore the reputation which was so regrettably tarnished when the Court of Auditors and our Budgetary Control Committee descended upon it in recent years.

I do assure the House, however, that the Committee on Energy and Research will be playing a major part in future in monitoring and reporting on progress in the two areas of research to which Mr Pintat refers in this report. I strongly support Mr Pintat's report.

President. — I call Mr Petronio.

Mr Petronio. — (*IT*) Mr President, the reductions in oil prices and the greater availability of this energy source at the moment should not make us over-optimistic, for these two factors are proof of a dangerous stagnation in world economic activity.

If we consider this situation as structural, we should be prepared for a zero growth-rate for quite some time, and therefore for a progressive increase in unemployment. But since the fight against unemployment is one of our Community's top priorities, since this is also true of the fight against inflation and since, finally, the success of both these battles is tied above all to a restoration of the balance-of-payments situation and a substantial reduction of the oil deficit, we need to consider the present breathing-space on the oil market as no more than a short-term phenomenon. We must therefore take advantage of this brief respite, the duration of which we cannot predict, to prepare ourselves for a foreseeable shortage and thus for higher costs of oil products, things which are bound to happen because of the growing needs of the third World and as a result of the hoped-for revival of world economic activity.

Otherwise we shall remain helpless, contenting ourselves with zero growth — the pessimistic outlook and deplorable state of affairs projected by the famous Club of Rome on the basis of one of its reports, though contradicted by other reports drawn up by the brilliant Paris group. We must therefore adjust ourselves to an expected fall in population growth and an appreciable diminution of consumption, particularly at the expense the Third World, or else push decisively for the post-industrial revolution, toward a highly technological and computerized society. In our opinion, what we must do in practical terms is take advantage of the breathing-space on the oil market to organize our response to the third energy challenge which will be issued sooner or later and which will constitute a further shock for our economy.

As to the dilemma between coal or nuclear energy, account must be taken of the fact that electricity produced by burning coal costs, as we have been told by the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, between 30 and 90 percent more than that obtained from nuclear plants. In addition to research into the liquefaction and gasification of coal and on all the other alternative sources, from solar energy to biomass, it is also necessary therefore to develop a nuclear programme, which must indeed be considered a vital necessity.

Our vote will thus be in favour of the Pintat report for the reasons I have briefly outlined, but it is also intended as an encouragement to the Commission to give practical consideration to the establishment of a European electrical network capable of meeting minimum and maximum supply demands whenever necessary. This would enable States without nuclear plants to obtain supplies from States possessing such plants.

My final observation concerns the problem of safety, which must be solved if we are to avoid, as far as possible, the threat of anti-nuclear barricades which we have heard about in Denmark.

It is true that 200 high-power reactors have operated for ten years without any serious accidents, but this is not enough. We must insist, on the one hand, on rapid progress with Ispra's Super Sara research project, which is of the greatest importance because it is unique, and, on the other hand, seek the best methods for storing radioactive residues and demonstrate their efficacy.

President. — I call Mr Protopapadakis.

Mr Protopapadakis. — (*GR*) I also support the Pintat report, because I believe that we need unlimited and abundant energy and that the use of nuclear energy is a valuable means of meeting this need. Without abundant energy, it will be impossible to maintain the culture which we in Europe have created, nor can we entertain the hope that other countries can attain an equally high living standard. Consequently, there are social and cultural, as well as economic, reasons for promoting the use of nuclear energy. Indeed artists and philosophers and those ecologists who are opposed to nuclear energy use the very same energy to develop their ideas and their artistic or philosophical talents. A lack of energy would consequently affect them as much as others, and in fact perhaps even more.

I would also stress that an abundant supply of energy is an important element in safeguarding world peace. With regard to the fears concerning the dangers involved in the use of nuclear reactors, I wish to state that, although many people regard the report as unsatisfactory, I have complete trust in nuclear-power tech-

Protopapadakis

nologists and am convinced that they would not permit projects to be undertaken which constituted a danger to mankind. Those who have no trust in these scientists should say so openly and demand that the universities close down the faculties at which nuclear-energy technologists study, since, in their view, these scientists are monsters and a danger to humanity. Needless to say, I reject this view. On the contrary, my support for nuclear energy is based on my trust in these people. Nuclear-energy technologists are men like us. They also have children whom they love, and they are also concerned about the fate of their children's children. Let us, therefore, trust science and the scientists and not seek to put politics in their place!

President. — I call Mr Sherlock.

Mr Sherlock. — Mr President, I must first of all draw to your attention to the fact that I am not speaking in my rôle of draftsman of the opinion of the Entertainment Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection.

(Laughter)

That was a Freudian one, was it not? Because on this occasion it really was more like an entertainment committee.

The small and, I thought, fairly sensible and sensitive report I had produced was in fact brutally done to death on a burning deck whence almost all but I had fled. There was a very considerable Socialist majority, which brings me to my first point, that I cannot imagine why those who seem to think they feel the pulse of humanity so warmly should take such a cold attitude towards the topic of providing energy for the reasonably foreseeable future.

(Applause)

It totally passeth my comprehension. But one thing does come well into my comprehension, and that is that those of us who seem to be at the two poles of this nuclear argument might just as well not waste time by talking to one another. No conviction will ever be carried across this House, I am certain.

I have made a few points. One was from a consumer point of view, because the committee is concerned with consumer affairs; and that is that whatever the method of accountancy — and there are some curious methods of accountancy employed — at least there is a reasonable realization that a plateau is predictable for the pricing of electricity from nuclear sources and that it is unlikely to be hoisted by many of the factors which do interfere with other forms of electricity production.

It is also 100% clear to me, who have watched people cough themselves to their bronchitic deaths in the Bri-

tish atmosphere, polluted very largely by the fuels of fossil origin, that without any doubt nuclear power is the cleanest, healthiest, neatest, sweetest way of producing electricity.

Of that I am certain beyond a peradventure. Shortly we shall be hearing the same Socialist cabal crying its eyes out at the prospect of acid rain, from the burning of fossil fuels, falling on the Norwegians — crocodile tears, I think.

Another matter I draw attention to is the need to educate those who are left in the middle and at least give some of them a chance to form their own opinion without being too much pushed from either side by those who argue about these matters.

My final point about the environment is that it is alright for us who are mostly pushing around in middle-class sort of situations, thinking about green fields and all the rest of it; but the environment for a great many of our population, including some of those who are foolish enough to vote for those opposite, is a fairly small room in which they spend a large part of their life, where they want to press a switch and know that the warmth will come on. They also want to know it will come on at price which they can reasonably afford. This is the environment which most of us are thinking about most of the time.

Finally, I would like to invite someone with more artistic ability than my own to invent a sticker for the motor-cars which at the moment are carrying the pretty one which in one of the parent languages reads, 'Atomkraft? Nein, danke'. I would like one with a icicle drawn on it and the motto around, 'Who is going to be a cold little girl?'

(Laughter and applause)

President. — I call Sir Peter Vanneck.

Sir Peter Vanneck. — Mr President, I am, as you know, the security hawk of my group. It is for this reason, because I am so keen on the Community being strong economically as well as militarily, that I support this resolution. The Russians are as keen to debilitate us in the one field as in the other. Opponents to nuclear power in Europe are playing the Russian game, whether they know it or not. Mr Veronesi showed his sense of balance: I wish the Socialists, including Mrs Weber, would do likewise.

In going forward, the choice in providing the energy the free world needs is between the theoretical pollution of nuclear energy and practical pollution from coal. The radiation Mrs Weber receives on a flight from Strasbourg to Paris is ten times that which she receives in a year from nuclear power. And let us not forget, as Mr Seligman has said, we have had in the

Vanneck

West 2 000 nuclear reactor-years of safe — i.e., non-fatal — operation. The airlines cannot say the same.

The pollution, including radiation from coalburning, is becoming intolerable, not only to us in the Community but from as far afield as Norway, as Dr Sherlock has wittily emphasized.

Nuclear energy is the long-term solution because it is the only available technology to fill the energy gap. Solar and fusion techniques are not yet really laboratory-proven, still less industrially proven.

I would say to the Socialists, the conviction which parliamentarians show in encouraging nuclear energy is the test of their sincerity in wanting to end unemployment.

(Protests from the Socialist benches)

If Socialists oppose nuclear energy, *ergo* they are unwilling to use a helpful tool for combating unemployment. They are the victims of their lack of political logic. Socialists should show political leadership in educating public opinion about the safety of nuclear power relative to the risks of other industrial activities instead of following a cheap-jack line to attract uneducated votes.

(Further protests)

Finally, Mr Seligman quoted the figure of 0.79 pence per kilowatt-hour for advanced gas-cooled reactors against 2.12 pence per kilowatt-hour for oil. I would say to Mrs Weber, who questioned that, that that does include commissioning and waste-disposal costs. I hope this Assembly will join in supporting the Pintat report.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Boyes to make a personal statement.

Mr Boyes. — Mr President, as a representative of the constituency adjacent to Sir Peter Vanneck's, I would ask him if he would like to withdraw the fact that people who voted for me were uneducated people. Would he like to withdraw that remark, please?

President. — I call Mr Purvis.

Mr Purvis. — Mr President, I hope the Commission has noticed that there is a little footnote on the agenda referring to an oral question signed by myself and various of my colleagues which may not seem directly related to the Pintat report, but it relates specifically to the coal question.

As we have heard from many speakers, there is a very direct relation, because the Commission's proposal for the energy balance in Europe over the next 15 to 20 years — even if it is all achieved on the nuclear side, the alternative energy side and every other side — will apparently result in the use of coal in the Community more than doubling. Where is that coal to come from? They estimate that indigenous coal production will stay mostly static around the level of 250 million tonnes per annum, as new coalmines replace old coalmines. That means that something like 350 million tonnes are going to be imported.

What steps has the Commission taken, or is it satisfied that the private sector is taking the necessary steps to ensure that that balance of supply is available to us? It is still set on the targets that it presented eighteen months ago? Are the predictions of indigenous coal supply still the same and what overseas supplies are they prepared to assure us will be available?

If that is the case, what steps are they taking to improve the infrastructure? I wonder if it has ever been really thought out in a straightforward manner, what effect this will have on the environment in terms of pollution caused by the burning of all that coal, what rail transport will be required, what enormous expansion of port facilities will be needed, and the stockyards, not just for the coal in transit but presumably for 90 days' stocks, i.e., 250 million tonnes of coal. What about the provision of new power-stations to burn that coal and transmit the energy by wire?

All these things have not really, as far as I can make out, been faced, and I would appreciate the Commission doing so. If they say — as they have said in our committee once or twice — they do not have the staff to do it, will they consider commissioning outside consultants to go into this in some depth?

President. — I call the Commission.

Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission. — *(IT)* Mr President, I begin by replying to the debate that has taken place on the Pintat report and assuring Mr Purvis that the Commission is not unaware that this debate also includes a question which, if I am not mistaken, bears his name as the first signatory.

As regards the Pintat report, I wish to say in all sincerity that my congratulations to its author on the work he has done are not a matter of pure form. We have the distinct impression that he has completely grasped the salient features of this communication from the Commission on the nuclear aspects of a Community energy strategy. I should add, in all justice, that he is not the only one to have done so: others, too, have underlined these features in the course of this debate.

What, in fact, are these salient features?

Natali

The first, as has been pointed out by Mr Fuchs and Mr Veronesi, is that the contribution of nuclear energy must be assessed within the framework of a comprehensive energy strategy and compared with that derived from other sources of energy.

Let me say in passing: only too often the mistake has been made of considering this form of energy in isolation — doubtless because of the existence of a separate atomic energy treaty — and this has encouraged an all too emotional and dogmatic dispute which is not conducive to an objective view of the matter. Mr Peterson, I hope, will not take it amiss if I say that in his speech I detected, perhaps, an echo of this emotional and even dogmatic conflict.

The second of the features brought out by the report is that, for the first time since nuclear energy has assumed industrial proportions, the Commission has submitted an organic document which, albeit in concise and sometimes unavoidably summary form, deals with all the important aspects of the nuclear problem: economic, industrial and development questions, questions of research and supply, safeguards to ensure the peaceful use of nuclear materials, safety and the disposal of radioactive waste.

The third feature — and here I particularly have in mind Mr Petersen, Mrs Weber and Mr Eisma — is that the Commission, while mindful of the positive and, I would even say, essential aspects of nuclear energy, does not underestimate the problems that have to be faced. One only has to read the paragraphs relating to the reprocessing of irradiated nuclear fuels, the safety of workers and of the population at large and the protection of the environment to see that we are not approaching this problem over-optimistically of vaingloriously but in a spirit of responsibility as — to take up a term used in the debate by, I think, Mr Normanton and Mr Petronio — a 'challenge' which cannot be ignored. As a Community, we certainly have all the means required to meet it: growing internal cohesion and enhanced cooperation on an international scale.

Dealing briefly with the motion for a resolution, I would assure Mr Pintat and the honourable Members that we shall fully meet our commitments as regards implementing and extending the operations already in progress and the launching of new initiatives: here I refer to paragraphs 4, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 and 17 of the motion for a resolution.

I should like to say to Mr Seligman, who is present and who dealt, among other things, with the relative need for supplies, that we shall submit as soon as possible a proposal on Chapter 6 of the Euratom Treaty. Obviously, as laid down in that Treaty, the European Parliament will have to be consulted, and this will be done as soon as possible.

I should like, therefore, to point out, with regard to paragraph 16 of the motion for a resolution, that the

Commission has already had an opportunity, during the debate on the Walz report, to state its position on this subject. Speaking generally, therefore, I would remind the House that the new arrangements for applying Article 37 of the Euratom Treaty are dealt with in Mr Calvez' amendment providing for a new paragraph 17A. This amendment has our support, since it points out that we have submitted a proposal concerning new arrangements for applying Article 37 with reference to the disposal of radioactive effluents capable of polluting the waters, soil and air-space of a neighbouring Member State.

I dwell on this point because our proposal constitutes a response to a call made repeatedly by the European Parliament, which, during the debate on the Walz report, was given an undertaking by the Commission which has now been carried out.

Referring still to paragraph 16 of the motion, I should like to recall what my colleague Mr Davignon had occasion to say at the sitting of 17 February during the debate on the Walz report. First of all, Mr Davignon pointed out that the call on the Council to amend its decision on Euratom loans (which, pursuant to Article 203, can only be done unanimously) so as to make them conditional on the positive outcome of a Community consultation procedure could only lead to another blockage in the decision-making process. Mr Davignon emphasized the Commission's undertaking — which I hereby confirm — that when exercising its own responsibility for determining the conditions of eligibility for Euratom loans, it would take account of the position of the European Parliament.

I now pass, Mr President, to the problems raised in the question by Mr Purvis and others.

As regards the powers of the Coal and Steel Community relating to trade policy, these powers, which are governed by Chapter 10 of the Treaty, are rather limited, and from now on no possibility is foreseen of entrusting to the Commission the conduct of negotiations with third countries for contracts for the import of coal into the Community.

Naturally, within the framework of regular consultations with third countries on energy problems, the Commission takes into consideration the export potential of these countries' coal-mining industry and their infrastructure with the object of reducing potential pressures on European importers. This is the line we have adopted, and we propose to stick to it.

Then there is the question of investing money in all the various stages of coal production in order to ensure regular supplies of coal to the Community. Members will know that certain financial instruments are already in existence, but at present there is no intention of strengthening these instruments in relation to the countries named in the question — that is,

Natali

if I am not mistaken, the United States, Canada, Australia and South Africa.

As regards the rôle that can be played by EEC commercial companies in assuring the adequacy and security of imported coal supplies, this falls within the area of national import measures, above all those taken by the coal-producing countries.

I agree on the desirability of incorporating a discussion on coal into a general debate on questions of energy. I would only point out that we have just been debating a Commission document on the nuclear aspects of our energy strategy.

In the document on coal in the Community's energy strategy, submitted on 10 February, we propose a consultation procedure for European companies concerned with coal supplies and an examination of management procedures in the event of crises at Community level. In our view, these mechanisms may help to maintain Community supplies at an adequate level from different sources.

As for the last question, concerning the need for protecting the Community's coal industry, I need hardly remind you that under the ECSC Treaty Member States can fix their own customs duties on coal imported from third countries and may introduce a system of import licences. The coal-producing countries consequently have the means of protecting and maintaining their own coal production.

In its communication of 10 February 1982, however, the Commission pointed out the economic and financial costs of such protection for the governments concerned and also for consumers, and these governments are in fact now encountering ever greater difficulties in financing this support. The Commission has submitted proposals which would have reduced the burden on these governments, but they failed to gain the Council's approval.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Radoux to speak on a point of order.

Mr Radoux. — *(FR)* Mr President, very briefly on a point of order. We are all familiar with the conditions under which we vote on a Friday morning, and I shall not expatiate upon the matter. But whatever you say in reply, I consider that it just is not responsible conduct on our part to take the vote now on a subject as important as the one we are about to vote on, when this House has over 400 Members — even if afterwards you establish how many took part in the vote.

President. — All Members have their views on that. We are all expected to be here on the Friday morning when the House sits.

I call Mr de Courcy Ling.

Mr de Courcy Ling. — Mr President, Mr Radoux has drawn attention to a rather serious state of affairs, and I think on behalf of my group, it would be wise if we emphasized it by having a roll-call vote.

President. — I call the rapporteur.

Mr Pintat, rapporteur. — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, first of all I wish to thank all those who have spoken for the quality of their contributions: this debate has proved extremely interesting.

I should like to reply very briefly to some of the arguments relating to the thesis put forward by Mr Petersen and his political friends. Obviously, this report has never maintained that all the energy consumed should be derived from nuclear sources. Clearly, this cannot cover the energy requirements of motor-cars, aircraft or many other sectors. Mr Petersen maintains that electric heating is uneconomical, but to this it should be added that all fuels are equally so. I would remind you that all fuels are equally so. I would remind you that according to the Carnot principle only a very small yield can be expected from burning coal. If we have no more steam engines today, that is because, as a result of the Carnot cycle, the yield is much lower than in the case of electric locomotives.

Mr Petersen also maintained that I had said coal-fired power-stations were much more expensive than nuclear power-stations. I never said that. What I spoke of was the cost price, not per power-station, but per kilowatt-hour, and this, according to the fuel used and the investments required — I have here the figures for my own country — amounts to 15 centimes for nuclear power, 25 centimes for coal and 45 centimes for oil.

Mr Petersen also asserted that Electricité de France received state subsidies: I would point out that it receives no subsidies from the French Government but borrows widely on the international Euro-currency market.

I would also point out to Mr Petersen that the consumption of energy is going to increase very considerably between now and the end of this century. All the experts are agreed on this, first, because of the economic expansion we hope for in the fight against unemployment, then because of the increase — 2 000 million people more — to be expected in the world population between now and the end of the century, and finally because of increased consumption in countries of the third and fourth worlds, which at present are in a state of penury.

Those who for years have attended, as I have, world congresses on energy problems will know that the

Pintat

most fervent champions of nuclear energy are the countries of the third and fourth worlds, who consider that 'it is the duty of the industrialized countries to consume nuclear energy; they can do so and leave us the coal and the oil that are available'.

At a time when we are rightly engaging in the fight against world hunger, it would be selfish of us not to use nuclear energy in our own countries, since this would mean condemning to hunger countries of the third and fourth worlds which are in great need of energy for the fertilizers needed to produce their food.

One last remark provoked by a speaker who was arguing that a choice has to be made between fast-breeder reactors and fusion. In my view — and some of us have had an opportunity of visiting Calder Hall, thanks mainly to the good offices of Mr Seligman — such a choice is quite superfluous, because fusion, which Europe is doing a great deal to promote and which is now fairly well advanced, cannot, even if it proves successful, be put to industrial use before the third decade of the next century; whereas using uranium in a fast breeder instead of a classical reactor makes it possible to multiply the world's energy reserves fifty-fold. The use of fast breeders would obviate all problems with regard to world supplies of uranium.

That is the reply I wanted to make very briefly to Mr Petersen and his friends.

President. — The debate is closed.¹

4. *Repayment or remission of import or export duties*

President. — The next item is the report by Mrs Lenz, on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations (Doc. 1-320/82), on

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-132/82) for a regulation amending Regu-

lation (EEC) No 1430/79, on the repayment or remission of import or export duties.

I call the rapporteur.

Mrs Lenz, rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, I will keep it short. The report before you concerns a rather technical matter in which Commission and Parliament, in the citizens' interests, are agreed on the need to modify a regulation on the repayment of import or export duties. All we are concerned with is the adjustment of a regulation making possible repayments which under the present régime had not been possible in this form. Under the new arrangement, these repayments will be allowed under certain conditions and so facilitate imports and exports between our various countries.

Having been informed by the Commission that the Member States would not withhold their approval, the committee gave the proposal its unanimous support.

President. — I call the Commission.

Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission. — (IT) On behalf of the Commission, I offer my sincere thanks to Mrs Lenz for her report, the committee for its unanimous opinion and the Parliament for the approval which it will assuredly give to this proposal.

President. — The debate is closed.¹

5. *Adjournment of the session*

President. — I declare the session of the European Parliament adjourned.

(The sitting closed at 11.25 a.m.)²

¹ For the vote, see Annex.

² For motions for resolutions entered in the Register under Rule 49, membership of committees, time-limit for tabling amendments, forwarding of resolutions adopted during the sitting, and dates for the next part-session, see Minutes.

ANNEX

Votes

This Annex indicates rapporteurs' opinions on amendments and reproduces the text of explanations of vote. For further details of the voting, the reader is referred to the Minutes.

Nyborg report, without debate (Doc. 1-276/82): adopted

*
* *

Bonaccini report, without debate (Doc. 1-284/82): adopted

*
* *

Purvis report, without debate (Doc. 1-285/82): adopted

*
* *

von Wogau report, without debate (Doc. 1-287/82): adopted

*
* *

Seibel-Emmerling report (Doc. 1-207/82): adopted

The rapporteur spoke

— *against* Amendments Nos 4, 5 and 6.

Explanations of vote

Mrs Salisch. — (DE) I shall support Mrs Seibel-Emmerling's second report, just as I did her first draft report.

On 19 June 1981, the Christian Democrats and the Conservatives prevented the implementation of this information system and so held up the introduction of this necessary consumer protection for one year. My assent to this report today is mainly based on the fact that, apart from a few cosmetic improvements, it differs in no way from the previously so hotly-disputed draft report of Mrs Seibel-Emmerling.

*
* *

Schwartzberg report (Doc. 1-286/82): adopted

The rapporteur spoke

— *against* Amendments Nos 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14.

Explanations of vote

Mr Horgan. — Mr President, I wish to indicate that I shall be voting against this motion for a number of reasons: principally because voting for this proposal will, in the short and certainly in the medium term, lead to an increase in taxation on the already hard-pressed population of Europe, and it will do so because, if this view of competition in air transport is adopted in the form in which it is before us today, the inevitable result will be subsidies by national governments to national airlines to stop them going the way of Braniff and Laker — those so-called pioneers of free enterprise. And, secondly, because I believe that the ideology of competition and of a spurious freedom of choice, which is available only to those with the ability to pay, is particularly ill-suited to an essential public service such as air transport.

Mr Lalor. — Mr President, I shall be voting against this resolution. Speaking to the House last night, I did ask that we look at this matter objectively and consider that both the Commission and the committee bringing in this report were acting too speedily and not taking into consideration the experience of the big airlines over the last couple of years. I said that I should be voting against this resolution this morning unless certain of the amendments that had been submitted were passed which would basically change the content of the report. This has not happened. We have only had one reasonable amendment accepted. The rest have been refused.

One of the reasons why I am voting against, Mr President, is that it was said somebody could not speak on this resolution yesterday because he could not afford to fly here. I want to indicate that the reason why he was not here is that anyone who wanted to speak for it is still in cloud-cuckoo-land, where he was flown by Laker Airlines and now cannot get back.

*

* *

Herman report (Doc. 1-189/82): adopted

The rapporteur spoke

— *in favour* of Amendment No 1, and

— *against* Amendments Nos 2, 3 and 4.

Explanations of vote

Mrs Salisch. — (DE) Mr President, I am sorry, but I can't do it this time in writing, because I should like my colleagues to hear the criticism I have to make. On a report whose title includes the word 'employment' the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment has not been consulted, and that I find deeply regrettable.

So much for my formal criticism. As regards the substance, I would say that here we are offered a correct analysis but the consequences drawn in the motion for a resolution are, in my view, inadequate. The rapporteur himself speaks of a serious threat to employment, but does not draw the consequences.

The motion for a resolution is, I would say, unfavourable to industry: there are no recommendations for social control; all mention of workers' participation has been abandoned; nothing much is said about the reduction of working hours. As a result, it fails to come up to what has already been decided on these subjects in this House. Therefore I shall abstain.

Mr Herman, rapporteur. — (FR) I should like to point out to Mrs Salisch that the opinion of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment has been asked for and been given. This committee informed us that it had already adopted an attitude on this subject in connection with an earlier report.

*

* *

Rieger report (Doc. 1-316/82): adopted

*

* *

Harris report (Doc. 1-302/82): adopted

The rapporteur spoke

— *in favour* of Amendments Nos 2, 3, 4 and 5, and

— *against* Amendment No 1.

Explanations of vote

Mr Protopapadakis. — (GR) Mr President, I shall vote for the Harris report because I believe that coastal protection is, perhaps, one of the most important topics with which we are called upon to deal. Since, however, the report deals with a very wide topic — an immeasurably wide topic, I would say — I fear that certain coastlines such as those of the Greek islands will be lost sight of in this enormous area, because they have no political power to protect them and set them apart from other areas. These islands are in danger of being ruined by tourism, since not all our visitors from the north are committed to protection of the coastline. This leads to disrespect for, and arrogance towards, the local population, pollution of the beaches and large- and small-scale thefts. One may speak of petty theft in the case of disappearance of objects needed for every day use which one has forgotten to take with one, and of large-scale theft when articles of archaeological value are involved. There is also traffic in drugs.

These points, which are dealt with in the text we are voting on, must be stressed and taken into account by the responsible authorities, so that the Greek Islands can be properly protected, not only for the sake of the local population, but also for tourists who appreciate the islands and wish to see them in their natural beauty.

*

* *

Nord report (Doc. 1-313/82): adopted

*

* *

Lega report (Doc. 1-321/82): adopted

*
* *

Pintat report (Doc. 1-303/82): adopted

Explanations of vote

Mr Kallias. — (GR) Mr President, in view of the urgent need for abundant and cheap energy on the one hand, and the dangers involved in the use of nuclear energy on the other, I wish to express the wish that the least dangerous energy sources will be developed so that they can at least meet the energy needs of the smallest countries, and that the dangers involved in the use of nuclear energy can be diminished over the years. For this reason I shall abstain, despite my very high esteem for Mr Pintat's work and for the important arguments which he has brought forward in support of his views.

Mr Skovmand. — (DA) Reading the Commission's communication to the Council on an energy strategy for the Community (nuclear aspects), one could almost believe that it was written by the nuclear industry itself, so enthusiastic and uncritical is it as regards nuclear energy.

Although it begins with a few pious words on alternative sources of energy, it goes on to say, without putting forward any evidence, that they will not be able to play any part until after the year 2000. Consequently, the only alternative at the moment is to develop nuclear energy.

The Commission's communication states that nuclear power is the cheapest form of fuel for generating electricity. It goes so far as to assert that it will remain the cheapest form of fuel even when one takes into account the cost of nuclear-waste storage and the cost of dismantling nuclear power-stations in the future. The Commission undoubtedly receives its information from the INFCE. There is no mention of the fact that other studies have reached different conclusions.

In the Commission's view, there is only one problem where nuclear energy is concerned — namely, the fact that there are still some people who have not grasped the advantages of nuclear energy, particularly the Danes. Both the Commission's document and the Pintat report suggest that steps must be taken to inform these stupid people of the benefits of nuclear energy in order to induce the Danish Government to modify its policy in this area.

The Popular Movement against Danish Membership of the EEC regards this continual pressure on Denmark as unacceptable. For this reason, we shall vote against the report.

*
* *

Lenz report (Doc. 1-320/82): adopted

**Salgs- og abonnementskontorer · Vertriebsbüros · Γραφεία πωλήσεως
Sales Offices · Bureaux de vente · Uffici di vendita · Verkoopkantoren**

Belgique — België

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

Montergade 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) 20 29-0
(Fernschreiber Anzeiger Bonn 8 882 595)

Greece

G C Eleftheroudakis S A

International bookstore
4 Nikis street
Athens (126)
Telex 219410 elef gr

Sub-agent for Northern Greece

Molho's Bookstore
10 Tsimiski Street
Thessaloniki
Tel 275 271
Telex 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

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 611008 ipzsr o

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

Sub-agent

Alan Armstrong & Associates
London Business School
Sussex Place
Regents Park
London NW1 4SA
Tel (01) 258 3740 (01) 723 3902

España

Mundi-Prensa Libros, S A

Castello 37
Madrid 1
Tel (91) 275 46 55
Telex 49370

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 Genève
Tél 31 89 50

Sverige

Librairie C E Fritzes

Regeringsgatan 12
Box 16356
103 27 Stockholm
Tél 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

Canada

Renouf Publishing Co., Ltd

2184 St Catherine Street West
Montreal, Quebec H3H 1M7
Tel (514) 937 3519

Japan

Kinokuniya Company Ltd

17-7 Shinjuku-ku 3-Chome
Tokyo 160-91
Tel (03) 354 0131

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 Εκδόσεων 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, comprise:

- 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 1982/1983: ECU 49 10 BFR 2000 IRL 33 60 UKL 29 USD 57

Single issue: price set accordingly in each case and shown on cover.

Prices do not include postage.

ECU 13.23 BFR 540 IRL 9 UKL 8 10 USD 16.20



OFFICE FOR OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS
OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

L-2985 Luxembourg



AX-AA-82-005-EN-C