

Annex

Official Journal

of the
European Communities

No 1-281

English edition

Debates of the European Parliament

1981-1982 Session

Report of Proceedings

of 8 March 1982

Europe House, Strasbourg

Contents

Sitting of Monday, 8 March 1982 1

Resumption of session, p. 1 — Minutes, p. 1 — Order of business, p. 4 — Action taken on Parliament's opinions, p. 9 — Immunity of a Member, p. 11 — Votes, p. 12 — Data-processing, p. 17 — Closure of the session, p. 21 — Annex, p. 21

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, 8 MARCH 1982

Contents

1. Resumption of the session	1	6. Votes	12
2. Approval of minutes Mr Pannella; Mr von der Vring; Mr Fergusson; Mr Nyborg; Mr Patterson; Mr Pannella; Mr Nyborg; Mr Cousté; Mr Galland	1	• Lizin report (Doc 1-852/81): European nuclear safety policy: Mrs Lizin; Mr Galland, Mrs Lizin; Mr Seligman; Mrs Lizin; Mr Galland; Mrs Lizin; Mrs Walz; Mr Irmer; Mrs Lizin; Mrs Walz; Mrs Lizin; Mrs Viehoff; Mrs Lizin; Mr Galland; Mrs Lizin; Mrs Viehoff; Mr Linkobr; Mr Chambeiron	12
3. Agenda: Mr Rogalla; Mr Gautier; Mr Arndt; Sir Fred Catherwood; Mr Megaby; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mrs Castle; Mr Forth; Mr Johnson; Mr Kirk; Mr Seligman; Mrs Walz; Lord Douro; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Sir Fred Catherwood; Mrs Scrwener; Mr Bangemann	4	• Aigner report (Doc 1-846/81): Exports of Community agricultural products to the State-trading countries: Mr J. M. Taylor; Mr Aigner; Mr Tyrrell; Mr Harris; Mr Hord; Mr Plaskovitis; Mr Brøndlund Nielsen; Mr Martin; Mr Alavanos; Mr Irmer; Mr Aigner	15
4. Opinions and resolutions of Parliament: Mr Chambeiron; Mr Notenboom; Mr Andriessen (Commission); Mr Chambeiron; Mr De Goede; Mr Andriessen; Mr Rogers; Lord Douro; Mr Andriessen; Mr R. Jackson; Mr Møller	9	7. Protection of the rights of the individual with regard to data processing (Doc 1-548/81), by Mr Sieglerschmidt: Mr Sieglerschmidt; Mrs Desouches; Mr Alber; Mr Tyrrell	17
5. Request for waiving of immunity of a Member — Report (Doc 1-1082/81) by Mr De Gucht: Mr De Gucht	11	8. Closure of the session	21
		Annex	22

IN THE CHAIR: MR DANKERT

President

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

1. Resumption of the session

President. — I declare resumed the session of the European Parliament, which was adjourned on 19 February 1982.

2. Approval of minutes

President. — The minutes of the sittings of Thursday, 18 February and Friday, 19 February 1982 have been distributed

Are there any comments?

I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (FR) Mr President, in a manner of speaking you are never mistaken.

Pannella

I wanted to say, as regards Thursday's minutes, that in view of the gentleman's agreement reached within the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions to try to get us out of a stalemate situation, I am withdrawing the objection that I had raised to the approval of these minutes.

As regards Friday's minutes, Mr President, I have to point out that I am still not satisfied and that your criticism of me, when I said that I had learnt through the press agencies, newspapers and so on that you had tried to invite President Reagan, was out of place. The press agencies have unfortunately borne me out: the press had been informed but Parliament had not.

President. — Mr Pannella, I am grateful to you for the gentleman's agreement on the minutes for Thursday and Friday.

I call Mr von der Vring.

Mr von der Vring. — (*DE*) Mr President, I would appreciate your assistance. During the February part-session there was something of an argument with the Vice-President in the Chair on the Thursday evening. He had proposed that my group's speaking time should be reduced because a rapporteur had exceeded the speaking time allocated to her committee. I protested against this.

If you now look at the verbatim report of proceedings for Thursday, you will find that, although the President's remarks have been omitted, it still contains the protest. This is a mutilated record, and when people read it, they will think that I am not quite all there. I request that the Bureau consider how this can be avoided in the future.

President. — Mr von der Vring, we seem to be dealing here with a substantive rather than a formal problem. We shall see that the corrections you want are made.

I call Mr Fergusson.

Mr Fergusson. — Before accepting Thursday's and Friday's minutes, Parliament, I think, would benefit from a statement from you, Mr President, on the exact position now of the Member who resigned last week, of his replacement and of any other impending resignations, having regard to the fact that the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions has been examining paragraph 7(3) of our Rules and, in fact, came to a decision last Wednesday. Can you tell us whether the decision which they came to on the Wednesday of last part-session has now been transmitted to you, and tell us what that decision is?

President. — Mr Fergusson, I certainly can. I have it in writing in English — and it reads as follows:

Dear Mr Dankert, at its meeting of 24 February 1982, the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions has considered the question of the interpretation of Rule 7(3), following the referral back to the committee of this question during the sitting of Parliament of 18 February 1982.

During the discussion in the committee meeting it became clear that no Member would object to the adoption of the minutes of the plenary sitting of Thursday, 18 February, which will be submitted to the Parliament at its next sitting in March.

In view of the above, the committee considers that there is no urgent need to interpret Rule 7(3). However, the committee has decided to nominate a rapporteur in order to examine this matter in detail at one of its next meetings. It is the intention of the committee to arrive at a conclusion as soon as possible.

That is why I consider that letters of resignation handed in and fulfilling exactly the same norms as previously would be acceptable.

That is not the case according to your interpretation?

Mr Fergusson. — Mr President, that was not of course the decision of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions to which I referred when I spoke a moment ago. I was referring to the decision taken on the Wednesday of the last part-session, which, of course, took place before the question of Thursday's minutes ever arose in the first place. I wonder, therefore, if I could still have an answer on that particular decision: whether it has been transmitted to you and if not, why not?

President. — Mr Fergusson, I have to inform you that no decision was transmitted to me, so I have to ask the chairman of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions, Mr Nyborg, to transmit it to the plenary now.

I call the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions.

Mr Nyborg, Committee chairman. — (*DA*) Mr President, no decision of the kind Mr Fergusson is referring to was taken. We discussed the matter but we did not take a vote on any decision such as that referred to. Certain matters were in the air, but the main points were as I indicated to you in the letter you quoted, namely that a gentleman's agreement was reached between those present at the meeting of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions, representing all political groups here in Parliament, to the effect that the minutes of the last plenary sitting be approved.

Nyborg

That is all that I can say with regard to what almost happened here today, for Mr Fergusson has put to you a question which I understand perfectly well you cannot answer. And there is no one else who can answer it. I know that the British conservatives were trying to secure the adoption of something on the lines of what Mr Fergusson is referring to, but it was not put to a vote and it was not adopted.

President. — Thank you, Mr Nyborg. I think that confirms my interpretation so far, and Mr Nyborg has added that there was no decision of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions on the previous Wednesday.

I call Mr Patterson.

Mr Patterson. — Mr President, there is a confusion between two meetings. The meeting Mr Fergusson was referring to took place here on 17 February, where there was a vote in the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions and where the committee did adopt an interpretation of Rule 7(3). It was that meeting which Mr Fergusson was asking for a report on, and it should have been given by yourself.

The second matter concerns the gentleman's agreement, and I think we must be very clear that this is what Mr Pannella and Mr Nyborg referred to. The gentleman's agreement, as I understand it, was as follows: There would be no objection to the minutes and hence to the resignation of Mr Clément on condition that no further resignations of this type took place until the Rules Committee had ruled. That was the nature of the gentleman's agreement. Now, we may all be more or less gentlemen, but my group considers that that is what it is bound by, and if it has been changed then my group is not bound by it.

President. — Two remarks from my side. There was a report from the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions on the Wednesday of the last part-session, which was not communicated to me, but it was not necessary either: because of the Siegler-schmidt proposal, it was referred back to the Committee. That is what happened on the Thursday of that part-session, so I am not yet aware of the facts of that meeting.

As for the question of no further resignations, I think that by approving the minutes of the Thursday, we accepted the resignation of Mr Clément. I cannot see how we could refuse further resignations which conformed to the interpretation of that Rule which we have followed so far, because the way I understand Mr Nyborg's letter is that the interpretation remains what it was as long as it is not changed. That is the situation we are in now. So, if the letter is in conformity with the interpretation of the Rules as we

have maintained them so far, we should accept resignations and we should accept new nominations. I think I have no other way to operate, and that, in fact, is what I am proposing.

I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (FR) Mr President, I should like to ask Mr Nyborg what is his understanding of a gentleman's agreement. In other words, who has given what? I believe that in this case both parties have given something. And so, Mr President, seeing that we found ourselves unable, after several hours of debate, to take any decision other than the one we took during the previous part-session, we tried to find a solution to the difficult predicament in which our Parliament was placed. Please note that what we actually said was that we did not wish to prejudice the interpretation of the Rules of Procedure, provided that approval of the minutes, insofar as Mr Clément was concerned, does not constitute a precedent.

As a committee we have a rapporteur who will tell us how to proceed in any future cases.

Mr President, we really only accepted this gentleman's agreement so as not to take up too much of Parliament's time with this question.

As regards any possible other cases of this nature, they will obviously have to be resolved in accordance with the interpretation that the Committee on the Rules of Procedure will give us. Otherwise, Mr President, with every new resignation we shall find ourselves again in the same situation as before.

President. — Mr Pannella, I don't think we should lose any more time over this. We are not prejudging in any way the deliberations of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions but, given that two resignations are imminent the opinion of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions must reach us tomorrow or the day after. In view of the Member States' electoral legislation, it is not possible to allow things to drag on any further. It is necessary, therefore, that the committee meet this evening or, at the latest, tomorrow morning to give its opinion on future resignations.

(Parliament approved the minutes)

I call the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions.

Mr Nyborg, Committee chairman. — (DA) I regret to have to inform you that the Committee on the Rules of Procedure cannot give an opinion on this question within the next two days. When we entered into this gentleman's agreement, the feeling was, as I pointed

Nyborg

out to you in the letter, that we should remove the need for any urgent procedure and deal with the question in a rational manner, and I should like to state here — and please do not think that I want to bring the discussions of our Committee out into plenary sitting — that no one in the Committee put forward an opinion that we could refuse to allow a Member to resign. This is just for your information, Mr President. I do not feel therefore that we shall have great difficulties to contend with in the next few days, and I think you can discard the view that the urgency procedure should be imposed on us again. Let us be left to do our work in peace! Let us return to the question when we have dealt with this matter in a sensible manner. We shall then be able to put forward a proposal for a change in the Rules of Procedure which will have reasonable prospects of being adopted here in plenary sitting. Let me conclude by saying that I do not thank Mr Fergusson for raising the matter here again.

President. — Mr Nyborg, I have to inform you, together with the Assembly, that Mr Fanton has communicated to me in writing his resignation as Member pursuant to the second paragraph of Article 12(2) of the Act on the election of Members to the Assembly by direct universal suffrage. The Assembly is required to take note of this vacancy. Next, we have the resignation of Mr Cousté. Consequently, given Mr Fergusson's interpretation, it is imperative we have an interpretation of this article within the next few days. It is unacceptable that the government of a Member State should be placed in difficulties on account of the interpretation of electoral law.

Mr Nyborg, Committee chairman. — (DA) Mr President, allow me to point out that you are making a mistake. What you have just said assumes that there will be an objection to new nominations for two seats, and you cannot know that. If no objections are raised, there is no urgency. Should we not wait, before deciding whether there is any urgency, until something happens to indicate the fact?

President. — No, Mr Nyborg, Mr Fergusson has informed me he would be opposing Mr Clément's resignation. I am therefore obliged to request your Committee's opinion before taking a position on that resignation.

I call Mr Cousté.

Mr Cousté. — (FR) Mr President, I do not understand why you bring my resignation into the discussion since that will not be before April. I do not understand why you should talk about it today. As I see it this is something that needs to be cleared up.

President. — Mr Cousté, I have just received a letter signed by yourself, announcing your departure.

Mr Cousté. — (FR) I have to tell you, Mr President, that you are referring to a letter that should not have arrived on your desk on the date you mention. I wish to place that on record.

President. — That is precisely why this problem needs to be treated urgently.

I call Mr Galland.

Mr Galland. — (FR) Mr President, I should like to protest against the disturbing inflexibility of certain aspects of the organization of our Parliament.

I know one has to have a system, but this morning I arrived at the parking lot with my car. I should have had on my windscreen the green sticker supplied by the Quaestors. As it happens, Mr President, all I had with me was the official pass which of course only Members have. Well, Mr President, it is a sad state of affairs that, when we are talking of introducing a European passport, access to the car park should be denied to Members who use their passport to prove they are Members. I hope you will take this matter up with the Quaestors and urge them to sort this matter out as soon as possible.

President. — Mr Galland, I regret this state of affairs and recommend that you apply directly, in this kind of matter, to the College of Quaestors. I hope they will make sure that this kind of situation is not repeated.¹

3. Agenda

President. — At its meeting of 16 February 1982 the enlarged Bureau drew up the draft agenda, which has been distributed.

At this morning's meeting the chairmen of the political groups instructed me to propose a number of amendments.

This afternoon:

- Pursuant to Rule 5(4) of the Rules of Procedure the report by Mr De Gucht, on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee on a request for the waiving of parliamentary immunity, must be placed at the top of the agenda.
- Pursuant to Rule 71 of the Rules of Procedure the following must be entered next.

¹ *Petitions — Documents received — Texts of treaties forwarded by the Council — Transfers of appropriations — Withdrawal of a motion for a resolution — Referral to Committee — Membership of committees: see Minutes.*

The vote on the report by Mrs Lizin, on behalf of the Committee on Energy and Research, on nuclear safety policy; the vote on the Aigner report, on behalf of the Budgetary Control Committee, on exports of agricultural products to the State-trading countries.

This means that, in all probability, reports scheduled for today, except possibly the Sieglerschmidt report, will be deferred until tomorrow's sitting, and report scheduled for tomorrow till the sitting of Thursday, 11 March 1982.

I should like to make clear it is impossible to say right now what these possible changes may be. All the reports will be called one after the other, but I would warn the Assembly straight away that the deferring of debates is already foreseeable.

I call Mr Rogalla.

Mr Rogalla. — *(DE)* Mr President, I should be grateful for your assistance with the interpretation of Rule 42 on the inclusion in the agenda of a question to the Commission and Council.

Together with several members of my group and with the support of the Socialist Group, I requested the Bureau in December to place a question on the agenda pursuant to Rule 42. The question was addressed to both the Commission and the Council and concerned a number of difficult legal problems specifically connected with Article 3 of the EEC Treaty and associated checks on persons.

I cannot find any mention of this question in the agenda before us or of any other question put down pursuant to Rule 42 — by any of the political groups — even though I have read it very carefully. If I understand Rule 42 correctly, there is no reason why this question should not be included in the agenda. I do not, of course, wish to prevent the enlarged Bureau from exercising its discretion in deciding on this matter pursuant to the fifth subparagraph of Rule 42(1).

But as there is no such thing as unlimited discretion, there undoubtedly being certain criteria to be observed, I would be grateful, Mr President, if you could tell me on what criteria such decisions are based. Is it the time the request is received? Were other questions put down pursuant to other rules of our Rules of Procedure? Or is it because of the content of our question, which is not to be found in any form in this month's agenda? Or what criteria are applied in this case? I would be very grateful for an explanation.

President. — Mr Rogalla, we considered this issue this morning and reached the conclusion that your ques-

tion can no longer be taken this week. It is therefore proposed that it be deferred to the April part-session.

I call Mr Gautier

Mr Gautier. — *(DE)* Mr President, the Bureau has placed on today's agenda the vote on the reports by Mr Aigner and Mrs Lizin in which, as a Member of Parliament, I should of course like to take part. However, the Bureau has also approved a meeting of the Committee on Agriculture for the same time — 5 to 8 p.m. — and as a member of the Committee on Agriculture I should also like, of course, to attend this meeting.

Can the President perhaps explain to me how I can meet both these commitments at the same time and in different places? When drawing up the agenda, the Bureau should perhaps be more careful to remember whether it has already approved a committee meeting. I should like it stated here for everyone to hear which I should attend, the vote or the committee meeting, to fulfil my obligations as a Member of the European Parliament.

President. — Since the Rules of Procedure prescribe that all votes that were not taken during the last sitting should take place now, I have no alternative but to cancel the meeting of the Committee on Agriculture. If, then, Sir Henry agrees that the meeting of the Committee on Agriculture should be postponed to a later date, we can now, in accordance with the rules, vote in plenary sitting on the Lizin and Aigner reports.

I call Mr Arndt.

Mr Arndt. — *(DE)* Mr President, I have two questions. The first concerns food aid, on which an urgent decision is needed this week so that appropriate decisions may be taken by the Commission and Council: we talked about this this morning. Is there any guarantee that, if the committee responsible, the Committee on Development and Cooperation, proposes a decision tomorrow, this decision will be adopted this week — possibly without debate — so that the Commission and Council are informed of Parliament's position in this regard? That was the first question.

The second concerns the famous Maij-Weggen report, to which I also referred this morning. May we be told when the Maij-Weggen report will be called here in the Chamber?

President. — On the first point, Mr Arndt: the longer we go on talking, the harder it will be to fix a precise time for the report on food aid. No decision has yet been taken on the report and no request for urgent procedure has been made. If it comes to that, we shall

decide on it in plenary sitting and will then have to find a place for it on the agenda. But it has not yet come to that.

I call Sir Fred Catherwood.

Sir Fred Catherwood. — Mr President, as I understand it, you are proposing to postpone the two reports of my committee from Tuesday. I understood you to say that these would be taken next in order, but then you said that they would be postponed to Thursday. There are three reports on Wednesday. Cannot the Tuesday ones be postponed in the correct order and taken on Wednesday?

President. — They will remain in the order indicated in the agenda but they first go to Wednesday and then go on to Thursday, I suppose.

I call Mr Megahy.

Mr Megahy. — Mr President, I was also going to make a point about the Maij-Weggen report. You are unable to give a specific indication when this is going to be debated, but in view of the fact that quite a number of reports are being pushed back in order, and in view of the order already on the agenda there is a very real danger it may not be taken at all. I hope that the Bureau of Parliament will take into account that this report must be debated this week in view of the intense public concern and the fact that it was not debated last time.

The other question I wanted to ask is why we have been notified so late that the De Gucht report on parliamentary immunity is being debated this afternoon. As someone who is bitterly opposed to the report, I have not had the opportunity, and neither has anyone else, of arguing this out within the political groups. As the Legal Affairs Committee met a fortnight ago, or nearly a fortnight ago, to discuss this I thought it would have been possible to give some indication that this important matter was on the agenda.

May I just raise one other point with regard to the procedure for withdrawing questions from the order-paper? At the last part-session, I tabled a question to the Council of Ministers, meeting in political cooperation, with regard to East Timor. I specifically asked that the question be withdrawn and be placed on the agenda for this part-session. It has not been. I have received a written answer. I wonder if I could have some clarification as to what exactly the correct procedure is should a Member wish to withdraw a question that has been tabled for oral answer.

President. — I have to inform you that concerning the report on parliamentary immunity, Article 5 (4) of our Rules of Procedure states absolutely clearly that if

there is a report on such a question it has to be taken as the first item on the agenda, and I have no way out of that.

As far as the seals are concerned, if we do not lose too much time now it is certain they will be dealt with on Thursday's agenda.

I call Mrs Maij-Weggen.

Mrs Maij-Weggen. — (NL) Mr President, now that two Members have referred to the report on seals, I must say that I am also beginning to feel slightly concerned. I feel that it is a very bad thing for the proceedings of our Parliament and also for our image if we never know precisely when matters will be discussed, particularly if the press has to wait. You may think me rather impertinent, but is it not possible for the report on seals to be taken as the first item at 3 p.m.? It will take no more than an hour, and then the other items can be considered. Then we can be sure that the vote will be taken at 6 p.m., and the press people who have come for this item — and I know that some have come from as far away as Canada, the United States and Sweden — can at least be sure that this report will in fact be considered. It is perhaps rather impertinent of me, but would it be possible to place the report on the agenda as the first item at 3 p.m.?

President. — If you are making a formal request, then I must ask the Assembly to vote on it. I am not doing this yet because this comes on Thursday's agenda but I would point out to you that you ought to have submitted it a day sooner. In addition, it will create still more uncertainty and still more disruption in dealing with other reports. We must simply do our best to see that the report is taken on Thursday. That is the point.

I call Mrs Castle.

Mrs Castle. — Two points, Mr President. First, may I support Mr Gautier's protest at the conflict between voting in this Chamber and the holding of a very important meeting of the Committee on Agriculture on farm prices. It is obvious from the absences from this Chamber that that committee meeting is taking place and some of us who have an interest in this very important question very much resent this clash between our duties. Your predecessor, Mr President, went out of her way to discourage the holding of committee meetings during plenary sessions. Will you please follow her example and forbid the holding of committee meetings at a time when we ought to be in this Chamber and showing an interest in the work of the plenary.

Secondly, may I strongly support Mrs Maij-Weggen's request that the debate on her report on seals be held

Castle

at 3 p.m. on Thursday. This matter has aroused a quite unique interest throughout Europe as our postbag and the number of petitions we have received show. I believe that a large number of people have come to attend this debate and they believe, perhaps pathetically, that this Parliament can influence events where this matter is concerned.

If we postpone this debate or hold it at midnight, say, on a Thursday, they will be deeply disappointed in this Parliament.

President. — Mrs Castle, on the question of the Committee on Agriculture's meeting, it is the procedure in this House that parliamentary committees do not meet during voting, so I assume that the Committee on Agriculture's meeting has been postponed until after voting. I hope we can complete the voting as soon as possible so as to enable also the Committee on Agriculture to meet at a reasonable time.

We shall come back to the second problem later.

I call Mr Forth.

Mr Forth. — Mr President, I am sure that your mastery of the Rules will not allow you to forget that any request for a change in the agenda must, under Rule 56, be tabled one hour before the session. Regrettable though it may be, requests made off the cuff and on the run in the Chamber now simply cannot be allowed. You do recall that, I know, Mr President.

President. — That is right.

I call Mr Johnson.

Mr Johnson. — Mr President, with regard to the last point, made by my inestimable colleague Mr Forth, you cannot table requests for a change in the order of business when you don't actually know what the agenda is to be. You yourself announced that items from Monday's agenda would now be taken on Thursday. That is, of course, the point Mrs Maij-Weggen was raising: there is no way she could have made her request an hour in advance.

May I just say one other thing, Mr President? As you know very well, because they are coming to see you tomorrow, a delegation of Canadian parliamentarians, including ex-ministers, is in Strasbourg. May I support most warmly the idea that this debate be taken at a time when all concerned, including our colleagues from the Canadian Parliament, can witness it.

President. — Mr Johnson, the proposed agenda for this session, which is dated 19 February, announced

that the votes on the Lizin and on the Aigner reports had to take place this afternoon. This had important implications for the rest of the agenda. That was made quite clear, so it is not a question of just knowing it now: it was known three weeks ago.

I call Mr Kirk.

Mr Kirk. — (DK) Mr President, I fully understand the desire for fixed times for the debating of the two reports which are the subject of interest. But the situation is such that not many of those present here in the House are able to predict when their reports will be debated and neither are those sections of the press which are interested in individual reports. I cannot really see how this House or you as President can now take a decision in favour of one report and not one of the other reports.

Even if the press and the public perhaps have a very keen interest in one particular report among those we are dealing with this week, I do not think that the House or you, Mr President, are entitled to make any change in the agenda which has been put before us. If there is such a great amount of interest, as some honourable Members suggest, I am sure that it will be worthwhile for both the press and the public to wait for the debate and report on it then, whether it takes place just after breakfast or at 10 o'clock on Thursday evening.

President. — We go on to Tuesday's agenda.

President. — I have received a request from Mr Seligman and nine other signatories to place on tomorrow's agenda the report by Mr Sassano, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Energy and Research, on thermonuclear fusion, now entered on the agenda for Thursday, 22 March as item No 17.

I would point out that this report was only tabled on 3 March and that the deadline for tabling amendments is therefore extended until this evening, 8 p.m.

In the event that Mr Sassano's report is placed on tomorrow's agenda, any amendments there are cannot be distributed in time for the debate.

Furthermore, the chairmen of the political groups considered this matter at this morning's meeting and we agreed to enter it as the first item on Friday's agenda to make sure that it is taken during the present part-session. Does Mr Seligman maintain his request?

Mr Seligman. — Mr President, our purpose in applying for this change in the agenda was to stress the fact that the agenda always puts the reports on Commission decisions right at the end, and this has been done again this week. These are the things that

Seligman

the Treaty asks us to give opinions on as a matter of urgency, and they should not continue to be put at the end of the agenda. But in view of what you have said about the amendments not being available, I think I must ask my colleagues who signed to accept your ruling that this must be left until Friday morning first thing.

President. — I call Mrs Walz.

Mrs Walz. — As you know, Mr President, we have a request for urgent procedure from both Council and Commission, which means that in any case this item must be settled. If this is not taken before Friday morning, the same thing will happen, possibly, as with the report by Mrs Lizin, i.e. someone will have doubts about Parliament's decision-making capacity and the vote will be postponed. So I consider this arrangement rather unfortunate.

President. — I believe there is scarcely any difference between Thursday evening and Friday morning since even on Thursday evening our decision-making capacity has already been called into question. The vote would then take place on Friday morning and the problem would remain the same. Consequently, in my opinion, we can accede to Mr Seligman's request.

Mr Pannella's request is withdrawn.

Wednesday:

- In order to be able to vote at 3 p.m. on the motion for a resolution contained in the Seitlinger report on a draft uniform electoral procedure for the election of Members of the European Parliament, speaking time will be allocated in such a way that the debate will end at 1 p.m.¹
- The debate on the report by Mrs Gaiotti De Biasi on a Community programme in the education sector, entered under item No 8, will include oral question with debate No 0-99/81 by Mr Schwencke, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport to the Commission, on the recognition of diplomas and certificates.

Thursday:

- The report by Mr Irmer, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, concerning the discharge for 1979, is withdrawn together with the report by Mr Tolman, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture.
- At the request of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection the

report by Mrs Scrivener, on asbestos, and Mrs Schleicher, on the marketing of certain dangerous substances and preparations, are held back until the April part-session.

- The report by Mr Sassano, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Energy and Research, on the thermonuclear fusion, is placed on Friday's agenda after the procedures without debate and reports without debate.

I call Lord Douro.

Lord Douro. — Mr President, I wonder if I could just ask for clarification of one point. I understood you to say that it had been agreed amongst the leaders of the political groups that Wednesday morning would be treated in an unusual way, that there would be a specific allocation of time for Wednesday morning for the Seitlinger report. But you also said earlier, Mr President, if I understood correctly, to Sir Fred Catherwood, that the order of the agenda was not in any way being changed and therefore two reports from the Committee on External Economic Relations due to be taken on Tuesday would simply be postponed until Wednesday morning. I am therefore asking how those two statements can be reconciled.

President. — Lord Douro, I did not say that these items would be taken on Wednesday morning. They will come at the end of the agenda for Wednesday. That is our normal procedure, which in practical terms means that they will be taken on Thursday; but I have to say it as it is officially, and that is that they will be placed at end of the agenda for Wednesday.

Lord Douro. — Mr President, if you would allow me to come back on that, I thought you said that the order of the agenda was not being changed. You are now saying that in fact the two reports from the Committee on External Economic Relations are going to be put after the Seitlinger report, which is a change in the order of the agenda, as I understand it.

President. — No, that is in complete conformity with the draft agenda, where you will find, on page 10 of the French version, page 11 of the English version, after the Hahn report: 'possibly, continuation of the previous days' agendas'.

I am sorry if I was not clear enough, but the agenda you have before you is clear on this point, so I think there is no problem.

I call Mrs Maij-Weggen.

Mrs Maij-Weggen. — (NL) Mr President, I wish to refer once again to the report on seals. I did not ask

¹ *Speaking time: see Minutes.*

Maij-Weggen

for the agenda to be changed. I asked that the report be taken at a certain time, and this is in fact something on which the Rules of Procedure have nothing to say. A proposal of this kind is therefore best made here, and I should like it put to the vote.

President. — Mrs Maij-Weggen, it seems to me that such a proposal cannot be made: proposals to amend the agenda otherwise than as provided for in the Rules of Procedure must, in future, be made by the President. I would not make that proposal, I would prefer to try and deal with it at a reasonable time on Thursday when the report on seals is to be taken. I think we have already lost too much time over the placing of this debate.

I call Sir Fred Catherwood.

Sir Fred Catherwood. — I simply want to say, Mr President, I see no reason at all for changing the order. If my reports are down for Tuesday I think they should go first thing on Wednesday. Maybe there is a reason for Seitlinger, but I see no reason why they should not come after Seitlinger, if Seitlinger is particularly important. After all, if we are going to change the order round like this, we could change any order. Let us keep them in the order in which they appear on the agenda.

President. — No, Sir Fred, the agenda provides that we take up the reports remaining from one day after the main items on the next day have been dealt with, and I have to stick to that.

With regard to Friday, the Committee on Energy and Research has adopted the report of Mr Price on aeolian energy. That is a report without debate, so that we can enter it on Friday's agenda.

I have also received the following request for amendment on which the Assembly must decide:

- Mr Collins, chairman of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, requests the entry on this part-session's agenda of the report (Doc. 1-1079/81), by Mrs Scrivener, on the combating of drugs.

Given the length of our agenda it is difficult to accede to this request which I must, nevertheless, submit to the Assembly.

I call Mrs Scrivener.

Mrs Scrivener. — (FR) Mr President, I support the application if that is what the Committee on the Environment wants, but really it makes no difference to me whether we deal with this matter now or in April. I support the arrangement suggested because I am a

member of this committee, but I should imagine the problem will still be with us in April.

President. — I call Mr Bangemann

Mr Bangemann. — (DE) Mr President, I am opposed to this and should therefore like to repeat what I said in the enlarged Bureau and at this morning's meeting. I believe that this is a very important report and that, like the Seitlinger report, for example, it should therefore be placed on the agenda in such a way that we have time to prepare for it. If we take it this week, it can only mean that it will get lost among other matters towards the end of the Thursday evening or Friday morning sitting, and I consider that unacceptable. I am therefore opposed to this request by the committee.

(Parliament rejected Mr Collin's request and adopted the draft agenda thus amended)¹

4. Opinions and resolutions of Parliament

President. — The next item is the communication from the Commission of the European Communities on action taken on the opinions and resolutions of the European Parliament.²

Mr Chambeiron. — (FR) Mr President, forgive me, but I was under the impression that the chairmen's conference this morning had decided to change the generally accepted procedure for handling this traditional item on our agenda, which concerns the action taken by the Commission on the opinions and resolutions of Parliament.

Clearly this decision, which automatically becomes a decision of Parliament, does not call for any comment on my part, and I am more than happy to endorse it. But I should like to ask you, Mr President, whether you could make a special exception, given the gravity of the situation in Turkey at this moment, and ask the Commission to tell us what it has done since January, when we passed our resolution on Turkey.

Perhaps you could also let us know what results you have had from your *démarche* following on the Fanti-Piquet resolution and perhaps also whether you envisage making a further *démarche* in the light of the arrest of the defence lawyer for the 52 trade unionists who are now facing the death sentence? I believe the question was worth putting, given the worsening

¹ Urgent procedure — Speaking time — Deadline for tabling amendments and motions for resolutions: see Minutes.

² See Annex.

Chambeiron

situation in Turkey and the repeated violations of human rights there, which is something to which no one in this Parliament can be indifferent.

President. — Mr Chambeiron, you could be right, but the Rules of Procedure — or the procedure we have followed up till now in its broad lines — provide that the Commission adopts a position on the resolutions adopted by the Assembly during its last part-session, i.e. February's, and not on previous or subsequent resolutions. In view of all this your question on resolutions adopted previously has no relevance.

Mr Notenboom. — (NL) Mr President, I should like to ask the Commission a question about the position it has adopted on Mr Deleau's report on small and medium-sized undertakings, which was adopted in February. It is referred to in the Commission's document on page 3, last but one indent. All it says there is that the Commission has adopted a position. I appreciate that the Commission cannot give all the details, but this resolution did remind the Commission of quite a number of promises it made a very long time ago, some of which have not yet been kept. Can the Commission give some indication of the most important decisions it has taken with regard to the resolution adopted by Parliament in February?

Mr Andriessen, Member of the Commission. — (NL) Mr President, the honourable Member is quite right to say that the Commission has not responded to every aspect of this resolution. It welcomed the resolution as such and has said that it intends to give serious consideration to the action it can take on the various suggestions made. I can add today that the Commission plans to submit a proper report on the subject in July and that this report will look into the suggestions contained in the resolution.

Mr Chambeiron. — (FR) Mr President, I simply wanted to thank you for putting me straight. I fully understood that under the new procedure we would henceforward be able to refer only to those resolutions or opinions that were adopted at the previous part-session. By way of an exception, in view of the really tragic situation now prevailing in Turkey, I asked you if you could not on my behalf request the Commission to tell us what exactly it had in mind to do, and I then went on to ask you if you had had any results from the *démarches* you were obliged to make following the adoption of the Fanti-Piquet resolution.

President. — Here again we have a resolution adopted during a part-session prior to February. I am quite prepared to tell you more about it, but I do not think that this is the place to do so.

Mr De Goede. — (NL) Mr President, I have an organizational problem and a fairly basic problem. Mr Notenboom has just referred to it in connection with the Deleau report. Under point 5 it says: 'During the deliberations concerning this body the Commission also adopted a position on the opinions of the European Parliament on ... and there then follows a whole list of subjects. But we all know that the Commission takes part in the debate at a time when the vote has not yet been taken on the resolutions themselves or on the amendments relating to these resolutions. The Commission knows as well as we do that in its final form the resolution may differ somewhat from that considered during the debate. I should therefore like to hear from the Commission what it does with the resolutions that are ultimately adopted, including the amendments to them. We very much welcome a provisional position, of course, but a final position would be even more welcome.'

Mr Andriessen. — (NL) Mr President, the procedure is such that, when the Commission speaks, the resolution has not been formally adopted. Recently, however, it has become increasingly the custom for it to be stated on behalf of the Commission in fairly concrete terms while the amendments are being discussed or during the debate which amendments it finds acceptable, in other words, depending on the form they take, which it will take action on and which it regards as not requiring action on its part. Sometimes it even has opportunity to say why this is the case. This is not always possible because there are often a large number of amendments.

Mr President, I appreciate the problem and I also appreciate that the problem becomes a little more urgent through the reversion to the original intention of this item on the agenda. May I propose that the Commission consider a practical way of informing Parliament what the Commission has done, while avoiding an unnecessary increase in the volume of paper. How precisely this is to be done, I do not know, but I am willing to consider this question with the Bureau or elsewhere with a view to finding a suitable solution.

Mr Rogers. — Mr President, may I suggest that, if Mr Andriessen is concerned about the volume of paper, the first thing he does is get rid of this paper which is presented to us as a farce at the beginning of each session. It says 'Commission action on opinions taken' and it then goes on to say what the Parliament did, which we already know anyway, then it goes on to say that there were certain matters discussed in which we expressed opinions, which we already know anyhow. There is then one section, paragraph 4, where it says that, as regards the Weber report and the Ghergho report, the amendments have been accepted and proposals are to be put forward. That is the only sign of action from the Commission. Then there is a long

Rogers

list of reports where it says that the Commission expressed its view and took note of what Parliament said. Quite frankly, it is a waste of time presenting a document like this. I wonder whether you could discuss with Mr Andriessen, who is the Commissioner responsible for relations with the Parliament, the possibility of a better form of report back to the Parliament. It might take the form of a report on previous reports, going back maybe 4, 5 or 6 months — follow-up reports, in fact. It may well be that we will have to go back four or five years, the way things are going. May I ask you, Mr President, to discuss with Commissioner Andriessen a better formula for submitting reports on follow-up action by the Commission on reports that have gone through Parliament.

Lord Douro. — Mr President, at the February part-session Mr Natali delivered to you, as President of the Parliament, a report on the state of the negotiations with Portugal and Spain. That report has taken a long time to be distributed to Members. I have just seen a copy of it and find it totally lacking in substance. I wonder, Mr President, whether you would allow me to ask the Commission if it would be prepared to submit a more substantial report on these negotiations because this one does not tell us anything we did not know before.

Mr Andriessen. — (NL) I do not know, of course, Mr President, precisely what Parliament already knows or does not know. All I can say is that the Commission has kept its promise. It has informed Parliament on what has been done. If Parliament is not satisfied with this, the report must be discussed, and Mr Natali or someone else will, of course, be prepared to exchange views with Parliament. For the time being, the Commission believes that it has complied with the request that was made and kept the promise it made. I have nothing to add to that for the moment. If Parliament wishes to discuss this, the Commission is naturally at its disposal.

Mr R. Jackson. — Mr President, I wish to support very strongly what Mr Rogers has said. I have the impression that this procedure with the Commission has become something of a formality. During my work as rapporteur for next year's budget, I have been reading through a large number of previous resolutions passed by this House and I have been struck by the number of specific requests made in resolutions by the Parliament which have never been acknowledged by the Commission, let alone answered.

President. — Mr Jackson, you are right, but we have to look for a solution to that problem in another forum. I think it is impossible to find the right solution now in a discussion here.

Mr Møller. — (DK) Mr President, I am in agreement with Mr Rogers and Mr Jackson and I feel I have a right to say so for, last month during the previous part-session, I commended the Commission since I really thought that, for once, we were actually getting something from the follow-ups which the Commission presented to us on that occasion. The reality was examined and information was given on what had been done. We did not need to be told that the Commission had acted on a long list of resolutions which Parliament had adopted during the previous part-session. But have they been acted upon positively or have they been rejected? If the action taken was of the kind we call in Denmark 'vertical filing', i.e. consignment to the waste paper basket, that was all we needed to know. But I should like here and now to state my feeling that either we should delete this fixed item from the agenda or we should ensure that it acquires content which can tell us something of the action the Commission has taken on our resolutions.

President. — Mr Møller, the item reads: Questions to the Commission on the communications from the Commission and I note that Parliament concerns itself with very general issues. This demonstrates once again that at the moment a problem exists on both sides and that, consequently, we must look for a solution.

5. Request for waiving of immunity of a Member

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-1082/81) by Mr De Gucht, on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee, on a request for waiving of immunity of a Member.

I call the rapporteur.

Mr De Gucht, rapporteur. — (NL) At its last meeting the Legal Affairs Committee decided to propose to Parliament that Mrs Castellina's immunity should not be waived.

Mrs Castellina was found guilty of libel in the press in two consecutive judgments when she was a Member of neither the European nor the Italian Parliament. She has appealed against these two judgments and has meanwhile become a Member of the European Parliament. As a result, Italy's Attorney-General has naturally requested that her immunity be waived. Mrs Castellina has herself said in this Chamber that she would like to see her immunity waived so that she can defend herself against the accusations and above all against the law on which they are based.

The Legal Affairs Committee felt, however, that the waiving of parliamentary immunity does not have legal consequences. In other words, parliamentary immunity was introduced to protect the institution,

De Gucht

not the Member concerned. This cannot therefore be seen as an argument for waiving Mrs Castellina's immunity.

In the previous European Parliament, before it was directly elected, parliamentary immunity was waived following accusations of libel, but only to give the national parliament the opportunity to investigate the matter thoroughly and then to waive the Member's immunity if necessary.

There is a basic difference, however, in that the former Parliament consisted of Members appointed by the national parliaments, whereas Members are now directly elected. The Legal Affairs Committee therefore feels we have a completely autonomous right to decide whether or not to waive immunity.

As regards the facts of the case, the Legal Affairs Committee considers that, if libel was committed through the press, it was clearly of a political nature. The newspaper of which Mrs Castellina was editor-in-chief was clearly a political paper. The articles published had clearly political aims, and because the waiving of immunity has no legal effect and because the offence was political, the Legal Affairs Committee feels that Mrs Castellina's immunity need not be waived.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will take place at the next voting time.

6. Votes¹

President. — The next item is the votes on two motions for resolutions.

We begin with the *Lizin report (Doc. 1-852/81): European nuclear safety policy.*²

(...)

After the third indent of the preamble — Amendment No 36/rev.

Mrs Lizin, rapporteur. — (FR) The committee turned down this amendment. In theory, therefore, I am against it. In fact, however, the amendment is advocating the insertion of a report that Parliament has

adopted. In the circumstances, I think one could abstain or vote in favour.

(...)

8th indent of the preamble — Amendments Nos 2, 37 and 25

Mrs Lizin, rapporteur. — (FR) I am against Amendment No 2 by Mrs Viehoff. As for No 37 and all of Mr Vandemeulebroucke's other amendments, these were rejected in committee and I have therefore nothing further to say about them. As for Mr Galland's Amendment No 25, it is not clear from the wording whether he is seeking an amendment or a completely new 8th indent. If he wants to add a new indent I could go along with that.

Mr Galland. — (FR) It is simply a modification by the word 'possible' if I am not mistaken.

Mrs Lizin, rapporteur. — (FR) In that case, I cannot agree to it.

(...)

11th indent of the preamble — Amendments Nos 5, 41, 27 and 71

Mrs Lizin, rapporteur. — (FR) I am against Mrs Viehoff's Amendment No 5 and Mr Vandemeulebroucke's Amendment No 41. Amendment No 27 by Mr Galland and Mr Calvez was rejected in committee and I recommend Mr Linkohr's Amendment No 71 for adoption.

(...)

14th indent of the preamble — Amendment No 8

Mrs Lizin, rapporteur. — (FR) I am prepared to let this amendment go through.

(...)

After the adoption of Amendment No 55

Mr Seligman. — Mr President, since Mr Vandemeulebroucke has 31 amendments to this report and each one of them so far — 17 — has been rejected, would he be kind enough to withdraw the rest in the interests of speed?

President. — They have been tabled and I have no request for withdrawal from their author. He is not reacting, so I have to wait until he does.

(...)

Paragraph 4 — Amendments Nos 74 and 11

¹ The verbatim report records only those parts of the vote which gave rise to interventions. For details of the vote, please refer to the minutes.

² See debates of February 1982.

Mrs Lizin, rapporteur. — (FR) I am for Mr Linkohr's Amendment No 74 and against Mrs Viehoff's Amendment No 11.

President. — I call Mr Galland.

Mr Galland. — (FR) I should like to know whether, on Amendments Nos 73 and 74, the rapporteur is speaking on her own behalf, since these are paragraphs that were adopted by the committee, or as rapporteur? I ask this because the voting indications she has given are in contradiction with the decisions of the committee.

Mrs Lizin, rapporteur. — (FR) Mr President, the constant problem we have been faced with has been such that we have tried to produce a balanced report on nuclear safety, without going into other matters. I believe my role as rapporteur is to maintain this balance and it is with this in mind that I have recommended the amendments.

President. — I call Mrs Walz.

Mrs Walz. — (DE) Mr President, I ask Mrs Lizin to tell us first what the committee decided before saying: 'I disagree'.

President. — In principle, the rapporteur expresses before the Assembly the opinion of the committee. I cannot, for my part, check whether he presents it or not. That is why I say that it is a matter to be resolved in committee.

I call Mr Irmer.

Mr Irmer. — (DE) Mr President, I do not think that the problem has been solved yet. Mrs Lizin spoke out in favour of an amendment as rapporteur just now, but both Mrs Walz and Mr Galland have pointed out that this did not accord with the opinion of the majority of the committee's members. Mrs Walz is the chairman of this committee, so she should know.

I am prepared to go along with the rapporteur whenever he speaks for the committee. My decision on how I should vote largely depends on that. But I do not agree that any Member of this House, in this case Mrs Lizin, should then be asked how he or she will be voting, because I should then like to be asked what I personally think of a given amendment, whether I am for or against it.

This question must be settled, because we still have quite a number of amendments on which the rapporteur will be asked to say what the committee's opinion is.

President. — Mrs Lizin has given her opinion as rapporteur. This has been contradicted by members of the Committee on Energy and Research. If the rapporteur does not exactly reflect the committee's opinion, he is, it seems to me, inevitably contradicted in plenary sitting. I have no other solutions to propose.

(...)

Paragraph 6 — Amendments Nos 13 and 76

Mrs Lizin, rapporteur. — (FR) I am against Mrs Viehoff's and for Mr Linkohr's.

President. — I call Mrs Walz.

Mrs Walz. — (DE) Mr President, I must again ask the rapporteur to abide by the vote in committee. She has again failed to do so. That is unacceptable.

Mrs Lizin, rapporteur. — (FR) In this particular case it is not a deletion that is being proposed, Mrs Walz. We are dealing with an addition which was not discussed in committee and which I consider to be compatible with the report.

(...)

Paragraph 10 — Amendments Nos 61, 79 and 16

Mrs Viehoff. — (NL) You did not put amendment No 3 to the vote on the grounds that, since it is the same as amendment No 79, it was not necessary to vote on it. As it seeks an addition to the text, they have nothing in common.

President. — Mrs Viehoff, by virtue of the fact that Amendment No 79 is adopted the text is so amended that your amendment is no longer applicable and must therefore, inevitably, lapse. It cannot be otherwise. The text is amended. Your amendment is no longer in the existing text.

Mrs Viehoff. — (NL) Let me read out what it will say if you add amendment No 79: 'needed for an emergency and to bear transfrontier problems in mind'; and then 'the costs thereof are passed on to the nuclear installations'. This is best placed after. I see no reason why it shouldn't be.

Mrs Lizin, rapporteur. — (FR) Mr President, however it is worded, I am against the amendment.

President. — But if it is adopted, contrary to your opinion, may we know if it is to be integrated in the text?

Mrs Lizin, rapporteur. — (FR) Yes, it can be incorporated in the text.

President. — I call Mr Galland.

Mr Galland. — (FR) I merely want to say that in French this amendment is meaningless. Surely it should say 'nucléaire', not 'médiane'.

(...)

Paragraph 15 — Amendments Nos 65 and 32

Mrs Lizin, rapporteur. — (FR) On this problem I am for Mr Galland's amendment, and as regards that of Mr Vandemeulebroucke I would say that as far as I am concerned the vote can be a free one. I shall abstain.

(...)

Paragraph 17 — Amendments Nos 81, 21 and 66

Mrs Lizin, rapporteur. — (FR) I am against the amendments by Mrs Viehoff and Mr Vandemeulebroucke. As regards Mr Linkohr's Amendment No. 8 I would say, remembering what Mr Galland said a moment ago, that as rapporteur I should consider that it ought to be rejected, but, in the interests of the balance I am trying to maintain in this report, I should prefer it to be adopted.¹

(...)

President. — I can now accept explanations of vote.

Mrs Viehoff. — (NL) Mr President, even after the report had been considered in the Committee on Energy and Research it lacked balance, and with the adoption of the amendments today, it has become far worse. The arguments from the right, from Mr Seligman, for example, who feels that, although responsible people who are concerned about the development of nuclear energy without guarantees of safety may not be quite Communists, they are

certainly well on the way to becoming Russia's tools, his contention that there is a safe way of storing radioactive waste, whereas any right-minded person knows that is not the case, his final conclusion that nuclear fusion and nuclear fission are the only solution to the energy problem in the long term and that nothing that Mrs Lizin has to say should be allowed to stand in their way, and a number of claims by Mr Galland and Mr Calvez, which I will not repeat — all this is the kind of argument that ignores safety aspects and, even worse, is a threat to safety in that it denies there is an absence of safety. Added to the objections I voiced last month, this is a further reason for voting against this report and resolution, because it suggests safety which cannot be achieved.

Mr Linkohr. — (DE) I very much regret that a report on the safety of existing nuclear power stations and perhaps those yet to be built has turned into a vote, a substitute vote, on whether we are for or against nuclear power stations. The Socialist Group will therefore be voting against this report.

This is slightly reminiscent of the custom of making any report that has the word 'nuclear' in its title in some way say: 'We are also in favour of the massive expansion of nuclear energy.' That is absurd.

One comment on Super-Sara. A figure on Super-Sara has been included here although we do not have any accurate information on the continuation of work on this project, which will probably be the Community's most important research project at Ispra. I have heard that, firstly, the costs will be very much higher than planned, that, secondly, the experiment cannot be carried out as planned and that, thirdly, it is not even certain that the Italian reactor safety commission will give its approval.

I therefore have my doubts on this subject, and I shall consequently be voting against this report.

Mr Chambeiron. — (FR) Mr President, at a time when negative and often irrational attitudes to the exploitation of nuclear energy are gaining ground, it gives me particular pleasure, on behalf of the French members of the Communist and Allies Group, to stress the constructive aspect of this report on nuclear safety policy. Although we do not entirely go along with the report and its accompanying motion for a resolution in view of some of the statements contained in them, we feel that it does constitute a responsible approach to the necessary development of the nuclear industry.

We fully subscribe to the view that essential mastery of the problems of safety, which is not only an objective necessity but necessary also to allay the legitimate fears of the general public, must not serve as a pretext for delaying the implementation of programmes for the construction of new power stations. It should be

¹ The rapporteur also came out
— FOR Amendments Nos 13 — 31 — 32 — 34 — 59
— 65 — 72 — 73 — 77 — 78 — 79 — 80 — 82 — 83.
— AGAINST Amendments Nos 1 — 3 — 4 — 6 — 7 —
9 — 10 — 12 — 14 — 15 — 16 — 17 — 18 — 19 — 20
— 22 — 24 — 26 — 28 — 29 — 30 — 33 — 54 — 57
— 62 — 64 — 75 — 76 — 84 — 85.

Chambeiron

possible for the energy independence of our countries to rely on a diversified development of all forms of energy without ruling out the nuclear option. We are also fully in agreement with the idea expressed in the resolution of increasing cooperation and exchange of scientific knowledge, both at multilateral and Community levels, for the purpose of achieving higher standards of nuclear safety. Had it not been for the fact that the motion for a resolution seeks to introduce additional and excessively restrictive regulatory measures on top of those already in force, and had it not been for the proposal to increase the powers of Community bodies beyond what we feel is advisable — and the various amendments that have just been passed make matters even worse — we should have voted for the resolution. As it is, however, we shall abstain.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)

President. — The next item is the *Aigner report (Doc. 1-846/81): Exports of agricultural products to the State-trading countries.*¹

I call Mr Taylor.

Mr J. M. Taylor. — Mr President, I should like to give notice on behalf of the European Democratic Group that we should like a roll-call vote on Amendments Nos 7 and 10. Perhaps you could allow this, Mr President, and on the whole.

(...)

After the 1st indent of the preamble — Amendments Nos 1 and 10

Mr Aigner, rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, I should like to state my views on all 10 amendments straight away. That will take less time.

The committee approved all 10 amendments and the resolution by the same number of votes for and against in each case. With the exception of the amendments for which a vote by roll-call has been requested, all of them are descriptive, and they will not therefore change the content of the resolution. I am sorry that these amendments could not be tabled until afterwards, the reason being that the various motions for resolutions were only referred to us after our plenary proceedings had begun. That is the background. We are therefore in favour of all the amendments.

President. — You are then in favour of everything.

Mr Aigner, rapporteur. — (DE) I am not in favour of everything. I am in favour of these amendments.²

(Laughter)

(...)

President. — I can now accept explanations of vote.

Mr Tyrrell. — Mr President, at the end of the debate Mr Dalsager tried to justify the previous Commission's performance. I cannot accept his explanations. The criticisms in Mr Aigner's report are made out. The Commissioner was indulging, in his speech, in double talk. His suggestion was that there was in 1980 a different refund for Russia than elsewhere. But that difference was scrapped by the Commission in June 1980. He suggested that a tender system for butter to Russia would have helped in 1980; there was such a system, but the Commission scrapped it in May 1980. In giving figures for sales to Russia, he quoted only butter but excluded butter-oil, thus distorting the position, and he further confused the issue by suddenly taking a 17-month period for his figures instead of a 12-month period, whereas the Aigner report had been dealing with a 12-month period on figures supplied by the Commission. Nothing I have heard from the Commissioner dispels my belief that Parliament was misled at the time in 1980 and the Commission is still evading the charges that the Aigner report makes against them. I urge the House to support the Aigner report.

Mr Harris. — Mr President, I also shall vote for the Aigner report. I shall do so because I believe the Commission must realize that this issue of subsidized food exports to the Soviet Union is assuming the proportions of a scandal. It is doing more harm to the concept of the EEC in the United Kingdom than any myth being peddled by the anti-marketeters. In the aftermath of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan we find that the Commission has sold four times as much agricultural produce to Russia as it had authority to do. The foreign policy implications of this action are enormous. At best, it is inefficiency. I hope, Mr President, it is nothing worse.

Mr Hord. — Mr President, I submit that this report is an indictment of the Commission's failures. I think it is fair to say that the Commission has also misled this House on a series of occasions when this important issue was raised at Question Time and in written answers.

At the same time, I feel it is slightly unfair that Mr Thorn should be involved with the criticism of this

¹ See debates of February 1982.

² The rapporteur was also for Amendments Nos 4, 5 and 8.

Hord

House, as he was not here at the time. And I would suggest that the Commission call upon Mr Jenkins to come to this House in April, when, I hope, we shall be concerning ourselves with the discharge or non-discharge of the budget.

(Applause)

Them, Mr President, we can ask Mr Jenkins whether he, as President, acted with due budgetary approval and whether, in fact, he was the person who gave the instructions to change the rules on the way in which sales were effected at the end of 1980 so that actual figures came forward in the 1981 figures.

As I say, Mr President, this is a constitutional issue. The Commission ignored the instructions of the Council and this House. I believe it would be in the best interests of the Parliament to ensure that the Aigner report is approved, and I shall vote for it.

Mr Plaskovitis. — Mr President, the Greek members of the socialist PASOK party will vote against the Aigner report, as they have voted against all its amendments, for the following reasons.

First, because we must emphasize that it is a mistake for the Budget Control Committee to try to turn itself into a political committee, as happens in the context of the Aigner report.

Secondly, because this promotes the tendency for the various problems that arise in connection with the relationship between East and West to become objects of exploitation for the purposes of propaganda, and this is completely contrary to the interests of peace.

Thirdly, we oppose any condemnation of existing systems, whether direct or indirect, and any imposition of economic or other sanctions against the eastern countries, because any such crusading counter measures would surely poison attempts to return to detente and to the limitation of arms.

In particular, we are opposed to paragraphs 7 and 8 of the proposed resolution, because if these paragraphs were to be adopted they would result in an exacerbation of the problem of disposing of agricultural products. As an example, Mr President, we wish to point out that a significant proportion of Greek soft fruit products, 29.3% in 1980 to be precise, is exported to the Eastern European countries. More particularly, in the case of citrus fruits the proportion of exports to these countries is as high at 76.1%, while only 3.8% are exported to the EEC countries.

Finally, we should not forget the proposed agreement concerning the supply of gas by the Soviet Union to West Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands, and the other countries, nor indeed the bilateral agreements signed between Greece and the Soviet Union and relating to economic matters and energy supply.

Mr Brøndlund Nielsen. — *(DA)* I have already expressed my views on this report during the course of the debate, and I have acknowledged the work Mr Aigner has done and the result which the report reflects. But if I vote for it, I wish to stress my view that in a general way the Commission should not be running an export business — of course I do not think that this is what the report says — and that the conclusions set out in the report do not argue against trade with countries having trading organizations which to a greater or lesser extent may be under State control, although we should of course be vigilant at all times if we trade with partners who hold that kind of monopoly position. Subject to these two observations, I am willing to support the report.

Mr Martin. — *(FR)* Mr President, there is no doubt that the sales of agricultural produce to the Socialist countries are nothing less than an obsession with this Parliament.

Our debates on this question in November 1980 and during the last part-session have proved that the accusations of the Committee on Budgetary Control had no serious basis. Irrefutable figures prove, on the one hand, that butter sales to the Soviet Union did not benefit from preferential prices and, on the other hand, that the EEC has enforced an even tighter embargo than the United States themselves.

The fact is that, in this whole business involving juggling with figures and distortion of the truth, the Commission has been made the scapegoat for the calling into question of the principles of international commerce and for political discrimination between countries with different social systems. It is regrettable that the Commission and the Council, who have recently decided on new measures to restrict imports from Socialist countries, should be party to this line of conduct. We condemn these discriminatory measures and call for the development of trade with every part of the world and without political discrimination.

For this reason the Communist and Allies Group will be voting against the Aigner report, particularly since the report has been rendered even more severe by the adoption of the amendments tabled by British Conservatives.

Mr Alavanos. — Mr President, Mr Aigner's proposal is unacceptable to the Communist Party of Greece, both on account of its anti-Soviet spirit and because it attempts to impose controls over, and raise obstacles to the export of agricultural produce to the Socialist States.

However, while the proposal is generally unacceptable, it is particularly dangerous for Greece at the very time when the government of Mr Papandreou is striving to open up our exports to the Socialist States,

Alavanos

which constitute a dynamic and potentially very positive market for Greek produce. Moreover, we too are amazed, following the figures mentioned by Mr Plaskovitis, how the EEC, which for example imports only 3.8% of our citrus produce, can wish to impose controls on our exports to countries that import 25% or more.

In the above spirit, and considering this proposal unacceptable from both the economic and the political standpoints, the Communist Party of Greece will vote against it.

Mr Irmer. — (DE) Mr President, Mr Hord has made it wonderfully clear why we must vote against the amendments. We could have accepted them without any difficulty, although the Aigner report, in the form submitted, would have been quite adequate. But from what Mr Hord has said, it is clear that the plan is to launch an attack against Mr Jenkins in the present election campaign, and we cannot of course subscribe to that...

(Applause — mixed reactions)

... If Mr Jenkins stands for the Liberal-Social Democratic Alliance in Britain, we shall not stab him in the back in this way.

(Mixed reactions)

In any case, the problem lies somewhere completely different.

(Cries)

I seriously suspect that Mr Jenkins had no control over the Directorate-General concerned at the time and that Mr Dalsager does not have this Directorate-General, with Mr Villain at its head, under control today.

(Mixed reactions)

I must say I was extremely surprised to hear that after the debate we had last month Mr Villain and also Mr Doumeng telephoned individual Members, trying to persuade them to vote against the Aigner report. And I repeat the claim that has not yet been refuted: it is in my opinion a scandal that the common agricultural policy should be helping to finance a French political party.

President. — Mr Aigner, you have asked for the floor, but I cannot give it to you. You are not on the list for explanations of vote. If you wish to make a personal statement, you may speak after the vote.

Mr Aigner, rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, may I point out that, before the debate began, I instructed an

usher to ask you to enter my name in the list of speakers.

President. — He has not done so.

Mr Aigner, rapporteur. — (DE) I am sorry to hear that. I ask you to take the usher to task over this.

President. — I take your word for it. The floor is yours.

Mr Aigner, rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, I give you my word that what I have just said is true.

Mr President, the two Communist speakers have either not read my report or want to hush up their own policy. The report makes no mention of a blockade or a ban or a policy designed to prevent the export of agricultural products to the Soviet Union. What it does say is that the Commission should be required to take greater advantage in future of the opportunities offered by the market, which it has failed to seize in the past...

(Applause)

We have merely accused the Commission of making a mistake in this, and we want it to develop its instruments accordingly in the future, because the market mechanism simply does not work with State-trading countries. We all agreed in the Committee on Budgetary Control that the manipulations in State-trading have assumed proportions that are costing the Community millions. It is not a question of regional policy somewhere or other: it is a question of protecting the taxpayer.

A second point: the Committee was not guilty of any kind of infringement in discussing the four motions for resolutions referred to it by Parliament for a decision. It was our duty to establish whether the information provided by the Commission corresponded to the figures it finally adopted. The only figures we have are those provided by the Commission itself, and they reveal a major discrepancy between the Commission's answer and its final figures.

I therefore endorse the request for a vote by roll-call on behalf of my group.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)

7. Protection of the rights of the individual with regard to data processing

President. — The next item is the second report (Doc. 1-548/81) by Mr Sieglerschmidt, on behalf of the

President

Legal Affairs Committee, on the protection of the rights of the individual in the face of technical progress in the field of data processing.

I call the rapporteur.

Mr Sieglerschmidt, rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, if you must leave the Chamber when we reach an item that has been occupying the Community and many other countries for years and is therefore surely an important question, please, do so a little more quietly.

It is impossible to think of present-day society without electronic data processing. It has brought great advantages, but it also has its dangers. The individual is particularly at risk where the recording of data on his person is concerned. I need only quote the phrase 'transparent man'. This is why countries in and outside the Community have introduced statutory protection of data on the individual as the use of data processing has grown. The more widespread the transfrontier flow of data has become, the more pertinent the question as to how the free flow of data — that is, without obstructions caused by national export restrictions — can be ensured. This in turn has entailed attempts at establishing as uniform standards as possible for, in particular, data relating to the individual.

Preparatory work has been going on in three institutions for many years: in the Council of Europe for almost 15 years, in the European Community, principally within the Commission, since the early 1970s and in the OECD since the mid-1970s. It was at about this time that the European Parliament also began to consider the subject.

The European Parliament then drew up the first report on the protection of data, which was adopted by the old Parliament in April 1979. A mere nine weeks after it was constituted in the summer of 1979, which demonstrates the importance of the subject, the new European Parliament was again discussing the matter on the basis of an oral question with debate. Two motions tabled by the Socialist Group in the spring of 1980 then led to this second report on the protection of data.

Although work on the first report took a very long time because it had to do the groundwork, it was put before Parliament within a month of being adopted by the Legal Affairs Committee of the old Parliament. The second report did not take so long for the reasons I have already mentioned, but it was not adopted until September last year. Now, five and a half months later, it is before the House, at a time that is certainly not commensurate with the importance of the subject.

I do not intend to go into the reasons why something that was possible in the old Parliament is evidently no longer possible in the new Parliament, and that is

proceeding with some haste. But that is a fact, and we should all think about this in general, not only in connection with this report.

Why do we need this arrangement for the transfrontier flow of data? I should like first to quote from the Commission's recommendation of 29 July 1981 on the convention adopted by the Council of Europe: 'Data protection is an essential component of the protection of the individual. It has the character of a fundamental right.' So what we have here is a fundamental right, i.e. a human right. What we are concerned with here, then, is a fundamental right, a human right.

Secondly, as I have already briefly mentioned, the free flow of data in the European Community is extremely important. The common market, which we are always trying to improve, must include a common market in data. There must therefore be an arrangement that allows data to be transmitted from, say, Manchester to Hamburg in the same way, and with as few restrictions, as they are transmitted from Strasbourg to Toulouse. As data relating to the individual are to be protected as a human right, there is a need for legislation on the protection of data in the Member States to be harmonized as far as possible and for thought to be given to an appropriate addition to the Convention on Human Rights adopted by the Council of Europe.

Mr President, important preparatory work has already been done in this field by the International Union of Lawyers, and the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe has come out in favour of this. We should support this development. There are now a number of international agreements in this area, for example the Convention of the Council of Europe on the protection of individuals with regard to automatic processing of personal data and OECD guidelines.

As the time available to me is limited, the only other subject I intend to discuss is the important question of whether we really need a legal instrument in the Community as well as this Council of Europe Convention, which was adopted in January 1981. I and all the members of the Legal Affairs Committee believe we need both. We are in very urgent need of the Council of Europe Convention, signed and ratified, and it is sad that only five Member States have signed it so far and two will probably ratify it shortly. But we also need a legal instrument for the Community, and on this the Legal Affairs Committee and I wholeheartedly agree.

Allow me to quote just two views on this subject, from completely different quarters. The Federal Association of German Industry says particular importance must be attached to the Commission's initiative because the Council of Europe Convention which has been adopted but has not yet entered into force does not solve the problems connected with the transfrontier flow of data. Transnational industry also expects this

Sieglerschmidt

Council of Europe Convention to provide a sound basis for the approximation of the various national arrangements. But the Convention has not fulfilled this expectation because it leaves a great deal of scope for special national arrangements, particularly where the most important provisions are concerned. Furthermore, the Commissioner for Data Protection of the *Land* of Hesse, Professor Semitis, says that the Council of Europe Convention cannot be taken as a basis, that it undoubtedly has its merits, but is certainly inadequate for a convincing arrangement. That is why, if we really want a free flow of data in the Community's common data market, we need a Community legal instrument alongside and in addition to the Council of Europe Convention, which is too flexible and leaves too many options open to the signatory States.

Mr President, I should like to conclude by speaking not as the rapporteur but on behalf of the Socialist Group. I can be very brief because, as I have already said, the Socialist Group tabled the motions for resolutions which led to this report. It has always advocated the protection of data in the European Community, before and since the direct elections, and it is completely satisfied with this report because, with minor reservations, the Legal Affairs Committee accepted what the rapporteur proposed.

I therefore call on you to approve this report in the same way as the Legal Affairs Committee, with complete unanimity across party lines.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MR MØLLER

Vice-President

President. — I call the Socialist Group.

Mrs Desouches. — *(FR)* Mr President, I am delighted to see this report come before the European Parliament and to offer it the support of the Socialist Group.

I should like to recall very briefly that the inherent risk in computerized data files lies essentially in the nature of the contents of these files — which include information about a person's health, tax position, means, his home and his purchases — and also in the fact that these files are so numerous. So far as France is concerned, I should say that every individual figures in some 250 to 600 files, both private and public, and the danger lies in the ease with which data banks can link into each other so that, by gathering together all the

information contained in the various files, virtually everything about a given individual can be known. I must also point out the considerable dangers attached to the use of information inferred through processing of these data files.

Having said that, it is true to say that the situation in the Community varies considerably from country to country. Some countries do have laws to protect the rights of individuals — this is true of France — even though such legislation is not exactly perfect, far from it.

Other countries have none at all.

It is imperative therefore, as the rapporteur has just said, for the Community to bring in legislation that will provide the highest level of protection and embody a number of essential features.

It must afford protection both to natural persons and to legal persons, such as associations and trade unions.

It must cover not only computerized but also manual data files, for though the latter may pose less of a threat they do nevertheless present certain risks.

Personal data must be organized. In France, it is now possible to find out what is on your file. This procedure is a first step: an inadequate first step. There should be an obligation on anyone setting up a computerized data file to notify, as a matter of course, those on his files, telling them not only what information is being stored, but also to what use this information will be put. The person concerned should at the same time be told what are his rights, what means of recourse are open to him, and all this should be free of charge.

It would be desirable to introduce the notion of liability for damage caused by operators of data files through misuse or disclosure of personal data on file.

It is desirable also to provide for a time limit, whereby, say, every five years the data would be looked at and the possibility of erasure considered.

It does indeed seem desirable, as the rapporteur suggests, to set up a Community body and also regional bodies which would exercise both monitoring and regulatory functions. These bodies should be able to evaluate the purposes of the files and of the data-processing operations to which they will be subjected. Needless to say, however, these regulatory bodies must have a democratically-based membership and system of operation, in other words, they must not be composed exclusively of members appointed by government agencies. They must include elected members, trade union representatives, and the like. They must, moreover, be given adequate resources and publish their findings.

Desouches

More difficult perhaps, but no less necessary, is the regulation of data banks and of interlinking of computerized records. It is imperative that we adopt Community provisions in this area. At the moment there is too much variation in the systems applied in different countries, and this could enable some operators to evade the regulations in one country by setting up their file in another country where the provisions are more lenient . . . I shall forbear to mention them.

As you know, data processing makes nothing of distances or frontiers. It is necessary therefore to harmonize legislation on data protection and endeavour to regulate transfrontier data flows. It is true that a first step will have been taken with the ratification by all the EEC Member States of the Council of Europe Convention; that would constitute a minimum. In point of fact, there is nothing in that text about regulating data banks, and besides it lays down that a State may not apply the convention to certain listed categories of computerized data files. We find this exclusion disturbing.

What is needed, then, is a genuine framework of Community law, and I would point out that computerized data files represent a formidable means of access to information about individuals and, hence, a potential instrument of oppression. I believe, as stated in the preamble to the EEC Treaty, that we are here to bring about a constant improvement in the living conditions of the people of the Community; we must also, therefore, protect them. That is why we must beware of and not allow the introduction of a system which is open to abuse and which, if we are not careful, could be used by the unscrupulous as an instrument of oppression.

(Applause)

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

Mr Alber. — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, data protection is a relatively topical and also very sensitive issue. Various rights have to be weighed up, and it is certainly not easy to reconcile the need to protect human dignity and thus privacy — and this cannot be rated too highly — and the right to information and also the efficiency of certain measures.

I should like to refer to just two areas, medical treatment and action by the police to trace criminals. What is of decisive importance is that the correct balance be struck between these rights and that we avoid throwing the baby out with the bathwater. It is understandable that many people are afraid of 'Big Brother', who knows everything, but not everyone who believes he is important enough for data to be collected on him is so important! And secondly, the protection of data

is not a technical problem, because there is no denying that the necessary safety precautions can be taken. It is entirely a legal problem.

Now, of course, the question is whether we also need a European directive. I believe that a great chance has been missed here, not by us but by others. This was a new legal area, and it should have been governed by European law from the outset. That is what we have always advocated. Although the governments of the Member States agreed to this idea, they lacked both the political will and the knowledge and ability needed to translate it into reality, and the officials involved in the deliberations were unfortunately unable to think in European terms. This chance was missed. We now have to make adjustments and harmonize to make up lost ground, and now we have so many national data protection laws that it might even be said that more laws have to be respected today than there are data to be collected.

If you now ask me whether we need a European directive, I would say, like Radio Eriwan: 'In principle, yes, but . . .' As we already have so many laws to observe, it would surely be advisable to wait and see how successful they are. This is particularly true of the Council of Europe Convention, because I am afraid that, if we now adopt our own directive, many countries will perhaps refrain from ratifying the Council of Europe Convention.

We should therefore wait a while before deciding to introduce a European directive, assess the experience gained with other laws first and then make the appropriate adjustments and harmonize as necessary.

President. — I call the European Democratic Group.

Mr Tyrrell. — Mr President, I agree with the analysis of the problem put forward by the rapporteur, Mr Sieglerschmidt, with his usual thoroughness.

I agree with the sentiments he expresses. Where we disagree is in the conclusion he reaches as to what should be done. There I entirely endorse the views put forward by my colleague, Mr Alber, just now.

There are two factors which have to be borne in mind in considering how to deal with the problem. First, there is the protection of the individual, and second, there is the need to protect commerce which is, of course, increasing its profitability and thus the profitability of the Community as a whole by using the data banks so fully.

Now Mr Sieglerschmidt and I differ in this respect: he calls for a directive and for a Community body to be set up to supervise and police a new framework of Community law. But in my view we already have what we need — subject to testing it — in the convention of

Tyrrell

the Council of Europe. It was only after many years' negotiations that the Council of Europe, as recently as September 1980, opened for signature the convention dealing with automatic processing of personal data. It deals in that convention with the quality of the data, the rights of the data subjects, transnational dataflows and it sets up a consultative committee. Is that enough? There are five Member States which have already ratified it; there are four that have not: Belgium, Holland, Italy and Greece — Mr Sieglerschmidt gives a slightly different figure, but that's my understanding of the matter. Then there are five members of the Council of Europe, who are not members of the Community, who have signed. So a great deal of progress has been made since September 1980.

The Community has already taken action through the Commission. It has issued a recommendation to the Member States that they should ratify it by the end of 1982.

Now will that be enough? Mr Alber is quite right in saying 'let us wait and see'. The difficulties and evils of having two systems of law in the same territory, operating side by side, are quite inordinate. I am not saying

that one rules it out for ever and for good, but I do think the convention needs to be given a try. The amendments that have been put down on behalf of the group in my name are self-explanatory. I would just draw attention to the fact that the remedy that Mr Sieglerschmidt seeks would be another major extension in Community bureaucracy. In my view the time for that has not yet arrived, and I hope it never will.

President. — The debate is closed.

8. Closure of the session

President. — I declare closed the 1981-1982 annual session of the European Parliament, and I would point out that in pursuance of the provisions of the Treaty the European Parliament will meet tomorrow, Tuesday 9 March 1982, at 9 a.m.

*(The sitting rose at 8 p.m.)*¹

¹ *Agenda of the next sitting: see minutes.*

ANNEX

Commission action on opinions on its proposals delivered by the European Parliament at its February 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 February part-session the European Parliament delivered nine opinions on Commission proposals in response to Council requests for consultation.
3. At the part-session seven 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 Costanzo on a special aid for raw tobacco following the earthquake in Italy in November 1980,

Report by Mr Rogalla on the draft decision of the Commission of the European Communities amending Decision 73/287/ECSC concerning coal and coke for the iron and steel industry in the Community,

Report by Mr Ceravolo on the proposal for a draft recommendation concerning the registration of recombinant DNA (deoxyribonucleic acid) work (COM(82) 467),

Report by Mr Woltjer on the common organization of the market in sugar (COM(81) 747),

Amended Commission proposal for a directive on the limitation of the noise emitted by hydraulic and rope-operated excavators, dozers and loaders,

Commission proposal for a regulation on the import arrangements to be applied in 1982 in the sheep and goatmeat sector in respect of certain third countries,

Commission proposal for a directive amending Directive 79/279/EEC coordinating the conditions for the admission of securities to official stock exchange listing and Directive 80/390/EEC coordinating the requirements for the drawing-up, scrutiny and distribution of the listing particulars to be published for the admission of securities to official stock exchange listing.

4. In two cases the European Parliament asked the Commission to alter its proposals under the second paragraph of Article 149 of the Treaty, and in both cases the Commission accepted the proposed amendments.

Report by Mrs Weber on a proposal for a directive on assessment of the effects on the environment of certain public and private works,

Report by Mr Ghergo on a proposal for a directive on the approximation of the laws of the Member States on flavourings intended for use in foodstuffs and the basic materials from which they are produced (COM(80) 286).

In both these cases, amended proposals are under preparation and are to be presented to the Council and the European Parliament shortly.

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

Report by Mr Faure on the contribution of rural development towards restoring regional balance,

Report by Mr Pottering on the formulation of a Mediterranean plan pursuant to a Council regulation,

Report by Mr Delmotte on the 1st periodical report on the economic and social situation in the regions of the Community,

Report by Mr Herman on the fifth medium-term economic policy programme (COM(81) 344)

Report by Mr Purvis on the European Monetary System,

Resolution by Mr Hopper and others on the urgent need for progress in executing the mandate of 30 May,

Resolution by Sir Henry Plumb on the mandate of 30 May,

Resolution by Mr Wagner on the American steel industry's complaints against Community exports,

Resolution by Mr de la Malène on hindrances to the normal pattern of trade between the United States and the EEC,

Resolution by Mr Berkhouwer on Soviet exports of natural gas to various Member States of the European Community,

Resolution by Mr Ligios and others on the holding-up of Italian wines in France,

Resolution by Mr McCartin and others on storm damage in Ireland,

Resolution by Mrs Poirier and others on the floods in France,

Motion by Mrs Duport on emergency aid for the region of St Marcellin in south-east France, which was hit by a tornado on 28 December 1981,

Resolution by Mrs Focke and others on Community and Member State aid for the Democratic Republic of Madagascar following the disaster it has suffered,

Report by Mr Blumenfeld on Parliament's role in negotiating and ratifying treaties,

Report by Mrs Squarzialupi on the position and problems of old people in the European Community,

Report by Mrs Walz on the issue of Euratom loans for the purpose of making a contribution to the financing of nuclear power stations,

Report by Mr Deleau on the position of small and medium-sized undertakings in the Community,

Report by Mr Rinsche on aspects and conditions connected with the European Community's coal supplies.

**Salgs- og abonnementskontorer · Vertriebsbüros · Γραφεία πώλησεως ·
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
Tél. 512 00 26

Sous-dépôts — Agentschappen .

Librairie européenne — Europese Boekhandel
Rue de la Loi 244 — Wetstraat 244
1040 Bruxelles — 1040 Brussel

CREDOC

Rue de la Montagne 34 - Bte 11
Bergstraat 34 - Bus 11
1000 Bruxelles — 1000 Brussel

Danmark

Schultz Forlag

Møntergade 21
1116 København K
Tlf. (01) 12 11 95

Underagentur

Europa Bøger
Gammel Torv 6 — Postbox 137
1004 København K
Tlf. (01) 15 62 73

BR Deutschland

Verlag Bundesanzeiger

Breite Straße — Postfach 10 80 06
5000 Köln 1
Tel. (0221) 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

« *Service de documentation* »

D.E.P.P — Maison de l'Europe
37, rue des Francs-Bourgeois
75004 Paris
Tél. 887 96 50

Ireland

Government Publications

Sales Office
G.P.O. Arcade
Dublin 1

or by post

Stationery Office

Dublin 4
Tel. 78 96 44

Italia

Libreria dello Stato

Piazza G. Verdi, 10
00198 Roma — Tel (6) 8508
Telex 62008

Nederland

Staatsdrukkerij- en uitgeverijbedrijf

Christoffel Plantijnstraat
Postbus 20014
2500EA 's-Gravenhage
Tel. (070) 78 99 11

United Kingdom

H.M. Stationery Office

P.O. Box 569
London SE1 9NH
Tel (01) 928 69 77 ext 365

España

Libreria Mundi-Premsa

Castelló 37
Madrid 1
Tel. 275 46 55

Portugal

Livraria Bertrand, s.a.r.l

Rua João de Deus — Venda Nova
Amadora
Tél. 97 45 71
Télex 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

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 Έπίσημων Έκδόσεων των Ευρωπαϊκών Κοινοτήτων · Office for Official Publications of the European Communities ·
Office des publications officielles des Communautés européennes · Ufficio delle pubblicazioni ufficiali delle Comunità europee ·
Bureau voor officiële publikaties der Europese Gemeenschappen

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 1.20 BFR 50 IRL 0.80 UKL 0 70 USD 1.75



OFFICE FOR OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS
OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

L-2985 Luxembourg

ISSN 0378-5041

Catalogue number: AX-AA-81-014-EN-C