

Annex

Official Journal

of the

European Communities

No 1-279

English edition

Debates of the European Parliament

1981-1982 Session

Report of Proceedings

from 18 to 22 January 1982

Europe House, Strasbourg

Contents

Monday, 18 January 1982	1
Resumption of the session, p. 1 — Speech by the Oldest Member, p. 1 — Election of the President (announcement of candidates), p. 7	
Tuesday, 19 January 1982	8
Election of the President, p. 8	
Wednesday, 20 January 1982	13
Speech by the President, p. 13 — Election of the Vice-Presidents, p. 16 — Election of the Quaestors, p. 18 — Order of business, p. 18	
Thursday, 21 January 1982	21
Joint debate: Belgian Presidency — Poland and Turkey, p. 21 — Agenda, p. 46 — Joint debate (contd), p. 46 — Membership of committees (vote), p. 59 — Joint debate (contd), p. 60 — Brucellosis, tuberculosis and leucosis in cattle, p. 65 — Movement of goods within the Community, p. 71 — Transport of dangerous substances, p. 74	
Friday, 22 January 1982	82
Votes, p. 82 — Adjournment, p. 84	

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.

Resolutions adopted at sittings of 18 to 22 January 1982 appear in the Official Journal of the European Communities C 40 of 15. 2. 1982.

SITTING OF MONDAY, 18 JANUARY 1982

1. <i>Resumption of the session</i>	1	3. <i>Election of the President (announcement of candidates)</i>	7
2. <i>Address by the oldest Member</i>	1		

IN THE CHAIR: MRS WEISS

Oldest Member

(The sitting was opened at 6 p.m.)

1. *Resumption of the session*

President. — I declare resumed the session of the European Parliament adjourned on 18 December 1981.

2. *Address by the oldest Member*

President. — My dear colleagues, today, once again, our Rules of Procedure give me the privilege of presiding over this Assembly.

First, I wish to thank you for your attention. May I also point out to you the theme of my message in the hope that this precious moment will be one of deep communion between us, faced with a world in crisis: communion in both sorrow and hope. Europe is our heritage, its very name synonymous with the perennial values for which we stand and which it is our duty not only to uphold but also to propagate. Europe is suffering and our Parliament is suffering with it. I want to convey that suffering to you. But Europe has hopes for the future and so too has our Parliament. With your consent I wish to bring that message of hope to you. I speak with the experience of almost a

century but, measured against the yardstick of history, my message is still young.

Just 30 months ago we were elected and came from the nine countries of our Community to this elegant Chamber, impatient to get to know one another and to work together to build Europe in a spirit of peace and progress. That process had already begun on the basis of economic and political principles bound up with the defence of our liberal civilization whose survival depended on our own resolve. How inspiring our cause! We numbered among us the young heirs to great names belonging to the imperialist and bellicose Europe of the past in which I was so painfully involved in my own youth: names like Balfour, Bismarck, Hapsburg, Poniatowski, Sayn-Wittgenstein, de Valera, but the memory of those precursors whose action we were continuing was still with us. At our inaugural sitting we recalled their vision of a harmoniously united Europe, moving ahead between the two super-powers. I should really be repeating myself if I were to describe those remarkable men to you again. However, we are their heirs and we are accountable to them. The hour has come for us to take stock of our first achievements.

My first message to the founding fathers is that since July 1979 the Community has acquired a new member: Greece which so fervently wished to join us. But according to the dictum which the gallant kings of France were fond of using to describe their ladies rather than their subjects, humans are fickle and unwary is he who trusts in them. Perhaps our Community was over-hasty in embarking upon enlargement at a time when its unity still lacked strength. Be that as it may, we all of us here today salute Greece with affection. Greece is a poor country, but as long as this is her wish, we shall help her in

President

accordance with our basic tenet of solidarity, and the simple fact of belonging to our common market will ensure her development. We see in Greece not only an economy in need of support but also traditions which will buttress our own moral strength. 600 years before the birth of Jesus Christ, Solon, the first European legislator, is reported to have exclaimed:

'Before the tribunal of time . . . to how many men have I given fresh hope for life in this Athens founded by the gods . . . I made them all free through the sovereignty of the law, by allying strength with justice'.

While it is not my role today to utter a new prayer on the Acropolis, let me rather say a prayer on the Roman *limes*, whose vestiges mark the right bank of the Rhine within sight of the line of blue mountains above us. At the opening of this formal sitting the crumbling pink stone walls of those mythical sites command us to exercise the feeling of despair to which some of us have fallen prey. If we are to be equal to the tasks which the future holds in store for us we must acknowledge that we are merely living through a difficult period of change. In face of threats, weariness and misleading ideologies, we must draw the lessons of this change and discern its virtues. We shall have the courage to do so.

No doubt our early days would have been troubled without the firm Presidency of Mrs Simone Veil. Her succession is now open. We are gathered here to make a new choice. We all know as an unwritten law the criterion on which that choice must be based. We must hand on the mantle of this eminent office to a man or woman whose life is inspired by faith in Europe and to whom we shall always be willing to lend our support in the troubled times that lie ahead. Let us give Europe an ambassador and an apostle as its second Parliamentary President: Let names written in letters of fire come forward — they too will belong to history.

But none of us will forget Mrs Simone Veil. Her exceptional gift of synthesis, her painstaking assiduity, her scrupulous compliance with the texts of which she was the guardian have always enhanced the prestige, in Europe and beyond its frontiers, of the institution which placed its trust in her. She has left us texts derived from her own experience, and, by that same token, of irreplaceable value. On 28 May 1981 when the Charlemagne Prize was awarded to her in Aix-la-Chapelle she already drew up a historical record. We are bound by that record which I shall now endeavour to interpret for you. I shall do so as one who has spent many decades on the paths of this world seeking to understand a mankind of four primary colours and a myriad different shades that herald a world in which, at long last, all the colours will one day fuse into a single hue. But what that hue will be no-one knows. Our little world has become a melting pot which is still seething. Europe can only play its part if it is integrated, conscious of its genius and sure of its strength.

What did Mrs Simone Veil say in Aix-la-Chapelle and

expand further in Rimini, Chicago, Brussels and Heidelberg? While welcoming the achievements which the Common Market has brought to Europe and the progress made by the Third World thanks to the aid given by our Community, she castigated the shortcomings of the Council and Commission in Brussels and of our own Parliament with a boldness for which we should be grateful. I quote:

'The clouds which have gathered over and around Europe are perhaps a source of even graver concern to the people as a whole than they are to us individually. Where there was full employment, we now have an army of unemployed. Raw material, and particularly energy, supplies to Europe are no longer assured. Peace in our society is threatened by terrorism. International tensions make us fear the worst. The hopes placed in the gradual contagion of a peaceful era established by Europe are now giving way to a new period of tension in most parts of the world against the background of persistent opposition between the two blocs.'

Those blocs are of course the Soviet Union and the USA.

We admire Mrs Veil's devastating clarity and cannot allow her to leave the Presidency of this Assembly without expressing our gratitude which is tantamount to a homage which, inspired by the enlightenment she has brought to us, will guide our choice.

Europe awaits our second choice! Before the end of this legislature, we must confirm the authority of our Parliament to give it credibility and make it more attractive to our voters who are not won over and whose interest in it may be flagging. We are not happy. And if, as I said before, I have chosen to express our sorrow from this rostrum, I have done so because many of you, placing their trust in my great age, have urged this upon me with a persistence and anguish which carried my conviction.

We are of course suffering from a general malaise. We can thus no longer tolerate the constitutional gloom with which we have to grapple, the legal contradictions which cripple us, the political uncertainties which defeat our purpose — darkness, contradictions and uncertainty combining to aggravate a complex process of disinformation. We sometimes seem to wish that disinformation upon ourselves, as is proven by reports which travesty the failures of our Community by suggesting that they provide the basis for hypothetical future improvements. We do so often unwittingly as a result of both the plethora and the inadequacy of the information passed on to us wrapped in a jargon in which statistics are written into 'brackets' or 'envelopes', in an inner sanctum of their own which is, to say the least, astonishing. For many of us, the real problems are spirited away under a mass of verbiage and abbreviations by hundreds of technocrats, hidden away in their strange lairs, who produce tons of multi-coloured sheets of paper and are more concerned with good living than with true involvement. Among their diabolical spells I have chosen at random the abbrevia-

President

tion MAD which, so I am told, stands for Mutual Assured Destruction, brought about by the methodical application of a flexible nuclear strategy. Three cheers for MAD: Mr Tindemans' report and the report of the Three Wise Men have fallen into oblivion. Obscure verbiage triumphs everywhere, everywhere political resolve is lacking. I say this in a whisper now but I shall say it out loud in a moment. The eminent President of the Commission, Mr Gaston Thorn, will surely not disagree with me.

I am an old lady and, like you, I suffer from this general malaise; in seeking explanations for this I am compelled to look back upon our own activities.

There are internal reasons first of all. They include the very statute of our Assembly. I shall not dwell on the acute problems we share with our officials. We should go ahead and settle them, acknowledging that, with its spirit of hospitality, the City of Strasbourg, which is on the way to becoming the parliamentary capital of the Community, will always be open to generous solutions. But what in reality is this Assembly of ours? It calls itself, and claims to be, a real Parliament. But, except over the budget, and then only within strict limits, it has no power of decision. It remains a consultative institution which was originally intended to devote itself to the implementation of the Treaty of Rome. Our founders conceived of us as carpet dealers — by carpets I mean, of course, butter and sheep, oil and wine, turkeys and pigs, energy, loans and so forth. Nevertheless, through cooperation, we have sought to tackle all the problems of the world without knowing what our own ultimate purpose in fact was. On the whole our work tends fortunately towards union, although events which we seem powerless to control are slowly but surely undermining that possibility.

While recognizing its merits in the bygone days of prosperity, we are alarmed by the agricultural policy of this Community. Without really protecting itself against certain levy-free imports, this policy, which at the outset was so beneficial, has helped to turn our agriculture into an industry — something which it hoped, for obvious social reasons, to avoid; it has also encouraged unrestrained overproduction which its original intention was likewise to prevent. Then again, many members of our Common Market have not been above trickery and their subterfuges are undermining the very principles which they themselves adopted. But let us not dwell on that! At all events, the surpluses have provided agreeable food for our declared opponents, a contributory factor to the doubts which continue to beset us.

Unemployment is adding to our troubles. Unemployment is a dreadful scourge and I do not seek to minimize the tragedies it causes — on the contrary. But I am sure you will agree that there are countless persons who look upon public assistance as a kind of divine right which they intend to enjoy indefinitely. Nevertheless, with such people in mind, we have

protested against the flooding of our market by goods from foreign countries; this ferocious export drive has been fuelled by the availability of cheap labour. Many meetings have been held to discuss Japanese cars. Belated and idle talk! Fought back by the United States, our competitors will in no way alter their designs on Europe in which, through Machiavellian stratagems, they have gained the support of industrial groups in our Member States so that the indecision and wait-and-see attitude of the Council are understandable.

We cannot claim in public to be building Europe while destroying it behind the scenes. We also hear lamentations about the steel industry, transport, oil supplies and about a strange monetary snake which bites its own tail at least once a year if only because of the enormous burdens borne by Europe in the shape of grants and above all loans to insolvent countries or countries which, if they had political difficulties, would immediately suspend their payments.

If we fail to spell out the relationship between the various institutions of the European Community, and if we allow it to become as permeable as a sieve, the prediction made by President Georges Spénale, on behalf of the delegation from the French Senate, may well come true. He said that, next time round, the direct elections by which we are appointed might turn out to be a 'pavane for a dead Europe'.

Let us therefore arouse public opinion in our respective countries by informing the people and moulding their views. We can manage this if we all set our minds to it. Carried away by political passion, I might even have suggested to you that our Assembly should turn itself into a constituent assembly backed by a common defence policy. Forgive me this fantasy forbidden by texts which have served their time like those 8 000 peace treaties recorded since the origins of history and allowed by their signatories to fall by the wayside. In my youth, I read the words of Ovid:

'Concealing his divine countenance, Jupiter took the form of a bull and became Europa's lover — Europa, the nymph, our common ancestor.'

Alas, Europe is no longer a nymph and, ladies and gentlemen, you may not be gods but neither are you bulls! I am an old lady and my advice to you is to undergo a metamorphosis of your own if you really wish to free us from our internal ills, including our spurious good conscience and our qualms.

With the fury of bulls, let us therefore take courage and demand of the Council and Commission a clear statement of their policy towards the vast Third World. Europe is on the road to ruin when our first responsibility is to uphold the standard of living of our compatriots. Despite our pious intentions, we know full well that our Community cannot support the millions of starving people who, while increasing and multiplying without bounds or conscience, face death

President

or slow decline in regions that have become deserts. We know full well that our civilization has unwittingly destroyed the biological balance; our doctors have reduced the death rate of populations which are growing at a frenzied pace, while nothing has been done to reduce the birth rate. We have been guided by our hearts. Our hearts still guide us although we well know that aid has been handed out in such a haphazard way that we have even given support to countries indoctrinated and armed against us: you may think I am a petrified 'historic monument' but I do feel this is the limit. The Commissioners seek to justify this attitude by a kind of metaphysics of turning the other cheek, to which we are of course free to subscribe, but if so let us proclaim it quite clear. Otherwise, let us speak out against it. Some august associations have gone so far as to finance Swapo terrorists from an Angola swarming with Soviet officers and weapons! Let us not indulge ourselves in resolutions of convenience even if we are unable to stomach the true face of misery. And how intolerable it is! But when we do come to grips with the problems and areas of endemic poverty which we would like to assist to the best of our ability, control over the actions which we recommend escapes us. Then we complain that hordes of international officials, experts in compassion, are acting without heed for local custom and tradition, and that, seeking to hasten what should be a slow process of evolution, they merely succeed in spawning vast poverty-stricken cities with an explosive future. I shall not dwell on the many instances in which funds or aid in kind sent by our generous tax payers to those unfortunates to whom we have drawn their attention have been misappropriated. These abuses have been described all too often. But in addition to these instances of misdirected effort or theft, we have also witnessed examples of deliberate starvation which we have not dared to acknowledge for what they are.

Such acts are as old as history itself and have always been perpetrated by brute force, but we lack the strength to put an end to them. Thus Amin Dada despoiled the hated Ik tribe by banishment to sterile lands. The Biafrans died of a slow and ingenious encirclement. The Karamojas were decimated despite our outcries and our milk powder, even though the smallest of policing operations would have sufficed to thwart the pirates who were cutting off their lifeline. The Cambodians will not come back to life again. A whole people has disappeared although our Community pleaded with its executioners for permission to assist their victims — assistance which they only accepted when they were certain of reaping a profit which we shamefully tolerated while damning it in the same breath. And what will become of Poland which has been slowly reduced to total deprivation although we all knew it as a land of milk and honey? Yes, we are suffering cruelly, and we shall suffer even more. No matter what its future may be, Poland, whose misery we can only relieve through gifts which may or may not reach their destination, has compelled our democracies to ponder on the underlying principle

of the power relationship between trade unions and the governments. Where does the real power lie? In Western Europe, the trade unions do not have to contend with the implacable forces of totalitarianism. Our countries are beyond all question democratic. But all the members of our Community know that a few men with no national mandate could, from one moment to the next, plunge their peoples into cold, darkness and solitude. If free elections are to continue, our countries will one day have to fight against what is known, in the jargon of some sociologists, as the 'dictatorship of the proletariat'. We are already in that situation.

In the last analysis panic is the worst of our internal ills. Our Parliament serves a Community which, through lack of political will, shrinks from responsibility for its own defence and carps at its surest protector. We are all familiar with the bleating pacifism which, starting from the Netherlands, spread through Germany before reaching Britain and Italy. Spontaneous and confused to begin with, it was soon brought under control by agents who are as lucid as their militant flocks are sincere, naive and frightened. In Germany, under the illusory cover of reunification with fellow-Germans in the East — a process which the Kremlin will never tolerate — this pacifism might easily lead to totalitarian domination, threatening the close, liberal cooperation between France and Germany, that is to say the very axis of the Community. Is it not time to release from their obligations those members of NATO who refuse its burdens but benefit from its protection? To the devil with those who seek assistance! I can only admire the dogged persistence with which Russian imperialism pursues its conquest of the world. I should prefer their determination to our own lack of it if the fate of the most precious of our possessions were not at stake: freedom of thought.

Before going on to the second part of my message, that of our hopes, let me conclude with a brief reference to the external troubles which our internal weaknesses have prevented us from combating.

Already facing a direct threat from the East, our Community is in the position of an accused on the world stage. The Afro-Asian majority in the United Nations loses no opportunity to condemn it with an arrogance which is all the more ludicrous as the West, benevolent to the last, foots their bills and puts up with constant infringements of the UN Charter. But nothing changes! Amin Dada was received with respect in the Manhattan palace of glass and Ayatollah Khomeini will be criticized there only when he is dead. In Manhattan the nymph Europa and her bull-god, the virgin and her male, are treated as cattle, as milch-cows or rather, since we are not at a loss for metamorphoses, as battery hens which lay golden eggs. The Europeans can never pay enough. My dear colleagues, what can we do about it other than argue our own case resolutely, instead of shrugging our

President

shoulders? We might after all plead forcefully our own burdens, and the fact that when we left the countries which we administered — often at their own request — we left them at peace with an infrastructure in working order. And then, these rights of man, to which appeal is always made to extract our wealth from us, are suddenly treated by the same beneficiaries as the appalling legacy of colonialism or, worse still, used to shore up a 'domestic code' that conceals glaring abuses — abuses with which I myself took issue long ago when I tried to protest against the sexual mutilations practised on women by certain African tribes, mutilations which some of our colleagues now draw to our attention with horror. In those countries the guillotine struck in curious hiding places. Make way for customary law, which extols the regal practices of those in authority! What is more, many third countries, the 'developing' countries as they are known in Brussels, suddenly show keen jealousy of the priority which we are trying, innocently enough, to give to the poorest among them, the least developed countries. They warn us against this 'favouritism' which they see as anti-egalitarian.

Yes, Europe is in the dock. Europe and the West in general. Terrorism is abroad seeking to destroy them. Terrorism which will perhaps render superfluous that other form of war whose spectre looms at the end of those disarmament conferences whose birth I witnessed many years ago in Geneva. At the first such conference, it proved impossible to agree on the meaning of the word 'soldier'. Since then they have done no more than condone reckless over-armament. Even the anticipated signing of the SALT II Agreement will turn out to be meaningless as the weapons to which they refer are already obsolete.

We are deeply aware of the ravages of terrorism and deeply alarmed by them. However, our revulsion takes the form only of funeral orations, of flowers and processions of mourning which, as soon as the coffin has been lowered into the ground, are followed by talk which never acknowledges the simple fact that, by allowing assassins to go free, our laws in fact give them a monopoly of the death penalty. How we cherish those monsters! Our solidarity is vacillating. Extraditions are refused. Solon would laugh today. The most powerful leader of our liberal civilization, President Reagan, suffered an attempt on his life. Our best known spiritual leader, Pope John Paul II, underwent the same ordeal. The boldest negotiator of peace in the Middle East, Anwar El Sadat, has fallen under the bullets. The crime is always the same! Terrorism sought to put an end to three destinies, those of the three modern Magi, who, each with a political and spiritual will of steel and following his own star, brought to the valiant young bulls of our prestigious arena the strength to throw off the banderillas already draining their life blood and to avert the final sword blow which would have forced them, dying, to fall on their knees, the red blood spurting from their veins. How can we speak here of President Reagan, Pope

John Paul II and President Anwar El Sadat without dedicating to them the thoughts which, like the tribute we have already paid to Mrs Simone Veil, will inspire our coming vote?

My dear colleagues, our emotion is the clearest source of the hopes you will have already felt welling up in the course of my address to you.

First of all, we have acquired a knowledge of the problems which we must now endeavour to solve jointly if we are to live happily together.

Thirty months ago, most of us, unaware of the trials which this European cohabitation would bring, were preparing enthusiastically for a honeymoon as Community newly-weds. Today the honeymoon is over and we realize the difficulties of our conjugal life save that, for once, wonder of wonders, there is no sexual fuss and bother at the root of it all! We know that our national areas are too confined, that essential technologies can only progress through common efforts and that together we must defend our possessions and our souls, if only to pass on the benefits to others. The experience we have now gained is infinitely more fruitful than our former innocent enthusiasms. Truly we can build a united Europe. But do we have the resolve to do so? Are we thinking of divorce or, worse still, of living on together while seizing every opportunity to be unfaithful? That is the nub of the problem. In a moment, our vote will decide the matter.

Perhaps we shall manage to streamline our agendas and, through some ingenious devices which will ensure that none of us are deprived of the right to state our views in public, succeed in purging our all too short plenary sessions of secondary debates which detract from our prestige — a prestige which we have not yet succeeded in asserting. Did not, only recently, a list of questions in Parliament serve up to us, in one and the same dish, the offensive characteristic odour of uncastrated piglets, the affair of the 1 500 apparently ill-judged political arrests ordered by President Sadat, and the case of those wretched Irish swimming pools which are apparently not yet heated by solar energy? Despite this confusion which sometimes causes this Chamber to empty all of a sudden, there is a second reason for hope: the effort which now seems to be making headway among us to consolidate our spiritual identity. Proposals are being put forward at last for European education in schools. Other projects abound. Let us encourage these measures. There can be no common action without faith in ourselves and in our own future. Brought up today in a kind of indifference to history, our children have lost all sense of belonging. They must rediscover it and learn to love and defend their identity, happy to find at last a purpose for their enthusiasm which is at present aimless. Then again, we see increasingly numerous groups of visitors crowding at the doors of our Palace from morning to night, groups who place their trust in our guidance. Let us guide them more wisely. Let us

President

also attract and guide more devotedly the delegations from the twinned towns of our Community. Europe lives in their hearts. Look at their faces: they are those of pilgrims who have come to renew their strength at a shrine. They are backed by powerful private associations. Let us turn aside for a moment from our offensively smelling piglets. Culture is more important than agriculture. Our mandate requires of us, first and foremost, a spiritual combat, a kind of crusade for our identity, no longer in a spirit of ingenuousness but with the backing of real competence. Our identity must be the basis of our political union.

A third reason for hope inspires my speech. A masterly 'European act' has recently been proposed to us by Ministers Genscher and Colombo who do not wish to see hollow political dreams drain our entente of its reality. You applauded them, conscious of a sudden and powerful historic advance. If the humorist, Mark Twain, had been alive today, he might, after listening to Mrs Thatcher's speech, have expressed the hope that Britain would one day cease to relish alone its mutton from the South Downs, seasoned with the sauce of North Sea oil — after all he criticized the suffragettes (and I was one of them) for desperately wanting something and imagining that what they wanted was the right to vote!

Fourthly, these 30 months have taught us that the protection of Europe could no longer be eluded. For some inexplicable reason we are forbidden until further notice to discuss defence, but apparently we are now allowed to discuss security. What a nice distinction. If we lived in security, we would of course be less unhappy and our courage would be ten times greater, as would that of those peoples who depend on our help. New projects are taking shape, for example the proposal for joint surveillance of the supply routes for the raw materials essential to our industries and the creation of strategic stockpiles which would deliver us from the deadly threat of embargoes.

As Francois Rabelais said 'knowledge without conscience is the ruin of man's soul'. Although I have engaged in the study of mankind throughout my life I still know little about it. Nevertheless I shall venture to paraphrase Rabelais:

'Le droit sans la force n'est que ruine de la liberté,
Recht ohne Macht ist Ende der Freiheit,
Right without power is the ruin of freedom.'

After competence, after spiritual identity, the mother of political will, and after security, there remains within me one last hope — the most pressing of all. Despite its misfortunes and despite the setbacks it has suffered, our Europe remains altruistic. It wishes the happiness of others and acts accordingly — look at the statistics — and with greater determination and generosity than many other rich nations which turn a deaf ear. From the Arctic to the Antarctic, all the disinherited of this world, even if they attack our Community, know that it will dispense its solicitude oblivious to that wasting of its strength against which I have

sounded a warning. We can grasp the torch of human justice which is about to go out in Manhattan. Let our Parliament therefore consolidate its own image and prestige without delay. If it still lacks the strength, it could devise a symbol, an emblem which might for example put an end to the need for organizations which do not bear its name to distribute aid. There could be a vessel *Europe*, another *Ile de Lumière*, ever-ready with its flag flying, to cross the oceans to succour the victims of disasters. Our Assembly, which was originally conceived as a gathering of shopkeepers but has since, on occasion, developed an apostolic mission, might now draw a distinction, among all the matters referred to it, between the negotiable issues on which bargaining is permitted and the non-negotiable — namely those issues which are concerned with the rights of man and require unanimity if we are to impose our moral strength on a world adrift. In the past 30 months a few initiatives of this kind have been taken, but too late and only after hesitant rallying to the underlying principles.

Nobody here confuses might with right! Let us leave that confusion to the United Nations and to its majority of dictatorial regimes. Here in a Europe deep in social change, right is in the throes of evolution. Liberty, equality and fraternity! Our Community has been moulded by those three words, revolutionary in 1789. They remain revolutionary today only through a change in meaning. The right to equality, for instance, hitherto understood as the right to equality before the law, is gradually changing into the right to *de facto* equality, the right to identical standards of living, bringing in its train the removal of all risk and all responsibility — hence the negation of liberty, a negation with which we shall have to come to terms, unless we reject it as the Swedish people, sated with boredom, eventually did.

These deep contradictions, still largely unexpressed, must not be allowed to destroy our grounds for hope. However, one factor is more disturbing than all others: the birth rate in our Community is declining so rapidly that our future, in the medium, let alone the long term, is no longer assured. Europeans will soon have disappeared! Asians and Africans have already begun to take their place. I am an old lady and I can only smile when I see that our governments purchase children through allowances whose generosity would have left our own mothers dumbfounded, and at the same time help to prevent those births by providing facilities which make us, willy nilly, the financial accomplices of all those unions that take place, we know not where, to sighs and gestures in the moonlight.

Dear colleagues, the time has come to cast your votes. Let us forget Ovid and turn to Solon. To the ballot boxes, for the triumph of hope!

(Loud applause)

¹ Membership of Parliament: see the minutes of this sitting.

3. *Election of the President* (announcement of candidates)

President. — During this part-session we shall be electing the President, Vice-Presidents and Quaestors of the European Parliament.

With regard to the election of the President, I wish to inform the House that so far I have received the nominations of Mr Dankert, Sir James Scott-Hopkins, Mr Chambeiron and Mr Klepsch.

Each of these candidates has notified me that he has agreed to stand.

Tomorrow therefore, pursuant to Rule 12(1) of the Rules of Procedure, we shall have to hold an election by secret ballot.

I would remind the House once again of the provisions of Rule 13(1) of the Rules of Procedure:

If after three ballots no candidate has obtained an absolute majority of the votes cast, the fourth ballot shall be confined to the two Members who have obtained the highest number of votes in the third ballot. In the event of a tie the elder candidate shall be declared elected.

Envelopes and ballot papers marked 'Election of the President' in the official languages will be distributed to you. You will be required to enter on these ballot papers the name of the candidate of your choice.

In this connection I would remind the House that Rule 79(1) lays down that:

Only ballot papers bearing the names of persons who have been nominated shall be taken into account in calculating the number of votes cast.

If any other name is entered the ballot paper will be deemed invalid.

The ballot papers in their envelopes should be placed in the ballot boxes set up in the Chamber. In order to speed up the election, four ballot boxes will be set up, each one under the supervision of one teller. The first will be for Member whose surnames begin with the letters A to D inclusive, the second for E to K inclusive, the third for L to R inclusive and the fourth for S to Z inclusive.

Members will not be called by name to vote; I shall merely announce the opening and closure of the vote. If this procedure is followed, I would hope that each vote might take about twenty minutes. The names of Members who have taken part in a vote by secret ballot have to be recorded in the minutes. Members are therefore asked to sign the list placed beside the ballot box before putting their ballot paper in the box.¹

(The sitting was closed at 6.55 p.m.)

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

SITTING OF TUESDAY, 19 JANUARY 1982

1. Election of the President:

*Mr Pannella; Mr Glinne; Mr Bangemann;
Mr Glinne; Mr J. M. Taylor; Mr Glinne; Mr*

*Pannella; Mr Vergeer; Mr Cecovini; Mr
Thorn (Commission)*

8

IN THE CHAIR: MRS WEISS

Oldest Member

(The sitting opened at 9 a.m.)

1. Election of the President

President. — The first item is the election of the President of the European Parliament.

We shall draw lots to appoint four tellers.

The tellers are: Mr Romualdi, Mr Gendebien, Mr Cousté and Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti.

I have received in accordance with the Rules of Procedure the following nominations: Mr Dankert, Sir James Scott-Hopkins, Mr Chambeiron, Mr Klepsch and Mr Pannella.

All the candidates with the exception of Mr Pannella have indicated that they are willing to stand. I must therefore ask Mr Pannella whether he wishes to stand for election.

Mr Pannella. — Madam President, referring expressly to Rule 79, since abstentions count as blank votes I accept my nomination.

President. — The ballot is open.

(The vote was taken)

The ballot is closed.

I ask the tellers to count the votes.

(The sitting was suspended at 9.40 a.m. and resumed at 11 a.m.)

President. — The result of the ballot is as follows:

Number of Members voting: 384
Ballot papers received: 384
Blank or spoiled ballot papers: 16
Valid votes cast: 386
Absolute majority: 185

The number of votes received by each of the candidates is as follows:

Mr Chambeiron: 43
Mr Dankert: 106
Mr Klepsch: 140
Mr Pannella: 16
Sir James Scott-Hopkins: 63

As no candidate has received an absolute majority of the votes cast, a second ballot will be held.

I call Mr Glinne.

Mr Glinne. — On behalf of my group I ask that the sitting be suspended for half an hour.

(The sitting was suspended at 11.05 a.m. and resumed at 11.30 a.m.)

President. — I remind the House that I have received the following nominations for the second ballot:

President

— Mr Klepsch, Sir James Scott-Hopkins, Mr Chambeiron, Mr Dankert and Mr Pannella.

The ballot is open.

(The vote was held)

The ballot is closed.

I ask the tellers to count the votes.

(The sitting was suspended at 12 midday and resumed at 1 p.m.)

President. — The result of the ballot is as follows:

Number of Members voting: 390
Ballot papers received: 390
Blank or spoiled ballot papers: 18
Valid votes cast: 372
Absolute majority: 187

The number of votes received by each of the candidates is as follows:

Mr Chambeiron: 43
Mr Dankert: 114
Mr Klepsch: 130
Mr Pannella: 18
Sir James Scott-Hopkins: 67

As no candidate has received an absolute majority, we shall hold a third ballot.

However Mr Taylor, on behalf of the European Democratic Group and Mr Glinne, on behalf of the Socialist Group have proposed that business should be resumed at 6 p.m.

(Parliament adopted the proposal. The sitting was suspended at 1.05 p.m. and resumed at 6 p.m.)¹

President. — I call Mr Bangemann.

Mr Bangemann. — Please forgive me, Madam President. May I, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group request that the ballot be postponed for a further hour.

President. — I call Mr Glinne.

Mr Glinne. — Madam President, we have just heard Mr Bangemann's proposal. For obvious reasons concerning the internal organization of Parliament and of this sitting in particular, and out of concern for

public opinion I wish to insist most strongly that the sitting should not be suspended beyond 7 p.m.

(Parliament approved the request. The sitting was suspended at 6.05 p.m. and resumed at 7 p.m.)

President. — I call Mr J. M. Taylor.

Mr J. M. Taylor. — Madam President, I have to make a request to you which I think is in the best long-term interests of this Parliament and which should enable Members to arrive at a good judgment on this, perhaps, the most important occasion in the calendar of the Parliament. My group would like, Madam President, to have a further hour's adjournment.

(Protests)

President. — I call Mr Glinne.

Mr Glinne. — Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, a short time ago we agreed that a further hour's adjournment of the sitting was justified but, as I insisted, that it should not exceed one hour. At this point in the proceedings I do not believe that a further suspension would help Parliament to reach a decision.

(Applause)

If the matter is not clear now, at 7 p.m. it still will not be clear at midnight.

I therefore request that a third ballot which you announced be held immediately.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — My view is that, since this House has adopted new Rules of Procedure, these Rules should be complied with. Certain practices were followed for many years and then Rule 88 was adopted. This Rule stipulates that the decision to suspend the sitting belongs to the House and not to the chairmen of the political groups. Consequently the matter must be put to the House.

Having said that, Madam President, I am against what has just been said. I am the first to object to wasting time. However for months the chairmen of the principal political groups have shown total political irresponsibility. I fully appreciate that we all may well need more time for reflection. It is a very bad criterion to regard discussion as useless as soon as one believes one has won.

¹ For membership of Parliament see minutes.

Pannella

For this reason I, for my part, Madam President, take the view that if a responsible group like the Conservative Group — whose political views are diametrically the opposite of my own — asks for more time to consider it should have it. I shall therefore vote accordingly.

(Applause from the European Democratic Group. Parliament refused Mr Taylor's request)

President. — We shall now hold the third ballot.

I have the following nominations for the third ballot: Sir James Scott-Hopkins, Mr Dankert and Mr Klepsch.

The ballot is open.

(The vote was held)

The ballot is closed.

I ask the tellers to count the votes.

(The sitting was suspended at 7.35 p.m. and resumed at 9 p.m.)

President. — The result of the third ballot is as follows:

Number of Members voting: 408
Ballot papers received: 408
Blank or spoiled ballot papers: 23
Valid votes cast: 385
Absolute majority: 193

The number of votes received by each of the candidates is as follows:

Mr Dankert: 162
Mr Klepsch: 156
Sir James Scott-Hopkins: 67

As no candidate has received an absolute majority of the votes cast we shall hold a fourth and last ballot. The candidates for the fourth ballot are Mr Dankert and Mr Klepsch.

I have received from the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group) a request, which I must put to the vote, to suspend the sitting for one hour.

I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — Madam President, a short while ago the Conservative Group requested time for reflection. The Group of the European People's Party and the Socialist Group rejected it; they were hoping for a

massacre. Now that Mrs Veil has been eliminated they are asking for time to reflect.

Madam President, I support the request even though I realize that it is designed to gain time for underhand bargaining and haggling. The time requested is less honourable than that requested by the Conservative Group. All right then, buy the Conservatives!

(Applause)

You will succeed, the prize is yours. But all it proves is that this Parliament is controlled by the EPP and that particular form of socialism!

President. — I call Mr Vergeer.

Mr Vergeer. — Madam President, under your excellent guidance we have now arrived at the last and final ballot in the election of the President of Parliament. This is undoubtedly an important choice. For that reason I request that my group be allowed to exercise the perfectly normal right of considering carefully before making the final choice. Therefore, on behalf of my group I request that the sitting be adjourned for one hour.

President. — I call Mr Cecovini.

Mr Cecovini. — Madam President, we should not apply a double standard. We are opposed to a suspension. All the moves have been made: the situation is quite clear. For all practical purposes a candidate who could have gained the votes of the vast majority has been excluded. There is therefore no room left for bargaining. Everyone has formed his own opinion. Some are for one candidate, others for the other. Let us now vote.

(Parliament rejected the request for a suspension)

President. — We shall now proceed to the fourth ballot.

The ballot is open.

(The vote was taken)

The ballot is closed.

I ask the tellers to count the vote.

(The sitting was suspended at 9.35 p.m. and resumed at 10.20 p.m.)

President. — The result of the fourth ballot is as follows:

President

Number of Members voting: 408

Ballot papers received: 408

Blank or spoiled ballot papers: 42

Valid votes cast: 366

The number of votes received by each of the candidates is as follows:

Mr Dankert: 191

(The House rose and applauded at length)

Mr Klepsch: 175

(Applause)

As Mr Dankert has obtained the largest number of votes I declare him elected President of the European Parliament.

I congratulate him on his election and offer him my best wishes for his period in office and invite him to take the Chair.

(Sustained applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MR DANKERT

President

President. — This evening I shall be brief. It seems to me that all I can do for now is to thank all those who voted for me as well as those who did not.

I hope that I shall be able to deliver a longer address tomorrow. My principal task this evening is to thank Mrs Weiss.

(Loud applause)

It would have been difficult to imagine that one of our number could, at her age, chair this Assembly for a day or a-day-and-a-half as effectively as the oldest Member and under difficult conditions. She has performed her duties admirably.

(Loud applause)

I now give the floor to someone to whom I shall undoubtedly speak tomorrow.

I call Mr Thorn President of the Commission.

Mr Thorn, President of the Commission. — Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to begin by joining with you, Mr President, in expressing our

gratitude to Mrs Weiss for having accomplished her task with such talent. A Europe, Mrs Weiss, which can allow itself the luxury of having an oldest Member of your vigour and energy, is certainly in very good hands. I wish to thank you for the way in which you have accomplished your task and to say how happy we are that you, Mrs Weiss, are our oldest Member.

(Applause)

Mr Dankert, the directly elected representatives of 260 million citizens from ten countries have, by a free and democratic vote just chosen you to preside over the destiny of the European Parliament. I apologise for using such sonorous words. But the words free, democratic, Parliament elected by direct universal suffrage enshrine the whole history, the whole short history, of the Europe of ours. I wish primarily to stress the fact that, beyond the importance of the events themselves this election is a symbol for the Community institutions.

Please accept, Mr Dankert, on behalf of my staff and particularly of my colleagues in the Commission — and indeed of all the Community institutions — my most sincere congratulations. As President of the European Parliament we wish you, Mr President, an outstanding term of office and we assure you that, where the interests of the Community are concerned you can always count on an open, attentive and loyal response from the Commission. For my own part let me add that I shall be most happy to work with you.

Compliments are out of place in these difficult times. You are taking up your high office, Mr President, during a difficult period for the Community, for the Member States and for its people. The tensions outside the Community, the effects of the crisis within it have brought home to everyone, individuals as well as institutions, the precariousness of what we once believed we had achieved. For my part I believe that we must come to realize, perhaps more clearly now than ever, the pressing need for a strong, united and independent Community. In the months during which I have had occasion to address this House I have repeated my conviction that Parliament must become a vigilant and critical body and that we in the Commission are most anxious for dialogue and for close cooperation with you.

I am aware, Mr President, how critical and how vigilant you have been *vis-à-vis* the Commission. The Commission is pleased to have before it today a Parliament which has shown itself capable of making its voice heard and consolidating its position. For this reason, Mr President, I wish to pay tribute — and I am sure that in doing so I am expressing the respect and the admiration of everyone — to Mrs Simone Veil, the first President of the directly elected European Parliament.

(The House rose and applauded at length)

Thorn

Much has depended on you, Mrs Veil, and it is to you that we owe most if not everything of what we have today. It depended on you, almost on you alone, whether this House two and a half years ago would become an arena for partisan struggle or what, happily, it is today: a responsible institution which is listened to and respected.

On you, Mrs Veil, and almost solely on you, depended the forging of a personality for this Parliament and ensuring that its voice would be heard in Europe and throughout the world.

You have succeeded, Mrs Veil, to the full. Although it is true that institutions last longer than individuals, nonetheless they bear the stamp of certain personalities. I am sure that the European Parliament and indeed the whole European Community bears, to its lasting honour, the stamp of the great President which you have shown yourself to be in times of difficulty.

(Loud applause)

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, a second phase in the life of the European Parliament is beginning. It is already marked by certain fundamental elements which, in the years to come, will undoubtedly guide the life of the Community and at the same time be at the centre of the debates and votes of this Parliament.

Mr President, you are a convinced European. You stood for election as President probably because you were fully aware of the difficulties of the present time and because you knew that you would be President during a particularly difficult period. Today, everyone can judge the size of the problems and the importance of what is at stake. May I express the wish that the Commission and the other institutions can, as in the past, transcend the difficulties of individual problems and be united on what is essential.

Mr President, during the next two and a half years it will be our task to establish firmly the role of this

Parliament before the next election. Thanks to Simone Veil and thanks to all of you, ladies and gentlemen, the first part of your mandate will have been fully discharged. I hope that, whatever the divisions among us, whatever party differences exist, we shall unite in meeting this challenge before the next European elections and ensure that Europe can play its proper role in this very troubled political and economic context and endeavour to respond to the mandate, to the budgetary problems, to the problems of unemployment, to the problems of inflation and to the problems of European union.

I hope, Mr President, that as convinced Europeans, to whatever party we belong, we shall together find the answer to the problems which Europe must face. We have much work to do and many challenges to meet. I hope that we shall meet them together. On behalf of the Commission I wish every success to you, Mr President, and to the European Parliament.

(Applause)

President. — I thank you most sincerely, Mr Thorn. As I have already said, tomorrow will be the time for the speeches. However, because you have spoken of my predecessor as President of this Parliament — it was in that capacity that I knew her — I wish to join wholeheartedly with you in paying tribute to Mrs Veil. I am convinced that what happens during the next two and a half years has been largely determined by the work which she has carried out on our behalf and which must be continued if we wish to win the 1984 elections. Mrs Veil, I thank you most sincerely.

(Applause)

(The sitting closed at 10.35 p.m.)¹

¹ For next sitting see minutes.

SITTING OF WEDNESDAY, 20 JANUARY 1982

Contents

1. <i>Statement by the President</i>	13	<i>Mr Glinne</i>	18
2. <i>Election of the Vice-Presidents:</i> <i>Mr Glinne; Mr Pannella</i>	16	4. <i>Order of business:</i> <i>Mr Patterson; Mr Delmotte; Mr von der</i> <i>Vring; Mrs Boot; Mr Harris; Mr Fanton</i> . . .	18
3. <i>Election of the Quaestors:</i>			

IN THE CHAIR: MR DANKERT

President

*The sitting was opened at 10.20 a.m.*¹

1. *Statement by the President*

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, rather than give any long speeches yesterday, I decided instead to confine myself to just a few words. I should like to thank you once again for electing me President. It is a great honour for me to hold this office so comparatively soon after the first real European elections, and I shall do my best to be a president for all of you over the remaining two-and-a-half years.

(Applause)

I hope that, as President, of the European Parliament, I shall be able to maintain very good contacts with the Commission and the Council, and I should like to extend a very warm welcome to the President of the Commission, Mr Thorn, and to the representative of the Council — I cannot see Mr De Keersmaecker here at the moment, but he seems to be somewhere in the general area.

As I said, my aim is to represent all of you, and that is a promise I know I can make because my predecessor has demonstrated that such a thing is possible in this multinational parliament.

(Applause)

I should like to address a special word of thanks to Mrs Simone Veil for that and because I am grateful to her for the steadfast way she has worked towards this end and thus helped to show this House's true face to the Community and to the world at large. It is mainly thanks to her that this Parliament has been, in the words of the British journalist David Wood: 'a presence if not a power in international relations'. Mrs Veil, that is something for which I should like to thank you wholeheartedly.

Allow me to add that the Northern Europeans are reputed to be somewhat taciturn. While this may be somewhat overstated, it is nonetheless true that we are not so good at paying compliments as the Southern Europeans, which is why I find it difficult to find the right words to express to Mrs Simone Veil my gratitude for the fact that she has allowed this House to benefit from her wisdom and influence, her authority and her courage. Thank you, Mrs Veil.

(Applause)

Having said that, I do not wish to imply that we shall be resting on our laurels over the next two-and-a-half years. A parliament derives its authority in the eyes of those to whom it addresses itself from representing its

¹ *Approval of minutes — Agenda: see minutes.*

President

voters, and it can only represent its voters if it devotes itself to their problems, if it seeks realistic solutions to those problems and if it uses its formal power to get those solutions translated into legislation. We have neither the power nor the authority. We do not have the authority because the process of acquiring authority is a long one; we do not have the power because we have so far been prevented from acquiring genuine or even participatory legislative powers despite the promises made by the European Council in 1974. Our most important asset is our legitimacy, something which we derive from the direct elections in 1979, but which is still not an established fact. The first real elections to the European Parliament will be those of 1984 and not until then shall we see whether the majority of voters in Europe really want this Parliament; it is only then that we shall know whether our formal legitimacy has become a political legitimacy and whether the way towards authority and perhaps power is opened to us. To ensure that this way is kept open, and to ensure that the majority in 1979 will remain a majority in 1984, we must give absolute priority over the next two-and-a-half years to strengthening our ties with our voters, and one of the ways in which we can do that is to concentrate more on what is of importance to our voters in those areas in which the European Community can or should be capable of coming up with answers.

Passing judgment and passing resolutions are not enough in themselves. The application of steady, unflagging pressure on the Commission and the Council to translate our decisions into European policy is at least as important from the point of view of this House's authority. I shall do all I can, as your representative, to see that that authority is strengthened, although I realize that it will take a lot more elections to the European Parliament before this House, bereft of a government, can exert the same authority as the national parliaments.

There are other reasons why we cannot simply rest on our laurels. Poland, world hunger, the arms race, the violation of fundamental human rights — whether in Turkey, El Salvador, Iran or the Soviet Union — the deteriorating international situation and relations between Europe and the United States and Japan mean that we must give constant thought to what role the European Community and the Foreign Ministers meeting in European Political Cooperation can play in the quest for better international relations based on the principles of peace and justice.

We must not be afraid to take the initiative. The paralysis which has beset the European Community over recent years makes it all the more imperative for this House to take the initiative and show the way, and that applies just as much to what ought to be happening within the Community's frontiers as to events outside the Community.

National policy is losing authority because none of the Member States is in a position to solve, off its own bat, the major problems facing countries, like unemployment, inflation, industrial innovation and energy supplies.

There has been a serious deterioration in respect for European policy over recent years as a result of the inability or unwillingness on the part of the members of the Council of Ministers to bear in mind, when weighing up — as they are perfectly justified to do — the interests of Member States and of the Community, the great — not to say, overwhelming — interest of all Member States in the further development of the European Community.

This House must not relax its efforts on this score.

At the end of last year, the Community passed the 10 million unemployed mark. Almost half of all the young people and women on the look-out for jobs are unable to find work. Entire regions which were once flourishing industrial communities — and I am thinking in particular of those areas where the steel and textile industries are concentrated — are under threat of becoming unemployment areas — if they are not already.

We cannot fight unemployment by adopting resolutions. I believe that, by stressing the social aspect of the restructuring of the European steel industry, this House has shown that we can do more by attaching more importance to the use of budgetary resources, something which does not always happen in the Council. In other fields too, we shall have to try to add at least a European dimension to national policies. One possibility here is the optimum utilization, in conjunction with the Commission, of the major opportunities offered by the discussion on the restructuring of policy, on the budget and on the mandate of 30 May.

Only if we make good use of these opportunities shall we get somewhere near to fulfilling the expectations of our voters at the time of direct elections in 1979.

In its debate on world hunger, this House showed that it is capable of formulating a definite plan of action as regards cooperation with a Third World which is turning more and more to the Community with a view to overcoming the North-South confrontation and the ideological alliances resulting from East-West relations.

It will be difficult — not to say impossible — to get Europe to play its proper role unless we in the Community are capable of bridging the gap between rich and poor — which is in the main a gap between the North and the South — and of enlarging the Community through the accession of Spain and Portugal on conditions whereby the two applicant countries are prepared to guarantee their further democratic development.

President

In my view, the major political priorities — and these cover the next two-and-a-half years as well — are the mandate of 30 May, the accession of Spain and Portugal and our relations with the Third World. However, the only source of power available to us — the budget — is not sufficient to enable us to put these priorities into practice. We must find new instruments to supplement the Community budget as a means of giving tangible expression to our political will. I mentioned just now the participatory legislative powers promised to us in 1974. Both Mr Genscher and the Commission referred to substantially improved consultation procedures. I too hold these to be essential. However, I would not rule out other ways of giving more substance to the role of this House in the European Community, because despite Mr Thorn's repeated assurances that the Commission and the European Parliament are natural allies, I do not get the impression that the Commission's actions are always in line with its assurances. One important condition for the effective functioning of relations between Parliament and the Commission is that the Commission should adopt a position which is just as independent of the Council as it is of Parliament. If the Commission is unable or unwilling to do so, it will be up to Parliament — as it can formally and successfully do in the budgetary procedure — to enter into more informal alliances with those Member States which are willing to incorporate Parliament's political decisions into European policy.

Clearly, the formal democracy enshrined in principle in the Treaty of Rome has not yet given rise to democratic relations in Europe even after the 1979 elections. The kind of goodwill we see demonstrated here and there should not cause us to forget that decisions in the Community are still being taken on the principle of unanimity, that the number of informal Council meetings is constantly increasing and that the President of the Commission is now supplying informal meetings of the Council with informal Commission proposals. If the situation is allowed to continue like that, and if there is no thought of a return to the letter and spirit of the Treaties, I see no way open to the European Parliament of successfully fighting for its right to represent the peoples of Europe and to have its voice heard in that capacity, other than by informal channels. Parliament has a duty to fight that battle because the fact is that, without democratic foundations, the Community will rightly be a condemned structure.

Respect for the European institutions has deteriorated since 1979 among wide sections of the European public, and Parliament has so far been unable to reverse that trend — hardly surprising in view of our meagre influence on European political events. What I really deplore, though, is that we have failed to depict ourselves adequately as one of the few institutions capable of maintaining confidence in the future of European integration and cooperation. There are many reasons for this, some of the major ones being beyond our control; but there are some which we could have avoided.

Half of our period of office, ladies and gentlemen, is now up, and it looks as though the time between now and 1984 will continue to be dominated by the economic and political crisis I referred to just now. It is a crisis which brings with it consequences for all of us, for the opportunities open to us and for our policies. However, the crisis also offers new opportunities to this House and to Europe as a whole. It will be up to us to strive to make good use of these opportunities by developing new projects, and we shall have to do so jointly, respecting each other's political convictions and working on the foundation of a Community sense of responsibility *vis-à-vis* a sceptical outside world. For that, we shall need new approaches, ideas and fast reactions, as well as a clear conception of the social realities of the present day.

This kind of approach is bound to have repercussions on our own organizational structure, which is not exactly clear-cut and which is barely capable of enabling this House to function as a proper parliament. I think it my duty to put forward short-term proposals to you or your representatives in this House's governing bodies regarding ways of improving the functioning of the plenary meetings and of drawing a clearer dividing line between the duties and responsibilities of the various managing bodies. For this I shall need your own ideas and suggestions.

(Applause)

Improved working methods will have an effect on the whole of our organizational structure. I shall be entering into close consultations with the Bureau and the Secretary-General with a view to ensuring that our organization is better geared to the needs of a fast-acting parliament than has been the case in the past, partly as a result of the substantial increases in staffing levels over the last few years. More efficiency and less bureaucracy figure high on my list of priorities.

(Applause)

The first steps in this direction have been taken over the last few months, particularly as a result of the Zagari Resolution adopted on 7 July last year. New initiatives are underway, some of them in pursuance of suggestions put forward by the Committee on Budgetary Control.

Clearly, in today's difficult financial and economic climate, this House too must try to tighten its own belt, and in this respect, the 1982 budget is a good start. Given greater efficiency and careful management of our resources, it should be possible to cope with the accession of Spain and Portugal without any exorbitant rise in costs. I do not mean by this that cost-cutting should be regarded as an end in itself: after all, Europe's most complex parliament must be in a position to carry out all its functions in a proper manner, because only then will it be possible for us to inject more substance into our difficult task of acting as a

President

watchdog on European policy than was the case over the first two years. That such a thing is necessary and important from the taxpayers' point of view is evident from the discussion on the mandate of 30 May and the annual reports of the Court of Auditors. I would add, though, that our criticism of disorder in someone else's house will bear more political weight once we have put our own house in order.

This latter point should be easier if we can find a solution in the near future to the question of the permanent seat of the institutions.

(Applause)

It seems to me intolerable that the governments of the Ten should be adjourning discussion of this question ever further into the future and thus not only causing extra cost, but also making it impossible for this House to function optimally within the framework of its limited powers. 'Intolerable' is indeed a strong expression to use, but the fact is that it is not strong enough as a means of warning against the risks being run by the democratic legitimacy of European integration — a democratic legitimacy which we represent — and hence integration itself unless a decision is reached quickly on this point. I shall do my best to bring about a quick decision, although I realize that it would not have any major material effect before the 1984 elections.

I am drawing to an end, ladies and gentlemen. As I said at the beginning of this brief speech, my intention is to be a president for all of you. A little mental arithmetic shows that I did not receive all of your votes, which is hardly surprising in a democratic process. I should like to express my sincere thanks to my two opponents from the last rounds and all my opponents from the earlier rounds of votes for the sporting spirit in which the battle was fought — here in this Chamber, at least.

(Laughter)

I hope that, over the coming two-and-a-half years, we shall be able to come up with a good measure of cooperation and thus help the European Parliament to make progress. I think I can say that on the grounds that, in my view, the representative of the majority who happens to have been elected would not be worth the votes cast for him if he were not prepared to give special emphasis to the rights of the minority and to act as a representative of all the Members of this House.

There is another aspect to my election, which is that, in contrast to the situation in 1979, we have witnessed a definite political campaign, whereby Members have done more than just toe the party line. As a result, we have had a clear and open battle, which is something I welcome, not simply because it is a sign of growing political self-awareness and action on the part of our

Parliament, but also because it clearly demonstrates the difference between the directly elected European Parliament and its nominated predecessor. Putting some distance between us and the old Parliament, however admirable it may have been — and that is something I can say as an ex-Member of that Parliament — is essential because the old Parliament had no life of its own, but derived that life from the role of its Members in the national parliaments.

We, on the other hand, are on our own, and because that makes life more difficult for us, we have a greater need of cooperation devoid of any political prejudices. I hope that that kind of cooperation will come about over the next two-and-a-half years.

The elections in 1984 will only be a success if enough voters are convinced that the Community deserves and needs an elected Parliament. It is up to all the Members of this House who believe that the growth of parliamentary democracy at European level is an essential precondition for the further progress of European integration to convince the voters that that is so.

(Loud applause)

(The sitting was suspended at 10.50 a.m. and resumed at 12.10 p.m.)

President. — Mr Cousté, who was appointed as teller yesterday, has informed me that he can no longer perform this duty. I must therefore select by lot another teller.

Mr Kühn is appointed.

2. Election of the Vice-Presidents

President. — I have received nominations for the Vice-Presidents and they are in accordance with the Rules of Procedure. The number of nominations exceeds the number of seats to be filled. The following Members have been nominated:

Mrs De March, Lady Elles, Mr Estgen, Mr Bruno Friedrich, Mr Gonnella, Mr Jaquet, Mr Johnson, Mr Klepsch, Mr Lalor, Mr Møller, Mr Nikolau, Mr Pannella, Mr Pesmazoglou, Mr Pflimlin and Mr Vandewiele.

I call Mr Glinne.

Mr Glinne. — *(FR)* I think it is not a bad idea if I mention that the political groups have agreed on all the names you have just read out, apart from Mr Johnson, Mr Pannella and Mr Pesmazoglou.

President. — I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (FR) All that Mr Glinne said is true, Mr President, apart from one thing. Our group refused to endorse a stance which is thoroughly anti-parliamentary. If you look at the minutes of the meeting of the group chairmen, it is quite clear that we protested against this situation.

President. — I repeat: the number of nominations exceeds the number of seats to be filled. This means that we must have a secret ballot in accordance with Rule 14 (1) of the Rules of Procedure, which reads as follows:

The Vice-Presidents shall then be elected on a single ballot paper. Those who on the first ballot, up to the number of twelve, obtain an absolute majority of votes cast shall be declared elected in the numerical order of their votes. Should the number of candidates elected be less than the number of seats to be filled, a second ballot shall be held under the same conditions to fill the remaining seats. Should a third ballot be necessary, a relative majority shall suffice for election to the remaining seats. In the event of a tie the oldest candidates shall be declared elected.

The voting will now begin.

(The vote was held)

The voting is closed.

(The sitting was suspended at 12.40 p.m. and resumed at 3.30 p.m.)

President. — Let me begin by extending a welcome to an old friend, Mr De Keersmaeker, who is here as the representative of the President of the Council. A very special welcome to you, Mr De Keersmaeker.

I have to tell you that the official results of the vice-presidential elections are not yet known but I can inform you that what I would call the block list has been accepted in its totality so that we have twelve Vice-Presidents, and that means there is no second round in the vice-presidential elections.

(Applause)

What I now have to say has no legal force. I can only speak authoritatively when I have the full results but I propose that the deadline for submitting proposals for the Quaestors be fixed at four o'clock sharp and that we resume at 4.30 p.m. What I announce now as unofficial results will be official results. I shall inform you beforehand of the results of the vote on the Vice-Presidents and then we can start, if possible, with the voting for the Quaestors.

I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (IT) Mr President, I would point out, on the basis of Rule 14, that in any parliament as in any democratic forum the announcement of the voting is a prerequisite for the legal validity of the voting. In this case, however, the voting was secret. I just want to make a comment for future reference because I, too, am pleased that there are not going to be any other ballots, although I realize that the majority in this Parliament, from De March to Scott-Hopkins, has reformed. Good luck to them — but not to Europe!

(The sitting was suspended at 3.35 p.m. and resumed 4.30 p.m.)

President. — I shall now give the results of the ballot for the election of the twelve Vice-Presidents.

Number of Members voting: 391

Blank or spoiled papers: 3

Valid votes: 388

Absolute majority: 195

Votes obtained:

- Mr Pflimlin: 311
- Lady Elles: 279
- Mr Estgen: 279
- Mr Vandewiele: 271
- Mr Bruno Friedrich: 267
- Mr Gonella: 265
- Mr Klepsch: 263
- Mr Jaquet: 260
- Mr Lalor: 248
- Mr Møller: 241
- Mr Nikolau: 237
- Mrs De March: 218

As you know, there were not twelve but fifteen candidates. The votes for the other three candidates were as follows: Mr Pannella, 75; Mr Johnson, 80; Mr Pemaszoglou, 67.

I declare that Mr Pflimlin, Lady Elles, Mr Estgen, Mr Vandewiele, Mr Bruno Friedrich, Mr Gonnella, Mr Klepsch, Mr Jaquet, Mr Lalor, Mr Møller, Mr Nikolau and Mrs De March have been elected Vice-Presidents of the European Parliament.

I congratulate them on their election and I trust that we shall all cooperate admirably in the Bureau of Parliament.

In accordance with Rule 14(2) of the Rules of Procedure, the Vice-Presidents shall take precedence in the order in which they were elected and where precedence is not obvious — because two Members received 279 votes — age will be the determining factor.

3. Election of the Quaestors

President. — The next item is the election of the Quaestors. I have received the following nominations which are in accordance with the Rules of Procedure:

Mr Enright, Mr Gouthier, Mr Maher, Mr Simpson, Mr Wawrzik and Mr Zagari.

Since the number of nominations exceeds the number of seats to be filled, we must have a secret ballot in accordance with Rule 15 of the Rules of Procedure, which reads as follows:

After the election of the Vice-President, Parliament shall elect five Quaestors.

The Quaestors shall be elected by the same procedure as Vice-Presidents.

Those who on the first ballot, up to the number of five, obtain an absolute majority of the votes cast shall be declared elected in the numerical order of their votes. Should the number of candidates elected be less than the number of seats to be filled, a second ballot shall be held under the same conditions to fill the remaining seats. Should a third ballot be necessary, a relative majority shall suffice for election to the remaining seats. In the event of a tie the oldest candidates shall be declared elected.

I call Mr Glinne.

Mr Glinne. — (FR) As I said this morning about some of the candidates for Vice-President, I must point out, Mr President, that the candidature of my colleague, Mr Derek Enright, was not agreed on by the political groups.

President. — The voting will now begin.

(The vote was held)

The voting is closed.

(The sitting was suspended at 4.55 p.m. and resumed at 6.30 p.m.)

President. — I shall now give the results of the ballot for the election of the five Quaestors.

Number of Members voting: 358

Blank or spoiled papers: 9

Valid votes: 349

Absolute majority: 175

Votes obtained:

— Mr Wawrzik: 270

— Mr Simpson: 261

— Mr Maher: 258

— Mr Gouthier: 237

— Mr Zagari: 205

— Mr Enright: 127

Since they obtained an absolute majority of the votes cast, I hereby declare Mr Wawrzik, Mr Simpson, Mr Maher, Mr Gouthier and Mr Zagari elected Quaestors of the European Parliament. I congratulate them on their election.

(Applause)

4. Order of business

President. — During the meeting this morning with the chairmen of the political groups it was agreed to propose the following amendments to the order of business of the sittings on Thursday and Friday:

Thursday

10 a.m. and 3 p.m.

— Joint debate on the statement by the President-in-Office of the Council on the six-month programme of the Belgian Presidency and on two motions for resolutions on Poland and Turkey;

— appointment of committee members, possibly preceded by the debate on the Maher report on brucellosis, tuberculosis and leucosis in cattle if the enlarged Bureau has not reached agreement and if the agenda allows it;

— Carossino report on the movement of goods within the Community;

— Delmotte report on the social and economic situation of the regions of the Community;

— Joint debate on:

— Gatto and Seefeld reports on the transport of dangerous substances;

— Maij-Weggen report on seal products;

— Caravolo report on deoxyribonucleic acid;

6 p.m.

— Voting time;

Friday

9 a.m.

— Vote on procedures without report;

Vote on the Council request for urgent procedure on sugar (if the Committee on Agriculture is in a position to give an opinion);

President

- Vote on the motions for resolutions on Poland and Turkey;
- Vote on the motions for resolutions on which the debate has closed;
- possible continuation of Thursday's agenda.

I call Mr Patterson.

Mr Patterson. — Mr President, we have in front of us the usual Commission report on action taken on our December part-session. Is this going to be on the agenda, so that we can ask the Commission questions as usual?

President. — Mr Patterson, I understand from the Commission that they intend to deal with that item in February, so that what happened in December will not be forgotten.

I call Mr Delmotte.

Mr Delmotte. — (*FR*) I heard just now that the report on the social and economic situation of the regions of the Community has been kept on the agenda for this part-session. I should like to point out, Mr President, that last week I sent a letter to the former President asking for this report to be deferred until February. I had been informed of something of note in fact, at the last minute, that Commissioner Giolitti, the author of the report which was presented to the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning, could not be present on account of some engagements with the Greek Government. The fact is that his presence was indispensable. In view of other factors which I also mentioned to Mrs Veil, I expressed the wish for this report to be discussed in February, and this was also the feeling of the other members of the committee. Mr President, I ask for this report to be deferred until February.

President. — I can tell you that this matter was discussed this morning, Mr Delmotte. In the light of the comments by the group chairmen and in view of the fact that the chairman of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning suggested he take your place, the Bureau decided to keep this report on the agenda. If as rapporteur you now object to this, it must be for the House to decide whether to keep this report on the agenda or to defer it.

Mr Delmotte. — (*FR*) I knew nothing about what you have just announced, Mr President, namely that the chairman of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning was going to take the place of yours truly, the rapporteur, but I shall let the House decide. In view of all the work that went into this

report, I do maintain my point of view. But since the House has the final say, I shall abide by its decision.

President. — We shall vote on the matter shortly.

I call Mr von der Vring.

Mr von der Vring. — (*DE*) Mr President, you announced just now that we have a Council request for urgent procedure. I should like to ask whether reasons have been submitted to the House and when you intend to put the request to the vote.

President. — We shall not decide until Friday because we do not know yet whether the Committee on Agriculture will be able to deliver its opinion.

Mr von der Vring. — (*DE*) Mr President, I think the Members of this House ought to have the Council's reasons in writing in good time, so that we can reach an opinion, because the Council's respect for urgent procedure is naturally not going to be automatically considered urgent by us as well, and so we have to have its reasons in writing.

President. — Mr von der Vring, the vote on the Council's request for urgent procedure will not be held until Friday morning. If you then feel that urgency cannot be adopted for want of supporting documents, you can vote against it. I call Mrs Boot.

Mrs Boot. — (*NL*) Mr President, also on behalf of the other members of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning, I second the request by the rapporteur as regards the report on the social and economic situation, the annual report by the Commission. We do not think it is right if the rapporteur is not there and if the committee thinks it can deal with the report in this way.

President. — I call Mr Harris.

Mr Harris. — Mr President, I wish to support the rapporteur for the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning. Mr Delmotte, and also Mrs Boot on this matter. I think this is one of the most important reports we have had in our committee in the lifetime of this Parliament. I wholeheartedly agree with Mr Delmotte, one of the most senior members of our committee, that it is essential that the Commissioner in charge of regional policy should be in the Chamber when this matter is debated, particularly as Mr Delmotte's report highlights some of the grave deficiencies of the approach the Commission is taking in this matter. I therefore urge all Members present to

Harris

support Mr Delmotte's proposal that the matter be put off until February.

President. — I call Mr Fanton.

Mr Fanton. — *(FR)* On the matter of the request for urgency on the sugar market, Mr President, I have not quite understood whether you want us to vote now or whether you were just saying that we should have to vote on Friday morning come what may. I think the idea of the Council's asking for a vote on the urgency of a matter which is not without importance, when we do not yet have a Committee on Agriculture, is rather a cavalier approach. I wonder why we cannot voice our opinion now, Mr President, by saying that we do not want to vote.

President. — On the one hand, Mr Fanton, the document has not yet been distributed while on the other we do not know what the Committee on Agriculture is going to decide. That is why I am suggesting we wait until Friday morning before voting on the request for urgent procedure. Perhaps this item should simply be removed from the agenda since the House is hardly in a position to consider it. I do not think any problem is raised by this matter as the Committee on Agriculture has been asked to decide.

Mr Fanton. — *(FR)* I am sorry, Mr President, but voting on Friday mornings is sometimes a bit doubtful. Consequently, I find it rather odd to place on the agenda a text which the Council says is urgent but which no one knows anything about. Since the Committee on Agriculture is still to be formed, I should be happier if the item were withdrawn.

President. — No, Mr Fanton. In my view Parliament sits on Fridays as well as on Wednesdays or Thursdays.

I put to the vote the request tabled in accordance with Rule 87 of the Rules of Procedure by Mr Delmotte, rapporteur of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning, seeking to defer the debate on the Delmotte report on the economic and social situation of the regions of the Community.

(Parliament agreed to the request and adopted the agenda as amended)

(The sitting was closed at 6.45 p.m.)¹

¹ *Deadline for tabling amendments and motions for resolutions — Speaking time — Tabling of two motions for resolutions — Agenda for next sitting: see minutes.*

SITTING OF THURSDAY, 21 JANUARY 1982

Contents

1. <i>Joint debate: Belgian Presidency — Poland and Turkey:</i> <i>Mr Tindemans (Council); Mr Pannella; Mrs Gaiotti de Biase; Mrs Macciocchi; Mr Hänsch; Mr Glinne (S); Mr Croux (EPP); Mr Fergusson (ED); Mr Galluzzi (COM); Mr de Gucht (L); Mr Meo (EPD); Mr Vandemeulebroucke (TCDI); Mr De Goede (NA); Mr Thorn (Commission); Mr Van Miert; Mr Penders; Mr Moorhouse; Mr Antonozzi</i>	21	<i>Mr Beyer de Ryke</i>	60
2. <i>Agenda:</i> <i>Mr Collins; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mr Sherlock</i>	46	6. <i>Brucellosis, tuberculosis and leucosis in cattle — Report (Doc. 1-930/81) by Mr Maher (Committee on Agriculture):</i> <i>Mr Maher, rapporteur</i>	65
3. <i>Joint debate (continuation):</i> <i>Mr Israël; Mr Pesmazoglou; Mrs Gredal; Mr Pranchère; Mr Hopper; Mr Efremidis; Mr Haagerup; Mr Hänsch; Mr Gondikas; Mr Seligman; Mr Kirkos; Mr Pannella; Mr Tindemans (Council)</i>	46	<i>Mr Gautier (S); Mr Helms (EPP), Mr Provan (ED); Mr Eyraud; Mr McCartin; Mr Narjes (Commission); Mr Maher; Mr Provan; Mr Maher; Mr Eyraud; Mr Provan; Mr Gautier</i>	66
4. <i>Membership of committees (vote):</i> <i>Mr Bangemann</i> <i>Point of order: Mr Pannella</i> <i>Lady Elles; Mr Pannella</i>	59 60 60	<i>Explanation of vote: Mr Provan</i> <i>Adoption of the various texts</i>	71 71
5. <i>Joint debate (continuation):</i> <i>Mr Romualdi; Mr Plaskovitis; Mr Habsburg; Mrs Boserup; Mr von Hassel; Mr Bourmias;</i>		7. <i>Regulation on the movement of goods — Report (Doc. 1-799/81) by Mr Carossino (Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs):</i> <i>Mr Carossino, rapporteur</i> <i>Mr Albers (S); Mr von Wogau (EPP); Mr Narjes (Commission)</i>	71 71
		8. <i>Transport of dangerous substances — Reports by Mr Gatto (Doc. 1-357/81/rev.) and Mr Seefeld (Doc. 1-355/81/rev.) (Committee on Transport):</i> <i>Mr Gatto; Mr Seefeld, rapporteurs</i> <i>Mrs Viehoff (S); Mr Bourmias (EPP); Mr Turner (ED); Mr Gendebien (TCDI); Mr Eisma (NA); Mr Moreland; Mr Narjes (Commission)</i>	74 75

IN THE CHAIR: MR DANKERT

President

(The sitting was opened at 10 a.m.)¹

President. — Yesterday I was able to extend a welcome to my good friend, Mr De Keersmaeker, who was here as representative of the Council. This morning it gives me great pleasure to see in the Council seat a former Member, Mr Tindemans. A very

warm welcome to you, Mr Tindemans, in your new role in this Parliament. I am convinced that with this new role cooperation between Parliament and the Council will be abundantly guaranteed. I hope that we can take advantage of this during the Belgian Presidency, but perhaps you will say something about that in your speech.

1. *Joint debate: Belgian Presidency — Poland and Turkey*

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

— Council statement on the six-month programme of the Belgian Presidency;

¹ *Approval of minutes — Referral to committee — Documents received — Texts of treaties forwarded by the Council — Transfers of appropriations — Rule 49 of the Rules of Procedure — Authorization of reports — Petitions: see minutes.*

President

- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-943/81), tabled by Mr Fantì and Mr Piquet on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, on the death sentence imposed on 52 Turkish trade union leaders;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-944/81), tabled by Mr Klepsch on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group), on the situation in Poland;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-945/81) by Mrs Macciocchi and others on the situation in Poland;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-951/81) by Mr Pannella on the situation in Turkey

I call the Council.

Mr Tindemans, President-in-Office of the Council. — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, as President of the Council I am particularly pleased to be able to speak in this debate today at the start of the Belgian Presidency.

Mr President, this House is particularly dear to me as I was a Member of it — and was proud to be one — for nearly two and a half years, and because I remain convinced, as I stated repeatedly during the election campaign in 1979, that it is its destiny to translate the European ideal into reality.

It would be remiss of me if I were not to start by paying tribute to the first President of the elected Parliament, who has not only performed her task in an exemplary fashion but, through her charm, competence and dignity, has made a major contribution to the influence of this House, Madam Simone Veil, Europe and this Parliament have a lot to thank you for.

(Applause)

Nor should I like to miss this opportunity of expressing my respect for the grand old lady of Europe, Mrs Louise Weiss, who on two occasions has presided over the opening of parliamentary sessions.

(Applause)

(EN) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I wish to thank in a very particular way my predecessor as President-in-Office of the Council, Lord Carrington, who has upheld the best traditions of British diplomacy in presiding over Council meetings during the last six months. Not so long ago, as a Member of this Parliament, I ventured to say at the end of my speech in answer to his statement: '*Messieurs les Anglais, tirez les premiers!*' It is now the duty of Belgium to assume the responsibility of the presidency.

(NL) I have particular pleasure in congratulating the new President of Parliament, Mr Dankert, on his election. We all know him to be a tolerant, capable and

polyglot Member of this Parliament and we are familiar with his ability to preside over a sitting. I wish him all the best for the future and hope that there will be ideal cooperation between the Council and Parliament.

(Applause)

Today I have the honour to introduce the action programme that will be defended by Belgium for the next 6 months, when my country will be in charge of the EC Presidency. You know the rule: each Member State takes it in turn to hold the Presidency. But what does Presidency mean exactly! Some give it a meaning it cannot have. Indeed, one single Member State cannot impose a programme, nor determine by itself the course to be followed. On the other hand it does not mean passively presiding over a number of meetings, or being concerned about current affairs without having insight into what exactly is to happen.

In the first place the Presidency must undoubtedly be concerned with continuity in the Communities, ensure the correct application of Treaties and see to it that nothing of what has been achieved so far can be lost. In the second place, it appears to me, the Presidency must try to establish a consensus for new initiatives, and in any case to arrive at a decision over draft directives submitted by the Commission. In the third place the Presidency must see to it the opinions of the European Parliament are seriously taken into consideration when Council policies are being formulated.

In this context, the priorities which the Presidency wants to consider and the problems it wants to solve constitute a matter of importance. It is in this context that the action programme assumes its full value.

Hence the task of the Presidency is a double one: consolidation and development. In this Parliament there will undoubtedly be much enthusiasm when I say 'development', because here it is very well known to what extent the construction of Europe has remained incomplete. But there are many, knowing what has happened in recent years, who will — according to their temperament — either smile or gnash their teeth. Already so much has been proposed, and come to nothing, so that — with or without help from wise men — scepticism has grown increasingly. Nearly every debate in this Parliament provides new proof of this fact.

Be this as it may, major projects have been announced, more than once. Let us think of the economic and monetary union, the European union, the founding of which was announced for the 1970s, and the European Foundation.

Now I could myself sum up some reasons why these promising proposals have not materialized. But such setbacks and disappointments must not ever prevent us asking the question: What do we want, in fact?

Tindemans

Why did an impressive generation of statesmen start with European integration? Are the motives that were valid then still valid now, and how do we imagine the future of the concept of Europe? Or, as someone put it succinctly, 'What are we to do with Europe, anyway?'

In the midst of the present confusion and stagnation, we should keep on asking ourselves this question, so as to have the courage later to take the right decisions in order to achieve the desired end.

I want to raise this question here, as an introduction, so that the broad lines of the Belgian programme may form part of the answer. For more details I refer to the Annex of my speech, which will be distributed to you.

European conciliation, which was one of the basic features of the Treaty of Paris, must now and in the coming years be reflected in relations on an increasingly human scale among the Member States. One of the things that this means is that we have to build up 'Europe of the citizens'. What we want is to fashion Europe in such a way that the living conditions of our peoples are improved, that understanding becomes a self-evident fact, that the feeling of unity is strengthened. This can be done by a number of small measures by which it can really be proved that Europe is a community today, a union tomorrow.

The European Foundation, which was proposed as early as 1975, might be the most important initiative here. In a broader sense, with and by means of this foundation, understanding for one another's individuality could grow and the foundation for a stronger European consciousness could be laid.

A second reason often given by the 'fathers of Europe' after the war was the absolute necessity to put an end once and for all to the economic heresies that had bedevilled Europe in the 1930s. Economic nationalism, self-sufficiency, import quotas, import bans and currency manipulation had led to economic war and, consequently, bloody warfare. It was as if the crisis had been institutionalized. The real constituent parts of the individual power of a country — for example coal and steel — were used as weapons to increase differences among peoples, and there are some historians who claim that these were one of the causes of war.

In the post-war period, with its economic boom on an unprecedented scale, we seemed to have rid ourselves of these bugbears. However, in this period of crisis, would anybody dare to contend that they have gone for ever? — for these phenomena seem to be making a reappearance here and there.

Old errors come up again, dressed in new clothes — and what is more, they seem to be original — at least to those who do not remember anything about our most recent history. We in Europe have rejected these

mistakes, errors and follies of the pre-war years, at a time when they are still fresh in our minds, and we must continue to fight against them. This means that we have to defend the internal market of the Community, to make the common market secure, to abide by the rules of competition, that we have all accepted.

Among the problems for which an urgent solution must be found, I would like to mention the mandate of 30 May 1980. In this context, I would like to express my appreciation for the work of the Commission, and of its President in particular, Mr Gaston Thorn, for the efforts he has put into the endeavour to resolve problems still outstanding.

At the informal Council meeting on 14 and 15 January, we came very close to an agreement. I still hope it can be reached on January 25. Such an agreement should in itself be a proof that the Community can still, at this moment, solve difficult problems. We cannot afford a failure anyway, because this could lead to a really crippling crisis.

One of the essential accomplishments of this Community, with a real economic and social content, is the common agricultural policy. Whatever adjustments may be made to this policy therefore must never affect any of its fundamental principles.

What the monetary problems of the Community are is, I believe, well known. The economic and monetary union we worked on in the 1970s is still far from being realized. Still, in 1979, a start was possible in the form of the European Monetary System. To be sure, it was a very hesitant start, but nevertheless a promising one. The hopes that were placed in it have, however, not been fulfilled. But whenever possible, this system must be reinforced because we firmly believe that a new, great and irreversible situation in the Community can only be established when a monetary and economic union forms its basis.

It is also regrettable that since the collapse of the well-known Bretton Woods monetary system, no further attempts have been made to reach agreements among the spheres of the European Community, the dollar and the yen. If we were able to reach such arrangements, there would be a new foundation on which the Western economy could build with more confidence. As President of the Council, I have now been invited to visit the United States and Japan, and I intend to discuss these problems in the course of these visits.

When the ECSC was founded, it was hoped that the components which then formed the foundation of the modern industrial nations — i.e. coal and steel — would no longer be a cause of envy and strife, but would on the contrary be the most suitable means to promote the common welfare.

Tindemans

For some years our view of the importance of coal as a condition of industrial development has undergone a change. Nobody can deny that energy remains the condition *sine qua non* for future economic expansion and for policy covering welfare and prosperity.

It is perhaps in the energy sector that the resurgence of nationalism poses its greatest threat. I hope therefore, together with you, to be able to strive for the acceptance of a European common energy policy

Our greatest challenge in these troubled times is however, I think, the common struggle against the economic crisis. After all, our purpose in founding the European Community was to prevent a situation such as our countries knew in the 1930s, from ever occurring again. How are we to persuade our peoples that we have a common destiny and that what unites us is more important than what divides us, if we are unable to wage a common and effective battle against unemployment — particularly among the young — with unflagging energy?

If there was one sphere in which the European ideal ever raised great hope and expectation among the people — not only among a handful of politicians and technocrats — it was on this issue: how are we, in a joint endeavour, to tackle the economic crisis and give our peoples new hopes and new prospects for the future?

A democracy which cannot offer any hope is threatened with collapse.

This is perhaps a rather harsh statement, but there are those among you who have experienced it yourselves, and written as much too. Therefore the European Community must find a policy that will prove how results can be achieved with intelligence, courage and a common approach. A European industrial policy is therefore necessary and it must be coupled with a common effort in the field of research.

Let me add that the Community should not only form a common market for goods and capital, but also for services, a domain in which much remains to be done.

(Applause)

To conclude this chapter, I would like to stress that Europe is an economic power in Europe — no other kind of power. Without this economic power the political cooperation and our influence in the world are meaningless. This should be borne in mind whenever we speak about the role and the meaning of Europe on the international scene.

(FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, let me add that the Community, as I have just said in Dutch, was intended as a common market not only for goods and capital, but also for services, a domain in which much remains to be done. To conclude this chapter, I would

like to stress that Europe's power in the world is based only on its economic power. Without this economic power, political cooperation and our influence in the world are meaningless. This should be borne in mind whenever we speak about the role and the meaning of Europe on the international scene.

The third reason why dedicated people have spent all these years striving to achieve a united Europe is the need to speak with a single voice in the current major international debates. Europe should largely be able to determine its future by itself.

In my report on the European Union I wrote in this respect:

Our vulnerability and our relative powerlessness are obvious to any of us. These two factors combined make external relations one of the prime motives for European integration. The European identity will obviously be much the more evident if the Community can speak with one voice on major international problems.

We should have the courage to do so in at least four areas. First, in our relations with the United States. We have so many ties with this country that an extensive dialogue between us is imperative, for monetary questions, economy (let us remember steel) and security. We cannot omit the problems of the new international economic order. This Parliament houses enough specialists in policies in favour of the Third World who will give their full backing whenever unanimous standpoints have to be upheld. Under no circumstances should Europe act again divided, as was the case during the last special session of the UN on the North-South dialogue.

I would also especially like to mention the problem of hunger in the world. We will do all we can, not only to offer assistance and to ensure that the assistance we offer really reaches the people who suffer, but also, primarily, that development assistance should be geared to agriculture and food production in the developing countries.

Thirdly, we should formulate a policy to cope with the various crises occurring close to the European borders. In the first instance, what I have in mind is the Middle East. Tension is again mounting there. The annexation of the Golan Heights by Israel contributes to this, while the suspending of the Arab Summit in Fez, did not improve the situation. Developments in South Lebanon could lead to a new explosion. The war between Iraq and Iran has not yet ended.

Four Member States are preparing to help in evacuating Sinai, through the international force responsible for maintaining security.

Since the European summit in Venice, the Ten have been trying, together with the efforts of the USA, to develop a peace initiative, based on the guarantee that all countries in the area may live in peace within

Tindemans

secure, recognized or guaranteed borders, and on the possibility for all people from the region to find a way of obtaining the right of self-determination through a global peace settlement.

Three Presidents, Mr Thorn, Mr van der Klauw and Lord Carrington, have widened the possibilities that can be used in a peace initiative, through intensive cooperation. Their proposals were accepted at the Summit in Luxembourg

What can the Ten do at this point? They must continue to manifest great interest in the problems of the Middle East and clarify the principles underlying their attitude.

However, since the Summit in Venice, a lot has changed: elections in Israel, in France, in the USA, while President Sadat has died a tragic death. Also the Arab Summit has been postponed. All this means we have to re-evaluate the situation. We have to do this quickly, in close contact with all related parties, in order, if at all possible, to produce concrete proposals. Mistrust has grown recently so that the road to peace has become more difficult. Consequently, our first task is to take measures to restore confidence.

A fourth area would be security. During the Belgian Presidency the UN General Assembly will hold its second special session on disarmament. Its results will largely determine the international political situation. It will, therefore, be more necessary than ever for the Ten to show great mutual understanding and unity and make the European point of view clearly understood by the whole world. We will spare no effort to make the Ten's contribution to that conference a substantial one. We have already called on our partners for their unconditional support.

The subject of security would be incomplete if I disregarded the tragic situation in Poland. Here in Parliament we have already had the opportunity of expressing our grave concern at developments in Poland. Since 13 December this has become a tragedy. On 4 January the Council of the Ten's Ministers for Foreign Affairs met in Brussels and expressed in a communiqué its profound indignation at the events in Poland. The Ten denounced the violation of human rights in Poland as well as the denial of the principles of the Helsinki Final Act, an act which was also signed by Poland and the Soviet Union. The Ten also denounced the pressure exerted on Poland by a thoroughly totalitarian regime, which has clearly obstinately refused to tolerate evolution of any kind.

The Ten expressed their willingness to send large-scale assistance to Poland, subject to the re-establishing of respect for human rights, trade union achievements and the Helsinki principles. This should include the re-establishing of the dialogue between the authorities, Solidarity and the Church. But nothing seems to indicate such a renewed tolerance.

The Council will however continue to watch developments and again indicate its position in the light of events. It decided also to use international bodies to repeatedly denounce what is happening in Poland. Accordingly the Ministers will attend the meeting of the European Conference on Security and Cooperation, which will resume in Madrid in 9 February in continuation of the Helsinki Conference.

On 15 January the Council decided that the President of the Council should speak for the Ten, as the late Aldo Moro did in Helsinki.

I will not elaborate any further on the Polish tragedy; the Parliament will doubtless be discussing it again.

If need be, my words may indicate once more how important political cooperation is becoming for Europe. Many voices have already been raised in favour of greater cooperation and this Parliament quite recently discussed the proposals of Ministers Genscher and Colombo. I had the pleasure of taking part in that debate myself. The scope of those proposals is very wide. They are aimed at approving an act while accommodating actions under the Treaties, political cooperation, intergovernmental activities and the meetings at European level of certain Ministers. The European Council would fulfill this umbrella function.

I have already proposed establishing an *ad hoc* Committee under the Chairmanship of the Belgian Ambassador, Phillipe de Schoutheete, author of a book on political cooperation, to investigate the proposals and their outcome, and submit them to the Ten for decision. This Committee has meanwhile started work and I really do hope that their efforts will lead to positive results.

In conclusion I would like to talk about the improvement of cooperation between the institutions. I have worked with you, and am all too well aware of how frustrating the Commission-Council-Parliament relationship can be for a busy MP. This is now being investigated again, but I have already asked that a time table should be worked out for the meetings, in order to enable Ministers to be present at both public sessions of Parliament and Committee meetings.

(Applause)

If we work together well in this respect a new dialogue could develop between the Parliament and the Council, to the benefit of both institutions.

As far as the enlargement of the Community is concerned, the Ten decided on 15 January that contacts between the Directors dealing with political problems in the respective Foreign Affairs departments, will be held with the participation of Portugal and Spain. At the same time certain special ministerial meetings of the Ten will be held annually within the

Tindemans

framework of political cooperation, to which Spain and Portugal will also be invited. In this way we are already preparing for the accession of both countries.

The Genscher-Colombo proposals also raise the problems of decision-taking in the European Community. I hope this Parliament will do everything in its power to override all unjustified blocking of decision-taking resulting from the rule of unanimity. The enlargement of the Community makes this approach inequitable.

(Applause)

It was not my purpose, ladies and gentlemen, to give you a complete list of what the Belgian Presidency intends to accomplish during their half-year.

I simply wished to highlight some points so that you would know in what spirit and according to what philosophy we hope to carry out this Presidency.

I continue to believe in the need for greater European integration and I regret that this grand idea is often no longer championed with the conviction shown by those whose photographs we see hanging up here in the lobbies. Six months pass quickly but Belgium will use that time to pinpoint with conviction a number of absolutely necessary measures. I am well aware that a French philosopher wrote: 'Les évidences des uns sont rarement les évidences des autres.' But when preparations for the future, or indeed limited chances of survival, are involved, when it is the face and soul, nay the genius of Europe that is concerned, I am convinced that it is here, in this very Parliament, the outcome of direct universal suffrage, that a very great majority will be found to fight for what is most essential.

A directly elected European Parliament is something historically unique. By finding the right relationship between Council, Commission and Parliament we should be well on the way to fulfilling our own historic task. It is with this conviction that Belgium will be carrying out its period of office. It is this Parliament which will enable Belgium to put an end to the current defeatism and stagnation in order realistically and pragmatically to achieve a new and more fruitful European impetus.

(Loud applause)

President. — I want to express the warmest thanks to the President of the Council for his speech. I do believe it marks the starting point for the further cooperation between Parliament and the Council which I mentioned at the beginning.

I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — *(FR)* Mr President, as my colleagues will undoubtedly recall, we have been trying for more

than a year to persuade our Parliament and the other institutions to adopt a reasonable and rigorous attitude on events in Turkey, events in the Mediterranean, and therefore events in Europe. I believe, Mr President, that we have very clear views on this. But there is a danger that these clear views, in principle, stated by everyone, may not be put in practice either by the other Community institutions or by our Parliament.

I believe, Mr President, that we cannot go on compromising with this situation which is — as could easily have been foreseen, and as we did in fact foresee — an increasingly intolerable one of death and violence. I think we have a duty to take up a clear position immediately. The proposals we are making are the same as we have been making for nearly a year. But what I think is necessary is briefly to consider, in general terms, our attitude towards Turkey, and therefore, indirectly but very obviously, our attitude towards Poland and towards the problem of freedoms and law in our Europe and in the world at large.

As you know, I do not think it is East-West problems which determine our history, but rather the North-South problem. Nevertheless, these problems exist. And I think that if we want to be Europeans in today's world — our world — we cannot regard Europe as an abstract entity. It is the Europe of political democracy, the Europe of the people which concerns us and which we must defend.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, either we say to ourselves that dictatorship must always be fought, and that one does not compromise with dictatorships, or we say to ourselves that political realism itself requires us not to compromise. For the 'Munich policy' of appeasement, whether from the right or from the left, may come once more to the fore in the 1980s. We must fight vigorously against the spirit of anti-legal violence, against the structures of violence and dictatorship of the 1980s, which are in my view those of the real communism and real anti-socialism of the countries of Eastern Europe. But we shall not be able to do so if we continue to deceive ourselves with regard to the militarist dictatorships and the dictatorships linked with a certain policy of the Pentagon or of NATO.

Mr President, we must not ignore the prudent advice of a Turkish political leader — who is now in prison, and perhaps paying in that way for his adventurist policy which led him, although a socialist, to carry out an act of aggression against Greece — or deceive ourselves that there are good generals who can in some way sweep aside the difficulties for democrats and then politely hand power back to them. That is the dangerous illusion you have followed, the dangerous illusion entertained by Europeans of a certain kind who are apparently quite ready to take a hard line on Poland but are not prepared to take one on Turkey.

Pannella

In fact, if we look closely we shall see that these Europeans — verbally forthright in condemning those who, in Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Afghanistan and Poland, represent in the 1980s, at the structural level, the greatest threat to peace, justice, law and socialism itself — that in fact these colleagues on the right are not really opposed to them. For, with regard to Poland, what will count in the 1980s is the agreement which Mr Reagan signed with Mr Brezhnev on 20 September for the supply of 18 million tonnes of cereals.

All the rest is showmanship — something which makes it possible to make a fuss. In fact we know that if Mr Reagan, the European right and NATO agree to threaten not to send food aid to the Polish people — I repeat, the Polish people — they also agree to supply cereals to the occupiers of Afghanistan, to the supporters of this dictatorship, to the Polish troops who are preparing to carry on, in one way or another, their civil war against the Polish people.

If we wish to be credible we must strengthen our Europe, which is surrounded — lulled by its illusion of effectiveness and efficiency, whereas it does not denounce the member countries of the United Nations, at least 130 of them, which are governed by military or paramilitary dictatorships — our Europe which is surrounded because of the lack of faith and lack of intelligence of the 'liberals', i.e. those who believe that political democracy is a luxury which we can allow ourselves from time to time rather than a rule which we must defend throughout the world.

If, then, Mr President, we are here today to say '*delenda quoque Ankara*', it is because every dictatorship must be destabilized, and because we say that we should fight for the destabilization of every dictatorship. We must not accept the policy of *faits accomplis*, either within countries or in international relations. The voice of London, which was the most feared weapon — which Mrs Thatcher now wishes to silence — the voice of London was the real enemy for Mussolini and Hitler. It was the voice of truth, the voice of reliable information. What dictators fear is not their opponents' armaments but the weapon of truth, the weapon of Helsinki — but of an active implementation of the Helsinki Agreement which alone can prevent us from being the eternal losers and from being united only hypocritically to celebrate the funeral of some democracy in the world. My dear colleagues, you are never united to attack, to demand that liberty should win through elsewhere. Every time you perform these sad masquerades. For example — I regret to have to say this to you, Mr President of the Commission — a month and a half ago, after a vote by the Committee on Budgets of our Parliament which blocked financial aid to Turkey, you asked the Council two days later that funds be paid to the Turkish generals through the European Investment Bank, to finance further these torturers of the powerless and luckless Ecevit. But we must get him out of prison, not in order to follow him

in his suicidal policy but in order to oppose those who, sometimes even willingly, hand over power to the armed forces in the belief that they will give them back the freedoms which they have failed to win as democrats. These people must be politically thwarted, but we must help them in spite of themselves.

I therefore hope that our Parliament will today express as clear and concrete a view as possible. If we wish to defend Warsaw, if we wish to defend Poland, if we wish to defend Afghanistan and El Salvador and all those throughout the world who are increasingly subjected to militarist ideology of the right or of the left — the ideology of authoritarian efficiency — if we wish to do that, our Parliament must today express a clear and concrete view on Turkey.

It is that kind of Europe which can win through, Mr President, and it is only that kind of realism which can win through. All the rest is only historical complicity in defeat and historical complicity with dictatorships.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mrs Gaiotti de Biase.

Mrs Gaiotti de Biase. — (IT) Mr President, it is not without some emotion that Poland is again the subject of debate in this Chamber. However, it is emotion which has become more intense on account of the need, as far as this Parliament is concerned, to spotlight the need for a political response rather than criticism and condemnation. We cannot fail to criticize and condemn — and this is what we do in the motion tabled by the Group of the European People's Party — the fact that in spite of everything that has been said the situation in Poland has not got any clearer, there is still repression and we have to take a gloomy rather than a bright view of things.

This was said during the debate in December. It was said by the Council of Ministers, the Foreign Ministers and the ministers of the NATO countries. I am convinced that this Parliament, by virtue of the role it plays in Europe, must do something more. It must realize that the process of European unity and our own unity represent a vital element of persuasion and a strong card that must be used to influence events in Poland.

The idea of playing Cassandra is not a political alibi. We have a political duty to influence events, not just to pass judgment on them. I am sorry that the political groups in this House were not able to formulate a common stance on Poland, which is what was done by the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation. I think it would have been a good idea to come up with a joint resolution which mentioned the statement by the ministers, the idea of sending a delegation from the European Parliament to Poland, some definite

Gaiotti de Biase

action by the Political Affairs Committee or at least an invitation from this Parliament to people in Poland with some real interest in instituting a dialogue, some form of communication, a way out of the situation.

But since such a motion has not been tabled, I can only ask for the adoption of the motion by the Group of the European People's Party which contains these points, and I would stress how useful it would be for the Political Affairs Committee to make a start, tomorrow, with these hearings which will call on leading figures from Poland for the necessary background. I do want to speak out here in the hope that this Parliament may perhaps adopt a common response to a problem which to some extent represents a challenge to the ability of Europe to offer a common response.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MR ESTGEN

Vice-President

President. — I call Mrs Macciocchi.

Mr Macciocchi. — *(IT)* Mr President, I want to talk about a motion tabled in connection with sending a delegation to Poland. In this context it is fitting to remember Parliament's duty to act and I shall go as far as to say, Mr President, that I should have expected a gesture along these lines, just as I am still expecting one from you. Far be it from me to suggest the ways and means, but I do not think that when the new President was putting Poland in first place among the major problems of the moment he was simply coming out with a word or phrase to touch our feelings, but I think he probably had some political action in mind.

To be truthful, ladies and gentlemen — and I am saying this for your benefit as well, Mrs Gaiotti de Biase — I take a pessimistic view. I do not think we shall do anything. I think we shall slowly get bogged down in long debates. Anyhow, I know the masters at this kind of debate, the people who tell us to be careful and to take it easy, not to stir things up, because our job is to calm things down and to pour oil on troubled waters. I do realize the tremendous difficulties we shall have to cope with if we want to get somewhere with some definite political action.

In this motion I have prepared I have made an effort — and the House will probably remember that I raised the matter back in December — to come up with a kind of resolution in which the more polemic aspects of strong political censure — which in any case has been expressed by me and by other people — were left

aside because the basic aim of the document was in fact to have a delegation from this Parliament sent to Poland. What my request dealt with was indeed the idea of sending a delegation to contact Polish governmental, military, parliamentary and religious authorities and the principal town councils in order to obtain information on the situation in Poland and to convey to them Parliament's concern that the dialogue between the different sections of the Polish nation should be resumed, that political prisoners should be released and that human rights should be respected.

I wonder, though, when human rights are mentioned, whether we have not arrived at the day when human rights are being swallowed up by the kafkaesque world around us, where they are being viciously trampled underfoot. You might well reach the conclusion that in spite of this treatment what has to be sought is an accommodation with that mighty power in the East, which makes open use of force by way of psychological pressure to bring about what might be termed an invasion from within by the Polish military authorities. The job of the delegation would be to observe what happens to food aid from the European Community on its arrival and to ensure that this aid actually reached the Polish people, to obtain as much information as possible on the treatment of political prisoners and to visit them wherever permitted by the Polish authorities, and lastly to report to Parliament on its return.

I now have before me here a motion by the EPP which makes the same request but which expresses it in a way I cannot agree with. I am calling on the EPP to withdraw this motion. What is the reason? I am asking because I am still nurturing the hope that at the end of the day we can arrive at a joint resolution from Parliament on sending a delegation to Poland. Yesterday we had a meeting attended by all the political groups with their documents on the same problem. From the meeting emerged our desire to have a discussion by the Political Affairs Committee — yesterday we failed to reach agreement on a joint text — which would enable us to table a joint motion on the idea of sending a delegation to Poland.

The point is that, if I were asked, I should be ready for the sake of this joint approach to withdraw my resolution and to make every effort together with the other groups to see to it that at the first meeting of the Political Affairs Committee there is a discussion which lets us adopt a single text on this idea of sending a delegation to Poland. I speak with the pessimism of reason, ladies and gentlemen, and with the optimism of hope. Let me say by way of conclusion, Mr President, now that I have explained my resolution and in view of the fact that I have said I favour a joint resolution, that I am ready to agree to withdraw my motion for a resolution when voting time comes round this afternoon.

President. — I call Mr Hänsch.

Mr Hänsch. — (*DE*) Mr President, as agreed with the group representatives yesterday, we want to try to work out a joint statement on the situation in Poland at next week's meeting of the Political Affairs Committee. If we want to help Poland and especially the Polish people, the best way we can do it in my view is with the maximum unity. All the group representatives who took part in yesterday's discussion agreed on this. I should like to ask you, Mrs Macciocchi, and also the spokesman of the EPP Group, whether this agreement still stands and whether you are going to withdraw your motions for resolutions, so that we can discuss the matter next week in the Political Affairs Committee.

President. — Mr Hänsch, the point you have raised is one which has to be dealt with by the political groups and not by the House. A decision will have to be taken among the groups.

I call the Socialist Group.

Mr Glinne. — (*FR*) Mr President, Mr President of the Council, Mr Secretary of State, Mr President of the Commission, ladies and gentlemen, it is not every day that our Parliament has the privilege of addressing a former colleague who has become the President-in-Office of the Council.

There are precedents, namely Mr Thorn and Mr Colombo, and we have no reason to be dissatisfied with them. Today we are particularly pleased to welcome a former colleague who, within Parliament and outside it, has always defended the interests of our institution and the strengthening of its role. Moreover, since as a result of certain private conversations, we have for several weeks been awaiting a positive public speech by the President-in-Office, we were very eager to hear Mr Tindemans' speech this morning. On the institutional aspect, we were not disappointed, although it seems to us that we must ensure that progress, which is very necessary, takes place in the framework of the Treaties without too much use of intergovernmental cooperation and without misuse of informal meetings.

We took note of what you said about Ambassador de Schoutheete's mission. The important thing, Mr Tindemans, is that you stressed the need to improve relations among the institutions and particularly with Parliament. On this point I would particularly like to draw your attention to some passages of, and some guidelines described in, the speech delivered very recently by Mr Dankert, the new President of the European Parliament. I am pleased that you said clearly that consultation between the Council and Parliament could be extended to cover matters that do not necessarily have primarily financial implications. We also take note, with interest, of your statement that the Council should react to every statement of

view by the European Parliament, that more account should be taken of Parliament's opinions, etc. These are encouraging words, and we hope that they will be rapidly put into practice — you said that they would — but it is important, for example, that the Council files, including those relating to political cooperation, should systematically include resolutions adopted by Parliament.

An important step would be for the Council systematically to send a representative to our Parliamentary committees. This practice was begun as early as 1973, as I well know, for I was present in that year at a meeting of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, in my capacity as President of the Social Affairs Council. I think we must go back to this practice and institutionalize it.

The statements of yours which I have just mentioned, Mr Tindemans, are not surprising from someone — I repeat — who stressed here only a few months ago, in the debate on the statements by Mr Genscher and Mr Colombo — and I quote:

that this Parliament too has a perfect right to debate all the problems which the European Council will also deal with in the future.

Referring to the two reports by Mr Hänsch and Mr Van Miert on interinstitutional cooperation, you then added very rightly:

We also take the view that the cooperation between the institutions must be revised.

In view of this, the Socialist Group asks only to be completely reassured about the nature of the relations which Parliament is likely to have with the Council during the Belgian Presidency, and about the latter's intention to do everything it can to strengthen the role of our Parliament and constantly improve relations between the directly elected parliamentarians and the governments of the Ten.

Mr Tindemans, we have a duty to be frank with one another. I must tell you that we were somewhat disconcerted and perplexed by the content of an interview which you gave recently on BRT (Belgian radio in Dutch) in your capacity as President-in-Office of the Council. Subject to more detailed checks, our initial reaction is that the tone adopted and the content of your remarks are not entirely felicitous with regard to our Parliament. I shall quote only one extract from the transcript of your interview, which somewhat surprised us. I had been questioned about your possible candidacy for the presidency of our Parliament, which you had considered at one stage, and you said the following:

I shall not go into the matter of the presidency — you probably know that most observers still gave me the best chance of becoming President of that Parliament. But I went no further with the matter, since it no longer interested me. When one has once borne responsibility, for

Glinne

example in one's own country, and has been able to do something in practical politics, the European mandate is frustrating in that, although one can make fine speeches and take part in votes there, one never has the feeling that one is contributing to a policy or that one has influence on events. And, as I said, when one has borne real responsibility that is discouraging and frustrating. I know the European Parliament inside out — this will probably facilitate my task as a minister, since I now understand the psychology of the Members of Parliament. But I must now defend the Council, although earlier I sat in Parliament — those are two different positions. As someone once said in a famous play, everything depends on one's standpoint.

There are, then, two versions of reality, there are subjective comments, and we have impression that the opinions given in this interview do not fully accord with certain speeches made by the same person here and elsewhere. As you know, when two worlds have two versions of the truth, they tend to be confusing. Finally, Mr President of the Council, our hope is that Tindemans the President of the Council will not distance himself too much from Tindemans the Member of the European Parliament, whose opinions we received well at the time.

Mr Tindemans, we are also pleased that in the action programme of the Belgian Presidency — a written document — you stressed the need to strengthen the economic and social side of Europe. But in our view you did not tell us enough this morning. To put it very briefly, we hope that you will take account, in general and in detail, of the recommendations of the European Trade Union Confederation, and that you will make every effort to create, with the help of others, the European social area already advocated, I think, at the end of last May by the French President, François Mitterrand.

We also attach great importance to the strengthening of the internal market and the creation of a real industrial policy, as stressed in your speech. We also believe — and I think this is very important — that the 25 January meeting on the 30 May 1980 mandate and on budgetary restructuring, after informal meetings which were unfortunately fruitless, will be crucial, and we think it must take place. I heard you in discussion with Mr Gaston Thorn in the French-language Belgian television channel, and I took in what you said about the opportunities which still exist for the date of 25 January. We would like to tell you that the success of that meeting should be the real concern, rather than questions about what we should do in case of its failure or after its failure. We also hope that a pragmatic solution will be found quickly to the budgetary problem. No decision has yet been taken by the Council on the 1982 budget, and we know that on 1 February the Member States will be asked for the first payments to finance the 1982 budget. At that stage it will be clear whether or not a new conflict is likely to arise between Parliament and the Council, or

at any rate between Parliament and a number of Member States.

For our part we are ready to assist you, Mr Tindemans, in encouraging a pragmatic solution. We are in favour of a compromise. Indeed, in this matter the Socialist Group prefers and encourages, in practical terms, political solutions rather than reference to the Court of Justice. It is also necessary to be able to count in this matter on a minimum of goodwill on the part of the Council. We believe that such a goodwill characterizes your attitude, and we therefore hope that the Belgian Presidency will play a positive and constructive role in this field.

I wished to communicate to you these hopes, criticisms and fears on behalf of the Socialist Group. On political cooperation, and particularly on the questions of Poland and Turkey, some of my colleagues will speak in greater detail. However, I should like to mention one point relating to the peace-keeping force set up for the Middle East and to warn you, with reference to certain rumours and press releases, against the participation of units from Member States of the EEC alongside units from countries ruled by dictatorships. The possibility has been mentioned of European troops being stationed alongside a Uruguayan contingent. It is a detail, but it would still be better to take measures in good time to reject such unhealthy proximity.

Mr President, at the end of the term of office of the Belgian Presidency we shall meet once more in this Chamber. We shall then be able to make an assessment and judge the results of Mr Tindemans' action on the basis of concrete facts. In truth, we are not expecting miracles, but we are expecting irreversible progress.

Finally, Mr President, I would like to stress once more that for us Socialists the problem of employment remains the first priority. Important results must be obtained in practice in this field. In our view the long wait of the European workers, particularly of the 10 million or so unemployed registered up to now — we have said and repeated this, and we repeat it once more — has lasted long enough.

(Applause)

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

Mr Croux. — *(NL)* Mr President, ladies and gentleman, the Belgian Presidency is taking office at a time of great tension in Europe and throughout the world, and at a time when many of our people are afraid of what the future has in store. This has undoubtedly had an effect on the situation and on political developments in Europe. Recent opinion polls point to a rekindling of the European ideal among

Croux

the public at large. It was Jean Monnet who said that, as far as European integration was concerned, more depended on political impulses and external pressure than on rational internal processes. We therefore think it right for the Belgian Presidency to have resurrected the idea of a European Foundation, and we very much hope that it will come into being on the 25th anniversary of the signing of the European Treaties. The European Foundation must not be allowed to become an elitist, technocratic development, but rather a decentralized European movement in all the countries of Europe, working hand-in-hand with other organizations in the same field. The President-in-Office stressed the need to strengthen social and economic policy, and we can give our support to his programme.

It is indeed a fact that the internal market must, as a matter of urgency, be freed from the shackles of certain non-tariff obstacles to trade. We hear plenty of reference to the 'reconquest of the internal market', albeit in a nationalistic sense. We, however, regard this as a European, a Community task.

Agriculture remains one of the main pillars of European policy. The President-in-Office emphasized that point, but we feel bound to express our concern as to the current delay due to the fact that the Commission has so far put forward no price proposals. We realize that the Commission wishes to link this problem with the question of restructuring and of the mandate of 30 May, but the price issue is so important to the farmers in Europe that we can afford no further delay on this point. As regards economic policy, the President-in-Office gave notice of a number of measures aimed at giving a boost to a genuinely European economic, industrial and innovatory policy, and we are thinking here of course of the massive unemployment problem. During the run-up to direct elections two-and-a-half years ago, all the political parties made a great issue of the unemployment problem. In the meantime, though, the number of people unemployed has risen from almost 7 million to 10 million, and prospects at the moment are so poor that we shall have to expect that figure to rise to 12 or even 13 million in the near future. Unemployment is a major problem no matter what country we are talking about — big or small — and regardless of the economic policy or the economic doctrine pursued by those countries' governments. The phenomenon is the same in the United Kingdom under Mrs Thatcher, in France under Mr Mitterrand and now even in the Federal Republic of Germany with its close-on two million unemployed. We are worried about the unemployment problem not only from the economic point of view, but also — and particularly — from the social point of view. Unemployment is one of the major scourges of Europe, especially among young people, as you yourself said, Mr Tindemans.

We advocate a genuinely European social policy. As we said years ago, Europe must be an oasis of social justice, and this must be one of the major values of our

European heritage that we should pass on to the rest of the world. Our request is therefore that general declarations should be replaced by a genuinely European policy. We hear over and over again that the unemployment problem cannot be solved by each country acting alone. What is needed is cooperation at European level, but that is really no more than a general framework, and the target level has so far been pitched too low. Mr Tindemans mentioned a number of possible aims and instruments such as scientific research, industrial innovation, a European investment area and the possibility of increasing the funds available under the new financial instrument to 3 000 million units of account. The fact is, though, that we are still not managing to centre our attention sufficiently on this highly important point. We hope that the Belgian Presidency will be able to make progress in this field. We would also like to see the idea of the Jumbo Council taken up again with a view to making progress along the same lines. You mentioned that point in your statement, and we hope that it will indeed yield results.

As far as financial policy is concerned, we should like to state very briefly that, in the conflict between the Council and Parliament over the budget, our aim is not to inflate the budget so much as to institute an effective European policy in sectors other than agriculture. You yourself mentioned the sectors in question, and we can only go along with what you had to say. The time has now come, though, for action. Parliament has not been fighting this battle for years now for the sake of boosting the size of the budget, but simply with a view to pooling our European resources and doing things on a European scale. We therefore hope that progress can be made in this field too.

The third important subject, Mr President, is the institutions themselves. Mention has already been made of this point, and important developments are now in progress. The French memorandum is an important document, as is the Genscher-Colombo European Act. We were pleased to hear that you have taken the initiative in setting up an *ad hoc* working party to formulate our ideas. We hope that the working party will be in a position to present its conclusions in the near future. We would like the Commission to involve the European Parliament in any discussion of institutional issues, with a view to the same kind of cooperation we had under the British Presidency. You referred to the role of Parliament, and we should like to thank you for the initiative you said you intend to take, particularly as regards the presence of ministers both in the plenary meetings and in the committee meetings. That is a highly welcome development from our point of view.

There are three points I should like to make regarding the situation of the European Parliament. Firstly, let us never forget that all the parliaments in the Western democracies are faced with serious problems. Parlia-

Croux

ments have always undergone change, and that should be no reason for us to get discouraged.

Secondly, relations between the European Parliament and the European Council and, for that matter, the Commission are of a very special nature. We are only at the beginning of a very long period of development, and everyone has a part to play. We welcome the fact that you, Mr President-in-Office, drew attention to the Council's duty to get away from the 'Luxembourg compromise', in other words, the unanimity rule. The French memorandum tends to this view, which is — we think — a hopeful sign. We hope that you will succeed in reinstating this major principle in the decision-making process, as you have said on a number of occasions in the past, and as we have been very pleased to hear.

Thirdly, what policy should be pursued by a Parliament, Council and a Commission intent on achieving European Union? Should we not be seeking new relationships? Is this a unionist policy? I sometimes get the impression that some people in this House adopt a unionist attitude, and you know better than I do, Mr Tindemans, what unionism can amount to. As far as the Council is concerned, we must think in terms other than those of the classic relations and classic conflicts between governments and parliaments.

Mr President-in-Office, those are the points I wished to make on the occasion of the commencement of the Belgian Presidency. We were particularly pleased to hear you place such stress on the position of Europe in the world as a whole. We are, after all, a small part of that world. Other Members will be speaking about the Third World, the North-South Dialogue, East-West relations and political cooperation. I should just like to remind you in conclusion of one of the guiding principles of the founding fathers of Europe: no one would doubt the need for the construction of Europe, but any such development would be inconceivable without a representative assembly of the peoples of Europe. We have been elected by the people, disregarding for the time being the fact that our work may not always have been 100 % effective. With a view to the future, we intend to work together with the Council and with the Commission on a European project in the interests mainly of the young people of Europe.

(Applause)

President. — I call the European Democratic Group.

Mr Fergusson. — Mr President, I know that Mr Tindemans is aware of the esteem in which our group holds him and he knows that there is nothing fulsome about the congratulations I now offer him on behalf of my group on his first appearance before us as his country's foreign minister and as President-in-office of the Council. It is I think another feather in the cap

of this Parliament, another cause for pride, that a foreign minister of a Member State has once again, I think for the fourth time since we were elected, been chosen from the benches of this Assembly. I must say I congratulate him. Though we are sorry he left, we welcome him back now in his new capacity.

We have paid due attention to his account of the internal problems now immediately facing the Community, and there is an element of familiarity about each one of them; some would say a hint of desperation which invites the request addressed not precisely to him but to his colleagues and to his advisers that they get on with it. We know it is difficult, but for Heaven's sake with Mr Glinne we now demand success. So far as budgetary reform goes, please accept the old adage that if you go on patching an old garment eventually you will be left with nothing but a great big patch and people will begin to notice. There is agriculture, the perennial problem, and unemployment and the growing tragedy in the Third World. It's not just that I want to make obligatory reference to these matters, I want to remind the new Presidency that we have here or are developing constructive ideas for doing something real about all these things. I think you know, Mr Tindemans, these ideas; we hope you will adopt them and examine them. You know that we will support you.

May I add from this group a few particular ingredients to all the advice and requests that you must have been receiving about the further evolution particularly of our institutions. The first may even help to solve the problems that I mentioned. Mr Tindemans knows that our special interest, as the last speaker said, is the return of majority voting in the Council of Ministers. It would be a splendid thing if this Presidency were to pull off this all-important advance. We welcome and we believe his assurances about trying to improve the cooperation between the Council and Parliament and his assurances in respect of our future influence. We hope, too, that he will look on the budgetization of the European Development Fund as something that might be studied most carefully in the next six months. We do feel that we have increasingly an important democratic part to play in the disposition of this money. He knows of course — and there is no need to say more than this one sentence — what we feel about a single seat for the Parliament's institutions.

However, I believe that the greatest single challenge, the greatest political challenge, of this Presidency is going to be East-West relations, the whole problem of trade, energy, credits, technological transfers in the context of the political and military tension in the world and of Poland in particular. Before proceeding any further, may I say of the Communist resolution on Turkey, that any attempt to equate the problems of Turkey with those of Poland is utterly false, both as to the conditions before the military takeover in both countries and the threat to world peace. We shall reject such cynical sand-throwing. Mr President.

Fergusson

Poland is at the forefront of our minds, the most besetting crisis in the world today, piled on top of Afghanistan which for two years has occupied and affronted us. How the Community handles the challenge of Poland and the new situation which arose on 13 December will determine whether or not we have a common foreign policy, or are going to have one, or whether foreign policy will simply be a matter of the occasional coincidence of our views and interests and willingness to take action.

It would be hard to exaggerate our alarm that the rulers of eastern Europe have not understood that European peace itself is endangered by their careless disregard for individual freedom and the most elementary human and civic rights to which they pay lip service and did so once again when they subscribed to the Helsinki Agreement. If they do not understand that, then perhaps at a more mundane level they have accepted that the creditworthiness of all the Comecon countries has plunged, in many cases out of sight, because the Polish economy and its financial base have been allowed to collapse.

However, the point is that we are directly affected at every level here by Poland — the moral, the political, the economic and, indeed, the physical. We can continue to avoid any real action to avert the wider catastrophe that we fear by pleading ignorance or confusion about the particular one — ignorance deliberately engendered and contrived by the suppression of all freedom within Poland. We can continue to procrastinate because of the vague promises of liberalization which are fed to us and we may, some of us, actually believe in the pious hope that General Jaruzelski will turn out to be a Tito who will bring about at least a degree of independence for his country.

Now I have put this particular point about the possible Tito-like appearance of the general in charge of Poland to a member of Solidarity who is chairman of one of the Solidarity shop stewards committees of the tractor factory in Warsaw. He was more inclined to compare the general to Pol Pot than to Tito and remarked that it was Jaruzelski who took action against Ursus in 1976, gave the order to shoot in Gdansk in 1970 and led the Polish army in Czechoslovakia in 1968. The plea is made that while in name a Polish general is the oppressor it is best to hold back. Mr President, there has practically never been a time in history when Russia has not directly or indirectly tried to coerce Poland. The episode is like a re-run of the episode in the late 18th century when the great Polish hero Kosciuszko took action against the Russians, sometimes against the Russian military, sometimes against a puppet. Poland tasted disaster then, too. It was that incident that the poet Campbell referred to when he wrote 'Hope for a season bade the world farewell and freedom as shrieked as Kosciuszko fell'.

But the man we have now is very far from being a hero, very far from being a Tito. And even if he were, we assert firmly that without Soviet pressure and direction, Poland's difficulties would now be resolving themselves more successfully, more democratically and more humanely.

The time for indignation and posturing and gesturing must have come to an end. There are two obvious areas where we should now make moves with a view to restoring Poland's progress towards such a state as represents the true will of her people. One, how to support Solidarity and put useful pressure on the military authorities to release those interned and to let renewal begin again. Two, the measures to make sure that the cost of running Russia's oppressive empire is borne by the tyranny in Moscow, not by the West. I hope that, with Mr Hänsch, our Political Affairs Committee next week will be dealing urgently with the detail of these matters and the possibilities of emulating the efforts of our allies here.

We must now use the economic power that Mr Tindemans spoke of and which our political unification brings to us. For the present may I ask him two questions he can answer later about the food aid going east from the Community. Learning, from the Solidarity members, the extent to which the Polish authorities are deploying food as a means of dividing the people against one another and of putting pressure on those who will not comply, can he, and will he, assure us that all food aid, paid for or on credit or given free of charge, will be distributed solely under supervision of the churches in Poland or similar independent bodies — that is what Solidarity asks for — and would he help to encourage *ex gratia* payments by the Commission for *bona fide* private efforts to get humanitarian aid — food aid — through for distribution through the churches?

We admire the unity and firmness of the stand so far taken by the Member States in general. The shriek of freedom to which I referred has been heard. May I ask, then, when are we going to do something real about it.

(Applause from the European Democratic Group)

President. — I call the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Galluzzi. — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Italian Members of the Communist and Allies Group listened carefully to the speech by Mr Tindemans and we have also read his action programme. It was with the particular interest that we noted what he had to say about the efforts the Belgian Presidency intends to make over the next six months for the revival of the Community. It is a revival which Mr Tindemans, drawing inspiration from Mr Colombo and Mr Genscher, views as the dual task of

Galluzzi

promoting political cooperation and initiating a policy of reforms and economic restructuring.

As I said, we were interested in what he had to say because we are utterly convinced of the need for this revival of the Community. It is not only from the crisis affecting détente and the deteriorating climate of international relations that this need stems but also from the Community's own internal crisis, a crisis which — as Mr Dankert pointed out yesterday — no country can cope with on its own and which needs a constructive effort by everyone if we are going to find a common strategy to deal with it.

Words are not enough, however, to revive the European Community. What we need is a plan, an overall strategy, and above all we need the courage to take decisions and to take decisions on our own, since they are the only kind of decisions which can give Europe the identity and the prestige it needs if it is going to become a credible partner.

The point is that there was no hint of this overall strategy in Mr Tindemans' speech. What we heard yet again was instead a long series of pledges and promises which in any case we have already heard at the start of every presidency and which just come round every six months without anything being done about them. The fact of the matter, Mr Tindemans, is that your speech clearly revealed the basic contradiction which has hitherto paralysed the Community and which lies behind the difficulties and the shortcomings of the last few years. What I am talking about is the glaring contradiction between the increasing realization that Europe needs a policy of its own and the fear and trepidation about actually making it a reality. It is a contradiction which is most clearly seen, in spite of all the fine words about the development of political cooperation, in the actual foreign policy of the Community.

Mr Tindemans, I do not think there can be any denying that nowadays, as far as the Ten are concerned, our assessment of the international situation and of how to cope with it is quite different from the view of the USA. It is quite clear that Europe rejects the Americans' determination to consider everything that happens in the world in terms of the East-West struggle and to put the solution of all the world's problems in second place behind the face-off between America and the Soviet Union. It is quite clear that on the European side there is an attempt to view problems as they are, instead of using the power bloc mentality to get a distorted picture, so that we can identify the real causes and find the most suitable and realistic solutions. When the time comes to move from this general approach to definite political decisions, that is when the fear and trepidation of adopting a stance of our own become apparent again, and all our ambitions dissolve in a cloud of good intentions.

Take the Middle East, which Mr Tindemans mentioned. As he said, it represents a vital problem for

world peace and for the progress of Europe. It is now a year and a half since the famous Venice declaration and in the meantime Israel has declared that the Jerusalem question is closed — to its advantage, of course. It has continued and refined the policy of settlements in the occupied territories and in a shock move it annexed the Golan Heights. The only response from the Council of Ministers was vague reiteration of the principles in that declaration of a year and a half ago, just to avoid giving the impression — and this was in your action programme, Mr Tindemans — that we had weakened or given up. There was no word of condemnation for Israel's strong-arm tactics, even though the Venice declaration said they would be condemned, and vigorously so.

Mr Tindemans told us that he intended to get talks going again in the next six months in the hope of finding a peaceful settlement, and he thus confirmed that what was done in the wake of the Venice Summit did no good at all and that the criticisms of the limitations of the Camp David agreement and the assertion that the Palestinians have to be associated with the peace negotiations — and these were the key elements in the Venice declaration — belong to the past and have little or no value now. The same goes for the problem of Turkey, on which our group has tabled a motion for a resolution which I trust will get the support of the House. On this matter, too, Mr Tindemans still tells us that he is expecting the Turkish leaders to give him an undertaking that democracy will be re-established. He expects to get this undertaking in spite of the trials which are still going on — the most recent one involved those trade unionists — and in spite of all the arrests and torture. Even though a delegation from the Council of Europe came back from Turkey and called for relations to be broken off — yes, broken off — between Europe and the dictators in Ankara, the Council was unable to suspend even as a temporary measure the financial protocols with that country.

And then there are the dramatic events in Poland. The President of the Council reiterated his indignation and repeated the criticism and condemnation of the domestic and foreign pressure which led to these dramatic events — and his criticism and condemnation have been formally echoed by the entire Parliament — but he forgot to tell us what every European government has said and is saying, namely, that while the events in Poland need to be condemned in the strongest terms they also require an effort to find a positive solution so that the Poles do not have to put up with hunger and isolation as well as with repression. What the events there really require is a determined effort to relaunch détente and peaceful negotiation, which is the only way we can hope for a genuine process of renewal in Poland.

Members will recall how the Italian Communists, in the person of our General Secretary, Mr Berlinguer, were among the most vigorous in condemning the

Galluzzi

events in Poland and we intend to follow a line for a positive settlement of the Polish deadlock. We hope that all the groups in this Parliament will want to take the same line, without trying to get political mileage out of the situation.

I think the same thing can be said about the Community's internal problems, Mr Tindemans, since we have got bogged down in summits that never get anywhere, in negotiations where nothing is negotiated and in compromises that are no compromise for anyone. The result is that Europe, which seemed to be making twin-speed progress, now gives the impression of having run out of petrol. I am not referring to the obvious inability — in spite of Mr Thorn's noble efforts — to cope with the problems of restructuring the budget and tackling the common policies and the surpluses. These are difficult problems but they are not the end of the world and in any case Parliament will need to be involved and to be asked for help with them. What I am referring to are the much more serious problems which the President of this House also mentioned yesterday. I mean the mass unemployment we now have, the internal imbalances which are becoming extreme, and the slow death of entire regions and entire sectors of production. There is no way these problems can be tackled without a plan, a scheme for a new approach, which involves everyone concerned, starting with the workers and their representatives. There is no way they can be tackled, Mr Tindemans, without taking a firm stand in the trade war which is being waged against us by other Western nations, especially the United States, and not only in key sectors such as steel, textiles and energy but on the financial and monetary front as well, with the high interest rates and the pressure of the dollar on the currency markets. These are the crucial issues which have to be tackled as of now, Mr Tindemans, if we really want to get through this crisis and stimulate the recovery of the Community. They are problems which require clear ideas, political determination and bold decisions. This is the only way we are going to get round the wall of nationalist and protectionist resistance and bureaucratic inertia and provide Europe's healthy elements with the necessary impetus to push forward.

What we need, ladies and gentlemen, is a joint effort, and we need a different relationship among the various institutions of the Community so that this effort can be encouraged and maintained. We were delighted to hear Mr Tindemans' comments on the need for a different relationship between the Council and Parliament. But the point is, Mr Tindemans: what do your comments actually mean? We should like to believe they indicate that the Council's response to the budget controversy will be to accept Parliament's legitimate position. This is the crux of the matter. This is where we see whether there is a real willingness to follow a different path and to take a fresh approach. Of course, we realize we have our own part to play and we must accept our responsibility boldly. And

while we are aware of the legal and institutional frontiers that are still to be crossed, we must also be aware of the tremendous potential we have for helping with the construction of Europe.

In his speech yesterday Mr Dankert said something which we endorse wholeheartedly, namely, that the legitimacy of a parliament is not an established fact unless it is political. In other words, the role and the power of this European Parliament of ours cannot depend solely on the fact that it has been elected by the will of the people. We need to be able to interpret this will and make it count for something, and so we have to produce policies and offer real solutions to the real problems of Europe and its citizens.

To our mind, the effort we have to make is not simply to claim a piece of the institutional action and to carve it out for ourselves but to work out a strategy which, for all the national and political differences which distinguish us, can foster on a number of vital points a fair consensus among all who are interested in the progress of Europe. We know that the parties of the Left cannot do this on their own. What we need is the commitment and joint effort of a broader spectrum of this Parliament. We are convinced that the conditions exist and we shall do all we can to ensure that this line is followed.

President. — I call the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr De Gucht. — (NL) Mr President, my European sentiments notwithstanding, it is nice to be able to welcome a compatriot as president of a Community institution. A highly experienced European may logically be expected to use his six months in office to bring any outstanding fundamental problems to a fair conclusion. We have no doubt that you will pursue your task with tenacity, personal commitment and a nice sense of diplomacy. The question is whether that will be enough. Are you and your predecessors not in fact ignoring a number of fundamental premisses?

Mr Tindemans, you and your predecessors have solemnly stated here that your intention is to strengthen the role of Parliament within the terms of the existing Treaties, with concertation the watchword. In other words, we must respect the Treaties — a perfectly normal state of affairs. However, no President-in-Office of the Council has ever come here and said that the Council too should and would respect the Treaties. It would seem then that what is perfectly normal for a directly elected body — the European Parliament — is not normal for the Council. There can be no future for this Community until there is general respect for a coherent institutional system incorporating the Treaty of Rome. The institutional element is a *sine qua non* without which it is impossible to plan, decide on and implement any policy whatsoever.

De Gucht

There are three comments that I should like to make in a purely personal capacity. In your accompanying memorandum, you say that the opinion of the European Parliament will have to be taken into account at the technical level too. What you should in fact have said is that the Council and the Commission ought to be playing less of a technocratic role and devoting more attention to political priorities. Secondly, I have always been suspicious of your institutional report, now known as the Tindemans Report, which had little to offer to the European Parliament, and your views have apparently not changed in the meantime. Thirdly, I find it a matter for regret that your comments on the European Parliament were characterized more by frustration than by hope.

Let me stress once again that the institutional element is a *sine qua non* for the implementation of any policy.

The people of Europe rightly expect the Community to play a part in helping to overcome the economic crisis. It is a fact that, without the Community — with all its defects — the crisis would have been still graver. It is a fact that there can be no return to purely national economic policies. However, it is also a fact that political institutions which forfeit the confidence of the people are doomed to oblivion, whether or not they believe themselves to be acting according to a sense of rigorous logic. The Community must tackle the crisis and must take decisions. We share your view that economic and monetary union is essential before Europe can enter a new phase of development. Some Member States are clearly not prepared to associate themselves definitively with the EMS. They are wrong, and we are counting on you to convince them of that.

In global terms, we can only reach agreement with the dollar and yen zones if we first of all put our own house in order. We must show again and again, Mr President, that certain forms of policy can be pursued at European level at lower cost and to the benefit of all of us — for instance, our policy on applied scientific research, on which the Commission recently published a memorandum which must have taken even the most hardboiled cynics by surprise. Our clarion call is that Europe's very future depends on more integration. I am thinking here particularly of my own generation and the spectre of unemployment among young people. Why are we doing nothing? Are we too blind to see? You remind me of the builder of the *Titanic*, who, unable to believe that anything could possibly have happened to his brainchild, went down with his ship and drowned.

(Applause from the Liberal and Democratic Group)

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

Mr Meo. — *(FR)* Mr President, Mr President of the Council, ladies and gentlemen, so here we are half-

way through our term of office, rather like someone aged about forty who might look back on his youth and say to himself 'what can I do with the time I have left?'

We lived through the youth of our Parliament with Mrs Simone Veil, and the tributes which have been paid to her show to what extent her success was also ours.

Yesterday our new President, who happens to be a brilliant man of about forty, made a speech, rich in content, on what remains for us to do in the lifetime of this Parliament. He spoke of world hunger, disarmament, unemployment, the need for balance in the powers and finances of the Community, and human rights in Poland, Turkey, El Salvador and the Soviet Union.

Similarly, I associate myself with the words of Mr Tindemans, President-in-Office of the Council. Yes, in the view of our group, he is right in wanting to relaunch European integration, in proposing a political cooperation committee, in not wishing to infringe the basic principles of the common agricultural policy, and we, and I myself in particular, would like to associate ourselves with the tributes paid to our Commission and its President.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am sure you will understand from what I have said and what I am about to say that, since it comes from a representative of the European Progressive Democrats Group, this tribute to Europe and to our Parliament is a tribute based on feeling and reason alike — a sincere tribute with no tendentious overtones.

But in the first half of the life of our Parliament, the speech made by Mr Willy Brandt in our first part-session two and a half years ago comes back to me forcefully — a great speech stressing how the European problem dominates all the other problems. He mentioned Europe cut in two, our brothers in the East — the division of our continent. He said: 'we must also devote some of our attention to improving cooperation with the neighbouring States and — however difficult this may be — to continuing the policy of détente between East and West in this part of the world...'

Today, echoing the speech made by Mr Willy Brandt two and a half years ago, I would like to tell you that as far as Europe is concerned no reduction of East-West tension is possible. No policy of détente is possible as long as freedom is crushed and gagged in Poland, as long as workers in revolt are machine-gunned as they were in Berlin in 1953, as long as a people aspiring to self-determination is crushed by tanks, as occurred in Budapest in 1956, as long as young people with a fervent belief in democracy immolate themselves by fire, as occurred in Prague after 1968, as long as trade unionists are imprisoned

Meo

and censorship and military dictatorship imposed, as long as freedom of conscience is violated, as is the case in Poland. No reduction of East-West tension, no rapprochement and no reunification between Eastern and Western Europe is possible except at the price of our freedom.

Yes, freedom is threatened. Last Monday Mrs Louise Weiss recalled the year 1981, marked particularly by the assassination attempts against the President of the United States and the Pope, and the assassination of President Sadat. May I add that in the last few months Americans representing the Atlantic Alliance in Europe have been attacked, kidnapped our assassinated, whether in Germany, Italy or last Monday in Paris. But it is not their freedom, it is our freedom which is threatened.

(Applause)

The European Progressive Democrats Group would like this idea henceforth to dominate all the discussions which will be held at European level between the Member States, the Commission, the Parliament and the people. This idea and a proper understanding of our interests should cause all egoism, however insular, to retreat. Of course there is the battle over herrings, the mutton war and the quarrels on the import of blouses from Hong Kong. Of course the interests at stake are not insignificant or negligible, but beyond them there is the essential point of the extraordinary solidarity of our peoples, who live on this small promontory of the Asian continent, and whose fate, political future and security are for geographical reasons inevitably identical. Yes, there is a shared European destiny.

Mr President, Mr President of the Council, ladies and gentlemen, at this time of election of a new president and commemoration of the start of our term of office, please excuse the seriousness of my remarks and this appeal addressed to all. But believe me when I tell you that before the end of our term of office we shall all be obliged to choose between neutralism and the defence of freedom.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MR DANKERT

President

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

Mr Vandemeulebroucke. — *(NL)* Mr President, Mr President-in-Office of the Council, I had hoped that Mr Tindemans would have shown rather more positive imagination and originality than deliver a mere list of moral judgements. Sadly, my hopes were disappointed. But what else can we expect, since the Belgian Presidency was taken over with absolutely no preparations. The only concrete points are the drafting of a Council agenda, the rejection of the unanimity idea and, lastly, the setting up of an *ad hoc* working party on political cooperation.

But what is the point of a Council agenda if the President-in-Office of the Council cannot even find the time on his own agenda to attend the election of the President of the European Parliament? What is the point of rejecting the unanimity rule in the Council Resolution when Council meetings are increasingly being turned into purely informal gatherings, and what is the point of setting up an *ad hoc* working party on political cooperation when the violation of human rights, even within the Community, cannot normally be included on the agenda? You seem proud, Mr President-in-Office, that you have already been invited by the United States and Japan to go there and speak on behalf of the Ten. But would you also accept an invitation to go and examine the situation in Northern Ireland? Are you willing to include the problems of Northern Ireland on the Council agenda? And lastly, what good can come of having a President-in-Office of the Council whose attitude towards El Salvador is glaringly obvious? What can we expect from him when we remember, for example, that he has said with regard to the problems in the Middle East that Uruguay could also send a peace-keeping force? Is it not abundantly clear that this is a manoeuvre designed to absolve the Uruguayan dictators of all guilt?

Mr President-in-Office, you mentioned a number of problems which Europe must solve if it is to become united. You discussed European monetary union, energy policy and unemployment; but we are all familiar with these.

A summary of these problems is not sufficient. There was no mention of the direction which you have chosen to take or of how you propose to tackle the energy problem. Are we going to continue to pin all our hopes on nuclear energy, with the protection of the shipping lanes by Europe, or are we going to devote more attention to alternative forms of energy? Nowhere was there a reply in connection with unemployment, now that the Commission has shown that a regional approach to unemployment would be certain to create a lot more jobs.

Your approach to the building of Europe is that problems should be dealt with exclusively at high level, and for that reason we feel that you are forgetting an important link, especially that of delegating authority to lower levels. Mr President-in-Office, at the end of

Vandemeulebroucke

your speech you said that six months would quickly pass; let us hope you are right!

President. — I call the non-attached Members.

Mr De Goede. — (NL) Mr President, I would like to extend my warmest congratulations to you on your election to the Presidency, and I am equally pleased to congratulate our former member Mr Tindemans, as President-in-Office of the Council.

Dankert, Tindemans and Thorn — three Europeans to the marrow and, as it happens, all from the Benelux countries, which could hardly be neater. But let us not raise our expectations too much. Harsh realities compel us to be realistic. I believe that in addition to their idealism Mr Tindemans and the two others do not lack realism, and in this connection I would like to say a few things to our new President-in-Office of the Council. Firstly, unemployment and the economic crisis. Europe must pull the world out of the doldrums. America took the lead in this after the Second World War but now seems unwilling to continue in this role. That is why Europe must take the initiative. These words were uttered by Professor Tinbergen, a prominent economist, Nobel Prize winner, an idealist, a realist and a Dutchman. I also subscribe to this belief. It should serve as a guide in a situation which for many people is very gloomy; there are, after all, ten million unemployed in the Community, and there is a steadily worsening economic trend throughout the world with the result that only statesmen, of courage and imagination are likely to be able to do anything about it.

In spite of the limitations imposed by the Council presidency, Mr Tindemans, we do expect something from you. You apparently said in an interview that your period in Parliament was not without frustrations — too little power, and so on. Well, now that you have been placed literally in the centre of power, we are entitled to expect — indeed, Parliament must demand from you — that this power is directed to the good of those whom we represent.

Secondly, the majority rule. As you yourself argued so forcefully in the report named after you in 1976, the presidency should not be encouraged to push the Treaty to its limits. No new agreements should be reached, and the Treaty should be simply observed. In a large number of cases this amounts to voting by majority. It is incomprehensible, for instance, that voting can be carried out in the Council with the agreement of all parties in matters concerning the budget or the salaries of personnel, while the unanimity rule is maintained for all other problems which, by virtue of their importance, are frequently not allowed to take second place to decisions such as those I have mentioned. The letter and spirit of the Treaties

must be respected once again, as our new President, Mr Dankert, rightly said yesterday!

Thirdly, I would like to ask for an assurance that Mrs Thatcher's appearance before the European Parliament after the London summit will be followed by the appearance in this House of Mr Martens.

Fourthly, European political cooperation. Mr President, EPC must be strengthened and intensified. I think we should examine what role the Commission can play in this, and I would point in this connection to the question of the EPC Secretariat. We must avoid creating an artificial distinction between economic and monetary cooperation on the basis of the Treaties and political cooperation in which the executive powers are pushed into the background. As I have already said, the distinction is artificial and is becoming more so as EPC is becoming intensified and we once again find the path to further economic integration.

Finally, I turn to Turkey and Spain. Mr President, we were pleased to welcome the economic sanctions against Turkey. In view of the massive death sentences passed on political opponents, we must apply pressure, and continue to apply pressure to get Turkey to restore its democracy. I also welcomed the reply to my oral question on the periodically endangered democracy of Spain. After all, we in the Community should jointly pledge our allegiance to the cause of freedom, democracy and justice as the cornerstones of our society.

President. — I call the Commission.

Mr Thorn, President of the Commission. — (FR) Mr President, let me say straightaway that I do not intend to comment today on the ambitious and thoroughly justified programme of the Belgian Presidency which Mr Tindemans has just presented to you. That is not the tradition. I merely wish to say to him before you all how reassuring and comforting it is for the President of the Commission to have Mr Leo Tindemans as President of the Council for this six-month period.

The programme speech of the President of the Commission is scheduled for your February part-session. That will therefore be an opportunity for me to hold an exchange of views in depth on the overall policy followed by the collegial body over which I have the honour to preside. However, Mr President, I cannot be completely silent on it, for that would be to belittle the dialogue for which you hoped in your opening speech and to fail to attach the importance which I should attach to your first speech as elected president of this Parliament.

I would like to use the time allotted to me to talk about two subjects: firstly, the Council's work on the

Thorn

30 May 1980 mandate, and secondly the situation in Poland.

In connection with the 30 May mandate, I should make a preliminary remark on the constitutional aspects of this exercise.

You have made an important speech with which the Commission very largely agrees. This is particularly true of what you said on the need for cooperation between Parliament and Commission. I think dialogue is important, and that it must be pursued on both sides and improved unceasingly. I would like to stress that for my part I am prepared, from today onwards and at any time, to cooperate on a more practical level. May I suggest to you, Mr President of the European Parliament, on the lines of the arrangements agreed with the President of the Council, that if you think it useful we might arrange a meeting between the Presidents once a month to discuss our difficulties and progress, for as experienced politicians you are all aware that one cannot always say everything publicly when matters are still developing. But I do not think one should keep secrets from the president of an institution such as yours, and I think one could then assess the main questions and see how best to bring about progress.

Cooperation between our two institutions can be fruitful only if we speak very frankly, Mr President, and if we avoid any misunderstanding from the start. I was pleased to note that a man with such a highly developed critical faculty as yourself, Mr President, is also critical of your own institution. At this point I willingly admit that the dialogue can be improved considerably on our side, but I think it can also be improved on your side. Thus, particularly with regard to the organization of the work, we could perhaps both make a gesture towards greater efficiency. It is in this spirit — and only in this spirit — that I would like to react to what was said yesterday on the informal meetings of the Council and the role of the Commission in the decision-making process. Mr President, you said that you wished, on behalf of Parliament, that the Commission would distance itself at least as much, or show itself as independent of the Council as it shows itself independent of the Parliament. Well, on behalf of the Commission I promise you that, but I would also insist that you grant at least as much independence to the Commission in relation to Parliament as it will demand in relation to the Council.

(Applause)

Now, to avoid any misunderstanding as to the practice of informal Council meetings, the Commission's position is very clear, and I am grateful to you for giving me the opportunity to explain it. In principle we, and myself in particular, are opposed to meetings of this type because they carry a risk of weakening the institutional role both of the Commission and of Parliament. And I shall tell you here, before this assembled Parliament, that I have asked the Members of my

Commission to oppose such informal meetings whenever there is a risk that the decision-making power may be transferred from a Council to an informal meeting. Of course I am not talking of some meetings which are really useful, in which the participants want to speak freely about the problems in a very restricted circle in order to work out solutions.

Mr President, those are our views; even if they have not always been accepted by everyone, I am pleased that they are in complete harmony with those you expressed on behalf of Parliament. The decisions must be taken in the Council, according to the rules laid down for the Council, and nowhere else, and I know that Mr Tindemans shares my views on this.

With regard to the meetings of Ministers of Foreign Affairs held on 14 and 15 December and 14 and 15 January to discuss the 30 May mandate, the position is different and I think that we both owe it to ourselves to clarify certain points.

As it was these meetings were a continuation of the work of the last European Council held on 26 and 27 November. They were described as informal because it was desired to restrict the attendance. Indeed, what was the alternative, Mr President? To reject such an extension of the European Council would have been to take a great responsibility — that of postponing the next discussion of the question to the European Council in March. It would have meant losing two precious months, and this accorded neither with your wishes nor with your concern. At the same time, it would have meant not making full use of the atmosphere which had been created by two days of keen negotiations. It was necessary not to relax but to continue. To reject this would therefore have meant in practice postponing the matter to the Greek Kalends. And bearing in mind what was at stake, and the urgent need for agreement, such a postponement seemed irresponsible to us. That is why we accepted these meetings, which were described as informal. Why? It is an open secret. So that they would not fall into the category of run-of-the-mill meetings and so that they would thus be open neither to all the officials nor to all the ministers, so that those who took part in the European Council could continue the discussion. But the Commission secretariat was represented. Indeed, I have always made sure that I am never alone in these meetings and that I am accompanied by the first Vice-President, Mr Ortoli.

We took part in the continuation of the discussions, but all our contributions hitherto — I think it is this which worries Parliament — remain within the framework of the various communications which we have sent to Parliament and which have been debated by it either in plenary session or in the relevant committees. In other words, it is within this framework that all the proposals made by me and by Mr Tindemans have been worked out. There has been no departure from that framework. This also applies to the guidelines

Thorn

which I presented at the last meeting of Foreign Ministers.

It is true, as you stressed, that a personal mission was entrusted to me. To whom did you want it to be entrusted, if not to the person who represents the institution called upon to make proposals, and on whose proposals the negotiations are based? Would it not have been a serious matter if someone else had been asked to make proposals? That would have been a departure from the Treaties, if another institution had been asked to make proposals — a function specifically reserved for the Commission.

There is no need for me to tell you that there was a special reason at that time, namely that the Presidency was about to change, and that this also involved a change of incumbent at the Belgian Foreign Ministry. Who would have wished that the current Belgian President of the Council should not have been assisted at the European Council at that time? Once more, therefore, remaining faithful to the spirit of the earlier proposals by the Commission, I made my contribution and sought to prove, through the Commission as a whole, that I never really departed from them and that they were never personal proposals.

I wished to stress this fact, even in my covering letter to the Ministers. There are those who will be prepared to bear that out. Moreover, I am pleased that at the end of our last meeting at the Egmont Building the President of the Council and the President of the Commission were asked to try to draw up together a record of the measure of agreement or disagreement which had been reached at that stage. That has always been my approach to work in the framework of the Treaties, respecting the limits of my powers, and you may be assured, Mr President, that I shall never abandon that approach.

To sum up, it is clear that the institutional role of the Commission and that of Parliament were respected throughout. We will seek to ensure that it remains so.

As Mr Tindemans told you, the 14 and 15 January meeting on the mandate was adjourned until 25 January.

The mandate was originally conceived as a way of rising above permanent negotiations on large sums of money, and showing that our Community is something more than a Community of accountants. Our Commission refused from the start to look at the future of the Community solely from the budgetary angle, and this is in line with your wishes, Mr President. Today nearly everyone thinks that we were right not to interpret the mandate in purely financial terms. Everyone acknowledges, at any rate for the sake of argument, that our overall approach was good, indeed that it was the only viable and defensible approach.

And it is true that the revival of the Community must concern all the economic sectors of the Community on which we have made proposals, and others too. This should only be a beginning. We have based our action on three sections, the content of which has been gradually made more specific. What are the results to date? Significant progress has been made; Mr Tindemans did everything he could to 'prod' the Ministers and reach an agreement last time. Despite all our collective goodwill, we did not reach one. The results are therefore still not enough after five negotiations.

And I will tell you very frankly and very much in earnest that we cannot wait indefinitely, bearing in mind the economic and political context which you debated this very morning, bearing in mind the international environment and the practical deadlines confronting us. We must reach an agreement rapidly. The credibility of Europe is at stake, and I am very concerned about this, because we have very little time.

I now turn to the prospects for the 25 January meeting. I have forbidden myself to mention here the bitterness of the negotiations, the exhortations which both sides felt obliged to make, and believe me they did not pull any punches. Nor would I wish to mention the egocentric nature of some policy statements, the lack of political vision, foresight and solidarity, which, alas, I saw increasing from one meeting to the next, from the day when we handed the Commission report to the Heads of State or Government.

Despite my deep-seated concern, I do not wish to give way to pessimism. We still have an opportunity to bring this difficult negotiation to a successful conclusion. This opportunity will present itself on 25 January, when the Ministers of Foreign Affairs meet in this informal or restricted Council. For if we do not succeed on the 25th, we run the risk of mixing up the mandate questions with other questions, and of a permanent trade-off process which is in the interests of no-one.

This leads me to my last point, Mr President, which is a word of explanation on the date of the presentation of our agricultural prices proposal for the coming year.

On Monday the Commission decided to postpone to next week the final discussions on the package prepared by Mr Dalsager. He was the first to deplore this, for his package had already been prepared in December. The postponement is therefore certainly not his fault. It is the work on the mandate which has held it up. Questions are being asked about the proposals, but I have the impression that they are not all that unknown, from my reading of the press and some letters said to be more or less confidential. I know that some of you, ladies and gentlemen, have been concerned about them, but I must remind you, and

Thorn

remind Parliament as a whole, of our priorities and its own.

For us, the first priority is really to complete the work resulting from the mandate, for all the others depend on it. I say this with all the more conviction in that you, Mr President, defended the same viewpoint in your speech yesterday. We are convinced that if we do not manage to 'bring out' the mandate, so to speak, on 25 January, our policies will have hardly any future. Even the common agricultural policy runs the risk of paying the price for this, because of the combined pressures of opposing interests.

It is therefore clear that a hurried presentation of the price proposals would have interfered with the work on the mandate, particularly with regard to certain products. If you read today's press you will, as experienced politicians, reach the same conclusion. Such interference could therefore be dangerous also for the farmers, who risked being drawn into a much wider bargaining process and compromising the prospects for the negotiations. We did not wish to run this risk, and postponement by a single week seems to me an entirely acceptable price to pay — I felt I owed it to myself to stress this. Moreover, if we wish to act in a consistent fashion with regard to these deadlines, aware of the real prospects for the forthcoming agricultural negotiation, please note that the Ministers of Agriculture, when asked to consider the possibility of bringing forward the meeting, decided that there was no need to do so. In their eyes also, therefore, there seems to be no urgency or danger. On the contrary, they agree with us that it is necessary to prepare the discussion well and engage in it zealously. I am sure that they will do so with the same enthusiasm as ourselves, and that you too in the Parliament, Mr President, will do so with the same zeal which the Council of Ministers and the Commission share, so that the date of 1 April may be respected.

And I would point out at this point, as we have already done through our spokesman, that it is merely a matter of one week's postponement, for neither you nor we can wait any longer if nothing happens on 25 January. We shall then deal in any case with the agricultural prices. I hope we shall succeed in persuading the Ministers to conclude the mandate exercise on 25 January so that we may then, in the interests of the Community and of the farmers, also complete this task by the deadline of 1 April.

Allow me now to say in conclusion that, like you, Mr President, I hope to be able to make a final appeal to all the Ministers to do their best to ensure that our discussions on Monday have a truly European inspiration which they have not had hitherto — let us admit it — and to all those concerned to show as much political will and as much ability to take decisions — which was not always the case.

Finally, a word about the situation in Poland, as you desired.

The Commission can only share the feelings which inspire the tablers of your resolutions, and the concern of Parliament.

With regard to more precise facts — the sale of agricultural products to Poland — I would remind you that the Community has since December 1980 granted special prices 15% below the world price. The reductions granted on tranches I, II, III and IIIA have so far been borne by the budgets of the Community. The decisions on these sales were taken in the light of the situation prevailing at the time in Poland, to help the Polish Government, and especially the Polish people, to overcome these difficulties themselves. The Commission thinks that the basic reasons for these Community decisions no longer apply, in view of the changes which have taken place in Poland since 13 December 1981. Moreover, I must tell you here that it has become increasingly difficult to monitor the distribution of agricultural products bought directly by the Polish authorities. We have recent examples of this. In these circumstances, the Commission has just decided to withdraw formally its October 1981 proposal that another tranche of sales be made available to Poland on special terms — I repeat, sales on special terms. It is not a question of emergency aid or food aid, but of sales granted on special terms. We are withdrawing this offer, but I hasten to add that the Commission remains anxious to ensure that the food supply situation for the Polish people does not deteriorate further. It therefore wishes the sale of agricultural products on normal terms to continue.

Moreover, I would remind you of the projects for direct humanitarian aid to the Polish people undertaken by our Community in the last few months. It seems to me that the time has come to increase this direct humanitarian aid to the civil population, which is given through non-governmental organizations such as Caritas, the Red Cross and others. Indeed, this is the best way of making sure that humanitarian aid really reaches the people for whom it is intended and does not remain in, let us say, official hands. We therefore propose to devote a part of the budgetary savings resulting from the withdrawal of our proposal on tranche B to emergency aid sent through non-governmental organizations. Formal proposals to this end will be presented by the Commission in the context of the budgetary procedure, and you, the Members of Parliament, will therefore have the chance to give your views on them. As we have just taken this decision, I wanted to inform you of it today in this debate. In order to decide on the nature of the aid and to have the best possible guarantees of its final distribution, the Commission will resume direct contact with all the non-governmental organizations concerned.

Thorn

Finally, with regard to the other economic and political implications of the new situation in Poland, the Commission is taking a very active part in the study of various possible courses of action within the framework of its powers, and the Council will be informed of these questions at next Tuesday's meeting.

(Applause)

President. — I sometimes regret that the President of Parliament is not allowed, as such, to speak in the debate.

I am only too pleased to accept your invitation to meet you once a month.

I call Mr Van Miert.

Mr Van Miert. — (NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in the short time available I shall just make three observations on Mr Tindemans' speech. To begin with, forgetting all political and party differences, I would like to wish the Belgian presidency much success, for its term of office comes in a very difficult period for the Community; it is a crucial period as far as all its internal difficulties are concerned, but also a crucial period from the point of view of political cooperation in East-West relations, etc. It is an advantage that the Council's activities are directed by someone who is a thoroughly committed European and is well versed in European affairs.

We are aware, Mr President-in-Office, that you have to confine yourself today to pious wishes. You have just begun your presidency and as President-in-Office you are only the first among equals, taking no decisions but simply playing the part of someone who has to try to arrive at compromises and get ten partners to agree — and their agreements, sadly, are all too often the weakest possible form of compromise.

However, I would like to join some of those who have expressed rather critical view, because in the coming months we shall need concrete achievements not just pious wishes. In this connection I would like to say one or two words on the Community's internal problems. It is all very well for us to talk about Europe's role in the world with regard to present world conflicts, but if we do not try to achieve greater internal cohesion and solve some of our own problems, we shall have no credibility when discussing solutions to difficult situations with others.

The elections to our own Parliament will be upon us before too long. Mr President, I don't know whether you will be standing for re-election, but I intend to do so, and so I am wondering what I shall have to tell the voters in order to convince them that this Parliament has a purpose, and that Europe also has a purpose. When young people ask me today what Europe is

doing for unemployment, I am afraid I have to admit that it is not doing a great deal, and that nothing much is being done towards creating an '*espace social*', what Minister Eyskens has called a joint investment policy, or the consistent safeguarding of Europe's own interests. I believe that this is the crux of the problem and that it will have to be dealt with consistently in the months to come. For how can we awaken hope — as you remarked, Mr President — if unemployment goes on increasing and if problems continue to accumulate? We may even make fools of ourselves if we go on talking about hope. We must achieve results, and I think you should give top priority to strengthening the Community internally by launching bold initiatives, as was done in the early days of the Community and in other crisis periods when hope was running low.

There is a second point which I would like to mention briefly, because it has not been discussed very much today. I hope, ladies and gentlemen, that we shall not need to shed any crocodile tears over the next few months because countries like Spain have been kept waiting too long and situations consequently arise which we as democrats find undesirable. But we know only too well that such situations can arise, and I recall that whenever this has occurred — even in the Community — the view has been expressed that these are internal affairs which we should not interfere with.

The Community has a duty to allow countries which have been waiting at its door for five years to enter it within a reasonable period. I hope that the Belgian presidency will be able to achieve a breakthrough in negotiations with Spain and Portugal.

Finally, a few words on Poland. I share the indignation of those who have spoken their minds on the events in Poland. I also share the views of those who feel that we cannot remain as onlookers but must do something. But I do not share the views of those who, while expressing their indignation at the events in Poland, ignore similar situations elsewhere. We can reasonably compare the military regimes in the West with those in the East, whatever their political colouring. But we cannot say that there are good and bad dead men — there are just dead men; and there are no good and bad political prisoners — there are only political prisoners.

No-one is a good trade unionist just because he is a Pole, and no-one is bad just because he has been condemned to death. In Turkey dozens of trade unionists have been sentenced to death or to life imprisonment. As a democratic Parliament we can only maintain our credibility if we adopt the same position towards such events, whether they occur in Poland, Afghanistan, Chile, El Salvador or in Argentina, where thousands of people are disappearing. We must have the courage to adopt a consistent approach to such situations. Only then will we retain our credibility. Otherwise, we shall make fools of ourselves.

Van Miert

My dear friends, let us see to it that we do not give the Polish people the impression that they are being cut off. We must be uncompromising in condemning what has happened. We must apply pressure to open up a way to restore democracy in that country, but we must not allow our attitudes to further the isolation of the Polish people. For this reason I would have welcomed a decision today by Parliament to send a delegation to Poland. After all, we sent a delegation to Cambodia, and I really do not see why we should delay any further in deciding to send a delegation from this House to Poland to hold talks on the spot with all the persons and authorities which the delegation wishes to contact and to propose the necessary measures to Parliament.

Mr President, I shall conclude by wishing the presidency success once again. Six months will pass quickly, perhaps too quickly for anything to be achieved, but I hope that with Parliament's help you will be able, over the six months, to carry out most of what you have set out to achieve.

President. — I call Mr Penders.

Mr Penders. — (NL) Mr President, naturally as a northerner I would like to extend a warm welcome to the new President-in-Office of the Council and to Mr De Keersmaecker, and right away I also cordially welcome two fellow party members. Yesterday, Mr President-in-Office, you said that you were well aware that you were not elected unanimously and that this is a normal part of the democratic process. You have a political function as President-in-Office of the Council, and I am convinced that Mr Tindemans and Mr De Keersmaecker will perform their tasks for the Community admirably. I think it is excellent from the political standpoint that the European Parliament, in the person of the President-in-Office of the Council, may welcome the chairman of a major European political group, namely the European People's Party.

The Belgians live in a small country, and I think this is an advantage from the Community standpoint. The plans of medium-sized powers are very often soon influenced by other governments and they tend to create rivalry rather than eliminate it.

The small countries are less likely to be suspected of wanting to extend their influence in Europe. After Belgium, it will be Denmark's turn; the whole of 1982 will therefore be taken care of by small countries. One question: when is the next World Summit, the one involving the seven leading economic powers, going to be held? Shouldn't we try to break the tradition whereby world summits are only held when the Council presidency is occupied by the so-called major European countries?

I mentioned the Community standpoint. To be quite honest, Mr President, I am a typical EPC man, and I

mostly deal with that sort of thing, but if there is one thing I have become convinced of over the past two and a half years it is that political cooperation derives its authority and influence in the world purely from the existence of the European Economic Community, the Common Market. No market means no power, no power means no influence and no influence means no policy. I address these remarks primarily to our British colleagues. There are a large number — and I am sure they all mean well — who get enthusiastic when they talk about European political cooperation, while they feel nothing but scepticism for the Community. But I repeat, without the market EPC is nothing. I am dwelling on this point, Mr President, because decisions have been taken at EPC level in connection with the Community's enlargement to include Spain and Portugal. The Director-General for Political Affairs receives members from Madrid and Portugal as observers, and special Council meetings are held with Spain and Portugal. I welcome this but I have certain questions to ask.

Have Spain and Portugal accepted the 'acquis' policy? If they have not yet done so but only need to accept it when completing negotiations, the policy will not be weakened.

In all honesty we have a definite problem with Greece. They have been unwilling to raise their diplomatic relations with Israel to Ambassador level and relations between Spain and Israel are also cool. How can that be? What can we expect in the future? I fear that this new EPC variant is intended to appease Spain and Portugal while the main aim of full membership is unattainable. Is EPC to act as a substitute for the EEC? That would be highly dangerous, for EPC and EEC are inseparable.

I have only one comment concerning Poland, as I understand, Mr President, that we shall be discussing Poland in detail in the Political Affairs Committee. I must put right a mistake on behalf of my Group and apologize to the other groups for this. We had tabled a motion for a resolution which has still not yet been withdrawn, but I shall do so in this case. The draft resolution by Mr Klepsch has been withdrawn. Things are bad in Poland, and the EEC is now faced with the question of what to do about the excellent declarations of 4 January. I found it an excellent declaration and I extend my warmest thanks to the President-in-Office of the Council. A number of possible measures — mainly economic — have been drawn up in case the situation does not improve. The situation is not improving. Maybe it is not getting worse either, but it is not improving. What does that mean? Is there a timetable? Do we have a timetable for the measures? Has any definite sequence been agreed upon?

Finally, Turkey, Mr President, I know that we should never generalize but always analyse and appreciate differences but never minimize the importance of any situation. Turkey is different from Poland, I agree.

Penders

There was terrorism in Turkey, I agree. The Turkish generals have in the past been willing to restore democracy, I agree. But we cannot call for solidarity for day in day out week after week and then just say that the situation in Turkey is very complex. It is very simple, Mr President, human rights are the rights of human beings, and there is only one kind of human being.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Moorhouse.

Mr Moorhouse. — Mr President, a motion for a resolution to declare a day of solidarity with the Polish people on 30 January 1982 was tabled in the registry at the beginning of this week under Rule 49, in my name and in the names of Mr Tyrrell and Mr Fergusson. Now this is a private initiative and I am happy to report that with the active assistance of individual Members throughout the House it has been signed by no fewer than 218 Members as of now.

And so, Sir, we have reached the magic number needed to secure automatic adoption and I would like to thank all those Members who have signed the resolution and express the hope that many more will still do so and I look forward, Sir, to your official announcement, hopefully, later in the day.

Now this motion goes hand in hand with another motion tabled by my honourable friend and colleague, Mr Beyer de Ryke, who called on our Parliament to display the national colours of Poland in our buildings.

Both proposals, if adopted — and indeed one is on the point of being adopted — while no more than symbolic, will I believe be of great significance to the Polish people in their hour of need.

Our solidarity resolution reiterates its condemnation of the state of war declared in Poland. The ensuing denial of fundamental human rights in Poland and the consequent suffering of the Polish people was condemned by this House on 18 December 1981, in the urgent resolution on the situation in Poland. And also we reaffirm our deepest concern about the continuing repressive measures being taken in Poland, continuing evidence of which I have received, Sir, from Amnesty International — and I hold the papers here from Amnesty International — in the past few days. They, I fear, confirm all that we are saying in the resolution. They give evidence of Solidarity members arrested, tried and convicted under a summary procedure following the imposition of martial law in Poland. Under this new totalitarian law those arrested face trial — in some cases indeed they have been tried, — under three separate procedural arrangements known as: summary, simplified or accelerated procedures.

If I single out merely 'summary procedure', the accused may be tried in civilian or military courts and can face a prison sentence of 3 to 25 years for offences that previously carried a maximum sentence of eight years. Mr President, imprisonment may now be punished by the death penalty and the accused has no right of appeal! I repeat: the accused has no right of appeal! That, I think, is sufficient evidence in itself to warrant the wording of the Solidarity Day Resolution expressing our continuing and deep concern about the situation in Poland.

Now the date proposed — 30 January 1982 — merely nine days ahead, was put to us by Solidarity members in Brussels. So we are meeting the wishes and respecting the wishes of the Polish representatives themselves in Western Europe. When this resolution is officially adopted, Sir, we will, with the greatest respect, instruct you not only to forward it to the governments of the ten Member States of the Community, but to the Presidents and the Speakers of the ten national parliaments inviting them also to join our Parliament in naming the day of Community-wide support — 30 January. Through the parliaments we appeal and ask the peoples of their individual countries to acknowledge this day.

Let me also mention in conclusion that I have heard this morning, in the past two or three hours, that Chancellor Schmidt, Prime Minister Thatcher, leaders of opinion in Belgium, Italy and Luxembourg and the President of the United States of America have agreed to make statements on Solidarity Day so that this will give the Polish people further moral support.

Finally, in conclusion, we have, Sir, on this side of the House taken careful note of the sentiment expressed by our honourable colleague, Mr Van Miert. It is certainly not, if I may say, through you, Sir, to Mr Van Miert, our intention in any sense to turn a blind eye to events in other countries. But we do believe that the situation in Poland is central to our whole position in Western Europe because it concerns not only Poland but our policy towards the Soviet Union. Indeed our very survival may be at stake. Those are the stakes at issue. So we make no apology for singling out Poland.

And may I say in the words, Sir, of the Polish writer, Jan Pietrzak, 'Let Poland be Poland'. That is the song of the Solidarity Union.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Antoniozzi

Mr Antoniozzi. — *(IT)* Mr President, the Presidency of the Council for the six months which have just begun is certainly of special interest at this time, not only because of the many serious problems confronting us but also because of the significance of

Antoniozzi

having as President of the Council that great European, Mr Tindemans, whose convictions are not merely theoretical but consistent and practically orientated, and who has made a significant contribution to the movement towards political union.

Mr Tindemans will no doubt remember that he is President of the Council rather than the representative of one of the worthy Member States, and his speech could be summed up in four categories of initiative: to resume progress with greater conviction so as to reinvigorate the economic and social side of Europe — a fundamental precondition for political revival; to strengthen the institutions so as better to interpret the current desire for unity and to put into effect the proposals for revision of the Treaties with a view to making them more appropriate to the future needs of political union; to contribute, not least through political cooperation, to a more incisive and unified image and presence of Europe on the world scene as a force for balance, progress, justice and peace; finally, to integrate more fully the moral and material interests, culture, spirit, civilization and tradition of the European peoples, widening their sphere of activity and strengthening their will for unity, and not merely in legal and formal terms.

Other Members of Parliament have spoken about the economic and social aspects and have useful suggestions, among which I would like to emphasize the urgent need to increase aid, in more practical and committed ways, to the scientific and technological research sector, which is the basis for the success of our products in the current competition among countries possessing raw materials and technology — competition which will become increasingly difficult and decisive in the next few years.

In the context of economic and social progress, it is undoubtedly very important to develop a more fruitful, coherent and effective will to strengthen the internal market and improve industrial policy, the European investment area, the Community policy on the granting and contracting of loans, the energy situation, the monetary system, medium-term economic policy, the agricultural, fisheries and transport sectors, regional policy, the Social Fund, social policy and other basic sectors.

Institutional questions and the question of progress towards political union must be given special attention in this period. In 1981 Parliament approved many institutional resolutions, one of which was proposed by me and concerned relations between Parliament and the European Council and interinstitutional relations, with a series of valid proposals for the stage of political development towards unity. The Colombo-Genscher proposal is undoubtedly an important act, and Parliament, the Council and the Commission must forcefully implement the content and take account of the undoubtedly useful aims of that proposal.

Mr Tindemans has recalled the basic procedural need to go beyond the 'unanimity' system of voting. The announcement of the creation of an *ad hoc* working group is certainly important. However, we hope that the result achieved by this working group will not end up in the archives, for the use mainly of universities and researchers, as did the Tindemans Report, the Vedel Report, the report of the Three Wise Men and various resolutions adopted by the Political Affairs Committee and by Parliament itself. Mr Dankert, whom I congratulate on his election, gave valuable and practical indications in this sense in his inaugural speech, Mr Thorn spoke of it with conviction, and Mr Tindemans concluded by referring to more real and rapid European integration. The presidents of the three institutions therefore seem to want to make practical progress on budgetary problems, political cooperation, strengthening of the Community presence in the world and above all in the developing countries, and contact with the other peoples of the world.

It is necessary to encourage peace, security and political negotiation on world problems, as well as to discourage terrorism. The assassinations of Mr Moro and Mr Sadat, the attempts on the lives of the Pope and Mr Reagan, and the very recent threats to kill Italian Christian Democrat leaders, events in Poland and other situations created by dictatorships — whether of the right, of the left or of other political persuasions — constitute attempts at internal and international subversion which must be combatted, making it clear that violence does not pay and that political dialogue in democracy, peace and security must form part of the initiatives of a united Europe, which must always defend human rights. Many swore in Helsinki to uphold these rights, although in practice they did not always draw sincere and honest conclusions from this stance.

The term of a President of the Council is too short — six months — to achieve practical results, even if he says in good faith that he wants to achieve them. In the last few days we discussed this problem with a number of colleagues, including Mr Zagari. I would like to propose making the outgoing President jointly responsible in a sort of committee of the Presidency of the Council, so as to have a type of office jointly responsible for initiatives, policies and commitments over a longer period. Otherwise we shall end up by moving from one speech to another without achieving much, however much goodwill there may be.

I would like to remind all Members that we represent about 300 million citizens who expect, from a Parliament elected by direct universal suffrage, valid and effective initiatives to make progress in supplementing and enriching forms of integration and to lay the effective basis for European union.

So enough of studies and theoretical proposals. Through their vote, the citizens carry out a concrete

Antoniozzi

political act addressed through us to the institutions. We must be aware of this if we do not wish to betray their trust. I would therefore urge Mr Tindemans to make progress on the road to European political union.

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

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

Vice-President

2. Agenda

President. — The vote on the membership of committees will take place before six o'clock, as soon as the Bureau has submitted its proposals, so that the committees can meet as soon as possible.

I call Mr Collins.

Mr Collins. — Mr President, anticipating for the moment some of the results of the votes to be taken later today on membership of committees, I should like to raise with you a point concerning an item at the end of the agenda — the report by Mrs Maij-Weggen on seals. I have had a discussion with the rapporteur on this. I should like to say that, as chairman of the committee, while this was being discussed, I have every confidence in the rapporteur. But we have had, in the last two or three days, an enormous amount of evidence on one side and on the other. Much of it is fresh and both of us think that we need to assess what we have received. We would like, therefore, Mr President, if Parliament agrees, to postpone discussion of this item until the February part-session. In that case, would the House also agree to the setting of a new deadline for amendments to take account of possible changes in our view? It is quite possible that changes will not occur, but to be responsible about it we would like to make sure that we are giving absolutely firm and good advice to the House. So I would be very grateful, Mr President, if under Rule 85 you would request the House to take this off the agenda.

President. — I call Mrs Maij-Weggen.

Mrs Maij-Weggen. — *(NL)* Mr President, I wholeheartedly endorse the request by the chairman of the Committee on the Environment. The hunting which is

the subject of the report begins in a few weeks. At the moment a great deal of information is coming in and I think it would be a good idea, if the report is to have some significance, if we looked at the latest information and incorporated it in the report. The Council of Ministers will then be able to consider our opinion on the basis of information which is as up-to-date as possible. I do urge Parliament to support this request.

President. — It is proposed that the Maij-Weggen report (Doc. 1-738/81) be deferred until the February part-session.

I call Mr Sherlock.

Mr Sherlock. — Mr President, it would be my pleasure in the interests of scientific truth to support the two proposals that have already been made for deferment.

(Parliament agreed to the request)

3. Joint debate (continuation)

President. — The next item is the continuation of the joint debate on the statement by the President-in-Office of the Council and the motions for resolutions on Poland and Turkey.

Mrs Macciocchi has withdrawn her motion for a resolution on Poland.

I call Mr Israel.

Mr Israël. — *(FR)* Mr Tindemans, I, in my turn and on behalf of my Group extend my very best wishes for your success in the crucial task which lies before you. Knowing that you are President of the Council raises a great many hopes. We feel this way because, not only have you shared our fate in this Chamber, but you have also, on some occasions, shared our feelings and criticisms with regard to the Council. We therefore take comfort from the thought that these feelings and criticisms will have more meaning for you than they have had for some of your predecessors.

I should like to address you, above all, Mr President, in your capacity as a leader in political cooperation. Your predecessor knew how to open up new paths and explore new possibilities and we should like you to follow his lead. We must not allow the idea of a permanent structure to be forgotten. We must pursue our efforts to strengthen political cooperation by putting foreign policy initiatives on a firmer footing. I am sure that I am not exaggerating, Mr Tindemans, when I say that we have every confidence in you.

Israël

I should like to go into greater detail, if you do not mind, particularly with regard to the dramatic events in Poland. Firstly, I must confess to a slight feeling of disappointment on a question of wording. Both you and the communiqué issued by the Council of Ministers have spoken of a totalitarian system. Many of us in this House, share the opinion that it is not just a totalitarian system which is oppressing Poland but also — and this must be acknowledged — a Communist system, and we would have been happier to have heard you say so. There is yet another reason for us to be disappointed. You have told us that there is a need to use the medium of international institutions to make Europe's voice heard. But we believe that Europe does not need the United Nations Organization to make its voice heard and that it is important enough — especially with a Belgian President — to make its views known directly. This is particularly true where the Polish question is concerned, as it is a tragedy for the entire European Community, since what is at stake is not only the safeguarding of peace in the world but also the salvation of a people who run the risk of starving to death under an oppressive regime. We therefore expect you to guarantee that food aid will be continued and I would even go so far as to say — and here I may be divulging a secret hope — that it will be continued whatever happens. We must of course lay down certain conditions, and we attach very great significance to the role which could be played by the Polish Church and even that of the joint committee of the Church and Government, but whatever happens, it is quite inconceivable that a population could be allowed to starve to death just because the regime in charge of it is regarded as corrupt.

We are also hoping for an initiative on Afghanistan from you, Mr President. Let us not forget that we are confronted by the greatest challenge to justice that we have seen in our time, because the USSR broke out of its boundaries — those fixed at Yalta — in order to invade Afghanistan and people are beginning to think, after two years of occupation, that nothing more can be done about it! It is up to you, Mr President, to show that there is a great deal that we can do in Afghanistan. In particular, you should try to take up the idea of a conference, with which the Afghan Resistance Movement would be associated, an idea originally launched by your predecessor. It is my intention, in my capacity as rapporteur on Afghanistan, to ask you, Mr President, to recognize the Afghan Resistance Movement, to recognize that its struggle is a legitimate one and to agree that we must some day find ways and means which will enable it to reach its goals.

My concluding remarks concern the Middle East, Mr President. You expressed yourself rather unfortunately here: you said that the Ten, or, more exactly, four out of the Ten were going to help with the evacuation of the Sinai. There is no question of *helping* anyone to evacuate the Sinai! The Sinai *will* be evacuated. The Israelis and the Egyptians have agreed

on this point. It is not the Community's task to help this evacuation, it must *guarantee* it and show its approval of the scheme devised at Camp David.

You were, of course, quite right to point out that a new assessment of the situation was called for, Mr President, and to say that a lot of water had flowed under the bridge since the Declaration of Venice was made. I should like to congratulate you on your lucidity, because, in the field of diplomacy, there is nothing worse than sticking rigidly to positions once they have been adopted and assuming that the facts as they were described in Venice hold true forever after. The disappointment suffered by Lord Carrington after the Fez summit meeting and, in particular, our disappointment at the fact that Point 7 in the Fahd plan — which says that all the populations in the region should be given recognition — was rejected by everyone, is sufficient evidence for those in the European diplomatic movement — if I may be allowed to refer to it as such — that they should not cherish any illusions when it comes to assessing the situation in the Middle East. Your belief that there is a need to restore trust in the region can only be realized, at present, if you accept the idea that an essential prerequisite for resolving the conflict is for the State of Israel to be genuinely recognized by all its Arab neighbours, including the Palestinians.

Once again, Mr President, I should like to wish you all the best and to thank you in advance. We have great faith in you.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Pesmazoglou.

Mr Pesmazoglou. — (FR) Mr Tindemans, the assumption of the Council Presidency by a Belgian has come at a time when we need to transform the reforms we have put forward in our resolutions — reforms which are generally accepted as essential for the progress and security of our citizens — into clearly defined political decisions and deeds in the months to come.

Given Belgium's historical role in setting up the Community and its contribution to it, we can only regard a Belgian Presidency in this crucial period as a good omen. Having said that, I feel that I must make the following points on the statement made by the President-in-Office of the Council.

My first point is that the spirit of the Community must rule all our efforts. By this I mean that the particular problems of all the Member States must be taken into consideration, that imbalances within the Community must be reduced, and that the ideas both of the free-trade lobby and of those who advocate a Community of two, three or even more tiers must be rejected.

Pesmazoglou

My second point is that the President of the Council has not put enough emphasis on the setting up of an urgent economic and social development programme in the Mediterranean basin. Such a plan is not just essential for the Mediterranean countries — and particularly for my own, Greece — but would also be a vital, salutary and effective move permitting general economic growth and helping to combat inflation and unemployment. It therefore has a much wider scope and would be worthwhile for the Community as a whole.

We hope that the Council will not drag its feet over this question in the months to come.

My third point relates to political cooperation, which is an achievement of major importance which ought to be respected, institutionalized and strengthened. It deserves our wholehearted and unambiguous support. This political cooperation must certainly be extended to the events in Poland and to other countries where constitutional legitimacy is threatened, and here I concur wholeheartedly with Mr Pannella and other speakers who have commented on the situation in Turkey. I should like to add a further item to the list, namely the military occupation of Cyprus in breach of international resolutions.

With regard to Poland, I should like to inform this House that, according to a recent and reliable opinion poll conducted in Athens, the majority of Greeks said that they condemned the military rule in Poland and supported any moves which would help that country to re-embark on a course of renewal.

I should also like to add that the Greeks still consider the Community to be a body which tries to safeguard human rights and constitutional legitimacy throughout the world, but particularly in Europe or in neighbouring countries, and definitely in those countries which were parties to the Helsinki Agreement.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mrs Gredal.

Mrs Gredal. — *(DA)* Mr President of the Council, I should like if I may to express my amazement and consternation at the fact that you did not say a single word about the Turkey problem.

Obviously, we are all very much taken up with the tragic developments in Poland, which have been mentioned by other Members of my Group. However, our great sympathy with the situation in Poland should not make us forget that there are other places in the world where the people are suffering injustice and I should like to deal specifically with Turkey here today.

As I see, our forbearance with General Evrens' regime cannot go on any longer and that, for this reason, the attitude adopted by the Commission with regard to the fourth financial protocol, i.e. to suspend aid until further notice, is quite correct.

I should like to address the President of the Council and the President of the Commission directly and ask them to give me their assurance that the Community will not make any moves towards cooperation and aid until democracy is established in Turkey. Some people, of course, will insist that the process of democracy was initiated with the setting up of the constitutional assembly. However, this assembly is an undemocratic set-up in that it was appointed by the generals, who decide what it should do, and it is the generals who debarred the old political parties and who have the last word. The so-called constitutional assembly does not, therefore, reflect genuine democratic progress and we reject any ideas to the effect that democracy can be re-established by undemocratic means.

The Council of Europe is to discuss the Turkey question next week here in this building and a delegation from the Council of Europe has just visited Turkey where it witnessed serious violations of fundamental human rights, torture and a lack of freedom for the trade unions and the press. The Danish Government together with the other Scandinavian countries and the Netherlands is currently considering bringing an action against Turkey before the Commission on Human Rights. The idea is very clearly that our approach to the military regime in Turkey should be precisely the same as our approach to the Greek military regime at the end of the 60s.

This Parliament, a large majority of which quite rightly condemns the situation in Poland, should in the same way condemn the regime in Turkey for its violations of human rights.

The Socialist Group has proposed suspending the EEC-Turkey Joint Committee until further notice. If we fail to reach agreement on a resolution to this effect, I can tell you that you should not expect any members of the Socialist Group to take part in this committee.

I should like to ask both the President of the Council and the Commission once more to give us their assurance that the Community will not open up any channels for cooperation and economic aid to Turkey on the grounds that people get the impression that there has been a slight move in the direction of democracy in very small areas. We in the Community must stand by the principle that we cannot tolerate cooperation with a country which continues in the violation of human rights, torture, censorship of the press and lack of freedom for the trade unions.

President. — I call Mr Pranchère.

Mr Pranchère. — (*FR*) Mr President, at the beginning of this new year, we, the French Communists and Allies, are by no means indifferent to the major issues which are gripping the attention of the public today. Indeed, we are calling for action to stem the tide of unemployment and to create jobs, to maintain the living standards of workers while promoting social progress, to strive ceaselessly to safeguard peace and to promote détente, and to give unreserved support to the popular movements which are sweeping through the capitals of the member States and other countries and which have caused millions of people to gather together, united by the same demand: that there will never be another world war in Europe. Poland — a country which is going through a very difficult period from all points of view at the moment — is part of this Europe. Confronted with its troubles, we are concerned to express our desire to do everything we can so that the Poles can sort out their own problems themselves, without the intervention of other parties, whoever they may be. We utterly reject the idea of economic sanctions.

We are very happy to hear from Poland that the discussions of a joint Church and State committee have begun. We hope that they will lead to the lifting of martial rule. We note with satisfaction that the joint committee has issued a statement emphasizing the urgent need to find political solutions leading to a real and lasting understanding and reconciliation. But whatever happens, it is quite inadmissible for others to make the situation of the Polish people worse by setting up obstacles to the delivery of food products, including those from the EEC.

Let us return to issues which are of strict Community interest. Having heard the account of the action programme to be implemented under the Belgian presidency, we must confess that we feel disappointed. There is no doubt at all that, with an approach such as this one, the crisis will carry on getting worse and the credibility of the Community institutions will wear even thinner in the eyes of large sections of the public.

We are all the more aware of this because we cannot but help compare this approach with what is happening in France, where the correct path has been taken. A number of changes are taking place in our country, as the government and workers are shoulder to shoulder in their struggle to ensure that working men are not sacrificed to capitalist profits and that national interests are not sacrificed to those of multinational companies.

In the time which I have been allotted, I shall try to limit my remarks to a few questions which seem significant to me. Among the broad lines of approach advocated by the Belgian President, are the strengthening of Europe in economic and social terms and of

re-enforcing its importance in the world, but how is one to square statements of intention with reality?

Let us consider agriculture. What is the use of making statements about respecting the principles of the CAP, when one subsequently refuses to implement the measures which would enable them to be respected and, worse still, when one adopts an approach which — by virtue of the 30 May 1980 mandate of the Council — jeopardizes the very principles themselves?

It is on a mandate of the Council that the Commission has just proposed a series of guidelines on the future of European agriculture which will be translated in a number of countries into a yet further drop in agricultural expenditure, a weakening of guarantees and the introduction of co-responsibility, making farmers contribute more generally to the costs of the budget. We should not allow the potential of agricultural production to be jeopardized, whatever the pretext, even a restructuring of the budget.

I should like to side-track for a moment. Let us consider not only the problems of malnutrition and hunger in the world but also those of millions of small farmers who would find themselves condemned to join the ranks of the unemployed. The truth is that what the CAP really and urgently needs is greater respect for Community preference, and a policy of exports which is not overshadowed by American influence, and an improvement of its instruments so that the future of agriculture and of those working in it can be guaranteed.

Our priority is to defend the incomes of family farmers. The last eight years have been marked by a fall in incomes as agricultural prices have not been raised sufficiently during previous years, but French farmers are just not prepared to see their situation get any worse. For this reason we are asking for an average increase in agricultural prices of 16% to offset the rise in production and living costs. We are also calling for the abolition of negative and positive compensatory amounts.

Not only is this 16% increase vital for family farmers, it is also feasible under the budget if we call a halt to all the many exceptions to Community preference and if we stop doling out free gifts to the United Kingdom, a practice which at present accounts for more than 30 000 million French francs. The agricultural price fixing procedure must be set in motion immediately as any delay will be harmful to farmers.

That is why we protested at the hold-up in presenting the Commission proposals to the Council and European Parliament.

We are determined to be on our guard where the questions of agricultural incomes and of enlargement are concerned.

Pranchère

We should like to restate our opposition to this expansion which would have extremely serious consequences, not just for French farmers and workers but also for those countries wanting to join the Community.

Is it right that the European Parliament has never held a serious and thorough debate on what the tremendous impact of enlargement would be? Yet it cannot be denied that there are great contradictions between this project and our cooperation policy with the ACP countries and those of the Mediterranean basin.

We believe that cooperation with Spain and Portugal can assume a different form. What we need now is a European social policy. This project has yet to be realized but it does have the merit of being one of the few Community socio-economic projects at the present time which is both ambitious and yet realistic, given the critical times in which we live.

Is it not time now for the Council to take France's proposal into consideration? France has begun to implement a policy of economic revival in conjunction with a strong social policy by reducing working hours and lowering the age of retirement. This is a new approach which urgently requires us to ask ourselves how we can harmonize social legislation in the various countries in a way that aims for the highest common denominator, in order to benefit women and workers in the Community.

I should like to conclude by drawing the attention of the Council and the European Parliament to the importance which we attach to the motion for a resolution submitted by our friends Mr Fanti and Mr Piquet — on behalf of the Communists and Allies Group — on the events in Turkey. In Turkey, more and more people are being tried and condemned to death, torture is being used systematically and hundreds of thousands of people are being subjected to massive suppression. We hope that our appeal for solidarity with workers, democrats and the Turkish people will be echoed in this House.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Hopper.

Mr Hopper. — Mr President, I should like to begin, as the rapporteur for the mandate exercise, by suggesting that Parliament should turn its attention to the procedures which it will itself adopt before its debates. It is necessary that Parliament should come out with one comprehensive view on the mandate. Is the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs to deal only with the Commission's response of 24 June, or is it to turn its attention to the other extremely important supporting documents? Is it to take account of the statements made by the President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers? (I may say, Mr President,

that at times the members of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs feel that they are aiming at a fast-moving and somewhat elusive target.) Are the other committees to report directly to this House on the various individual supporting documents, or are they to render an opinion to the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs? All these are important matters which remain totally unresolved at this point, and it is extremely important that the Bureau of Parliament should reach a conclusion within a few days. I know that Mr Dankert is well aware of this problem and will be looking into it shortly.

Secondly, may I welcome Mr Tindemans' recognition that at the very heart of the European Community lies the common market. The common market has been only partly realized. One of the great problems is that in the Council of Ministers there lie 80 draft directives, some of which have been there for years; and until those draft directives are enacted into law, we cannot say that we have completed the common market.

(Applause)

Now I understand that good progress was made with these draft directives during the British presidency, but that a final decision on many of them was delayed until a decision could be reached on other, more pressing, but possibly less important, matters. I should like to say to the President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers that I certainly shall judge the Belgian presidency by the success it has in getting these 80 draft directives into law.

Protectionism is a disease in all our countries without exception. The latest, and most serious, manifestation has been called *la reconquête du marché intérieur*, launched by the present French Government. I would urge the Council of Ministers and the Commission to turn the full spotlight of publicity upon this development.

I should also like to turn Parliament's attention to a most unsatisfactory aspect of the policies of the European Community. The general result of many of these policies is a random transfer of resources as between Member States, frequently from the poorer Member States to the richer. This cannot be right. If convergence means anything, it means a transfer of resources to be used productively from the richer to the poorer regions and States of the Community. I should like to borrow a phrase that Commissioner Narjes used only yesterday evening in my hearing: he said that what this Community needs is a Marshall Plan by which the richer regions of the Community will aid the less fortunate.

A final point — and one directed personally through the Chair to the President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers. In the excellent language classes which are

Hopper

conducted for Members upstairs, I have been reading a document by a German political philosopher called Max Weber. In this document Weber asks himself what are the qualities that make a good politician, and he picks out two which are sometimes in conflict. One of them is the ability to distance oneself from the problems with which one is dealing and to treat them with objectivity; and the second quality — I will give it in German — is *Leidenschaft*, passion. There must be passion in the outlook of a good politician.

I would commend to the President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers the need for passion in what he is doing, and I would ask him to take as his exemplar his great predecessor, Paul-Henri Spaak, who did so much to move his Community forward.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Efremidis.¹

Mr Efremidis. — *(GR)* Mr President, in the short time at my disposal I shall restrict myself to commenting on three basic points in Mr Tindemans' speech.

Firstly, in the field of economic and social policy the measures promised by Mr Tindemans are in essence neither new nor suitable for improving the living conditions of our peoples or getting the Community out of its present deep crisis. They are the continuation of the same policy as the EEC has in essence been following since it was founded, in other words a policy in the interests of monopoly capital. This policy explains the present situation, all the insoluble problems noted by the European Council in London and the recent meeting of the Foreign Ministers in Brussels, the continuing increase in unemployment, inflation and the constant decline in economic growth in every Member State. More particularly, the results are far more negative in respect of the farming economy and the economically weaker partners in the Community. The experience of our country in the first year after accession demonstrates this: small and medium-sized firms are closing all the time and our farmers, having suffered the destruction of their summer fruit are now for the first time faced with the anguish of seeing their oranges ploughed in as well.

Mr Tindemans, you speak of measures to create Community solidarity and of a citizens' Europe. But in order to put solidarity into practice there must be exceptional measures to help the workers, farmers, professional people, the weaker countries and the more backward regions. Talk of a citizens' Europe cannot hide the Europe of the monopolies.

Secondly, Mr Tindemans, you propose overcoming the crisis by broadening the institutional framework, limiting and abolishing the rule of unanimity and creating new Community institutions. You are mistaken, Mr Tindemans; the crisis of the Community has its roots elsewhere. The reason lies in the nature of the EEC and in the policy it is pursuing, which is aimed not at improving the standard of living of our peoples but at serving monopoly interests. That is why the institutions are at odds with reality. And that is also why the contrasts between capital and labour, between the stronger and weaker Member States and between the highly developed and more backward regions, far from decreasing, are on the increase. And that is why, for all your proposals, the situation is not going to get any better.

Thirdly, Mr Tindemans, you have plans for the common defence policy, the common foreign policy and European union. What is the purpose in having a third bloc, assuming it will be a third force, whereas in the interests of peace and for the sake of our peoples we should be doing away with the two blocs we have today? Furthermore, invoking Poland and attempting to capitalize on events there does not, in our view, serve the interests of the Polish people or of peace. Nor are we convinced by the interest you profess, since it goes no further than that, ignoring problems such as the danger of Europe becoming the flash-point of a Third World War and the threat of a nuclear holocaust with the increasing emphasis on the strategy of a so-called limited nuclear war, the aggressive expansionist policy of Israel in the Middle East, the murderous military regimes in Turkey and El Salvador and, much closer to the Community, the years of tragedy suffered by the peoples of Northern Ireland and Cyprus. Both you and the majority in this Parliament have nothing to say about all that. You do not even try to appear credible when talking about questions of freedom, democracy and self-determination. As far as we are concerned, as Members of this Parliament and as Members of the Communist Party of Greece, this debate further confirms our position against Greece's accession to the EEC and our continuing struggle to have it withdraw.

President. — I call Mr Haagerup

Mr Haagerup. — *(DA)* Mr President, my colleague, Mr Beyer de Ryke, intends to speak on the foreign policy aspects of the President of the Council's programme. I, on the other hand, would like to say a few words on the situation in Poland and our reaction to it.

As you know, the various political groups in this Parliament agreed that we should conduct a thorough debate in the Political Affairs Committee next week and, for this reason, the Groups have decided not to table a motion for resolution proper but rather a series

¹ *Membership of committees: see minutes.*

Haagerup

of proposals, since we would prefer to wait until after this debate before considering the steps to be taken. However, I should like to say that, as I see it, there are two main issues to which we should address ourselves — and I am making this point mainly for the benefit of the President of the Council, since the Governments of the Ten Member States and their cooperation are the deciding factors.

Firstly, there is the question of how we can most effectively help the Poles at a humanitarian level, i.e. with food aid and medical supplies. I will make no bones about the fact that we cannot rely on bodies connected to or under the control of the military regime to distribute this aid. We take a positive view of the stance taken up by the Commission in this matter, and we assume we will have an opportunity to discuss this question in greater detail with the Commission.

The second point concerns the steps we think should be taken at economic and political level to bring pressure to bear on the Soviet Union and the military regime in Poland. We do not underestimate the value of symbolic gestures, such as declaring 30 January a day of solidarity with Poland, and we are also open to the idea of sending a delegation to Poland — indeed, this idea came from my own Group. However, we will not be able to do without certain concrete measures. We cannot work on a business-as-usual principle — and I am not claiming, incidentally, that Governments of the Ten have in fact done this. We may be able to make clear by means of sanctions, credit restrictions, discontinuation of technology transfer and other measures, that we really intend to put pressure on the oppressors in Poland and those pulling the strings in the Soviet Union. However, it is not enough just to talk about these things. We must not be half-hearted in carrying out these measures and make out that we are doing more than we are in fact doing, and we must therefore decide what price we are prepared to pay to show how much importance we attach to greater freedom for the Poles — since we will obviously have to pay a price too.

We do not accept the charge that we are ignoring oppression elsewhere in the world — and I should like to make this point in connection with certain remarks which were made a few moments ago. We are very much concerned about the situation in Turkey too and I do not think the Turkish leaders are in any doubt about the Community's views on this question. However, we do not go along with the idea that the situation in Poland and Turkey are entirely comparable or that we should act in exactly the same way in both cases. We do not think that we should break off all political contacts with the other side, but we will probably be able, by gradually stepping up our economic measures, to demonstrate that the price of oppressing the people of Poland will become progressively higher. However, if we are to be able to do this and demonstrate this fact, there must be the necessary will and it is this will to which we must appeal, since

freedom and help towards establishing freedom also have their price.

President. — I call Mr Hänsch.

Mr Hänsch. — (*DE*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the Socialist Group I would like to add a few comments on the situation in Poland and on the Community's reaction to it.

In December — and here I am addressing the President-in-Office of the Council — the introduction of martial law in Poland was condemned by almost everyone in this House. We made it clear that we expect Poland to return to a dialogue between the social forces of government, church and trade union. It would have been a good idea for the ten foreign ministers in their declaration of 4 January — which we welcome and agree with — to have referred to Parliament's resolution. Part of the dialogue between the Council and Parliament, to which you are constantly alluding, is also that you should make it plain to the general public that Parliament and the Council are pursuing the same goal on this matter.

We are well aware that the only really effective measures which Parliament adopts are those which are passed with the largest possible majority. This will also hold true for our policy towards Poland. I repeat, we Socialists view developments in Poland with concern and are anxious to be given an indication that discussions between the government, church and trade unions will be resumed. Once again, we demand an end to martial law and the release of those interned. We endorse the declaration of 4 January by the foreign ministers of the Ten, which combined what is necessary with the politically possible. In everything we do, we must carefully consider whether the measures which the Ten wish to apply or are considering will make the wrong people suffer. We should ask ourselves whether economic measures may indeed turn out to be counter-productive, and whether any increase in the pressure we apply may have the fatal consequence of increasing internal pressure on the Polish people. We Socialists must not wait for union rights to be suppressed before discovering solidarity with workers and their organizations. I doubt the credibility of all those who speak in defence of the rights of Polish workers while doing their best to undermine them in their own countries.

Parliament would be well advised — and I shall wind up on this point, ladies and gentlemen — not to be overzealous in tabling motions for resolutions. I am pleased that all proposers are willing to withdraw their motions — Mrs Macciocchi has already done so, as the President has said — and I think that this should also be administratively feasible for the Christian Democrats. The Poles deserve thoroughly considered decisions from Parliament, which should be aimed

Hänsch

purely and simply at improving the lot of the Polish people.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Gondikas.

Mr Gondikas. — *(GR)* Mr President, I should like first of all to congratulate the President-in-Office and wish him every success in his difficult task which, you can be sure — considering what he has already done for Europe — Mr Tindemans will bring to a successful conclusion. His speech today was a message of optimism and faith in our endeavours. Very concisely he described the framework into which the Council's activities fit. I was left, however, with a fair number of question marks, and I am sure, he will allow me to put certain specific questions — not, of course, aimed at him, personally but at his colleagues and companions — and I would ask him, as far as possible, to give me specific answers.

Given that the principle of continuity in Community policy must be respected by all Member States and that this continuity becomes impossible if, every time there is a change of government in a Member State, there is also to be a change in Community policy, how do you explain the attitude the Council has adopted up to now towards the ideas of the new Greek Government?

Secondly, the Venice Declaration of 1980, which is binding on the signatory Member States, lays down the right to self-determination of the Palestine people and the participation of the Palestine Liberation Organization in negotiations on a peaceful solution in the Middle East. This being so, how then can the Council accept statements by one of its Members which are contrary to the spirit of the Venice Declaration not only on the problem of the Middle East but also on the question of Poland?

Thirdly, does the President-in-Office believe that the statement by a Member of the Council that the Polish crisis is an internal matter for Poland is in accordance with the spirit and convictions of the Community and more particularly with those concerning human rights? If not, what steps does the Council propose to take with regard to peace and democracy following events in Poland?

Fourthly, what stage has the Council reached in its efforts to determine a policy condemning the present régime in Turkey? Has the Council shown any interest in the restoration of democracy in Turkey and how? Is the Council aware that Turkey has recently stepped up its provocations against Greece? And does it realize that popular opinion in my country remains unconvinced that our partners in Europe have adopted a clear position condemning the present junta in Turkey? What are the specific measures the President-in-Office is to

put to the Council with a view to preventing the imprisonment and torturing of trade union leaders and politicians in Turkey in future?

Finally, has the new Presidency made any provision for taking up the Cyprus question? What specific plans are there which could form the basis for decisions in this field?

Knowing, Mr President, the views of the President-in-Office — at least insofar as we all had the pleasure of hearing them when he was himself a Member of this House — I am sure he will want to reply directly to the last two or three of the burning issues I have raised.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Seligman.

Mr Seligman. — Mr President, Mr Tindemans has announced a programme of action which demands progress and development in the Community and refuses to accept the cynicism and defeatism shown by some backbench speakers today. I welcome this evidence that the systems to achieve continuity in Council policy introduced by Lord Carrington have proved to be effective and that there is a continuity. As a result of the activities of Tuesday, there is in this Parliament today a new wind of change. I hope this will be soon spread to the Community. The new President of Parliament is already introducing an efficient and businesslike note into our work and aiming at well-defined objectives.

This Parliament is often accused of being just a talking shop. Well, that is correct. We are a talking shop; that is what a Parliament is for. It is for talking. However, this particular Parliament is much more than that. It is the real voice of the people of Europe and it is the only place where you can hear that real voice. It is not the voice of national governments, it is the voice of the people. That is why this Parliament's influence and power will inevitably grow; and as it grows, so the effectiveness of the Commission will grow. The Community spirit which is the hallmark of this Parliament will then replace the nationalism which has dominated so much of the Council's activities so far.

I therefore welcome the plan to include the act of setting up the European Foundation on 30 March. It will promote a much better understanding and interdependence between the citizens of Europe in education, science, culture and information. Our previous leader, Geoffrey Rippon, is a great supporter of the idea of a European Foundation. In education, which particularly interests me, it is essential that the syllabus of all member nations should include a second European language, European history, European geography and economics and European cultural subjects.

Seligman

Unless we develop a true European dimension in our education syllabus we shall not achieve European patriotism and pride alongside our national patriotism, and this applies particularly to Britain. There is no conflict between European patriotism and national patriotism.

Turning quickly to energy, which is my main subject, Mr Tindemans has emphasized that a common energy policy and a research policy is fundamental to economic convergence and social welfare in the Community and that convergence in energy policy is an essential prerequisite to economic convergence. The paramount ultimate objective of a common energy policy must be the plentiful supply of energy at reasonable prices in all parts of the Community and to all members of the Community, as well as to the developing world. No member of the Community — neither Britain, Holland nor France — can afford to be selfish in this matter. We all depend in the long run on the prosperity of the whole Community, which is our largest market, and also in the prosperity of the developing world, which will be our market in the future. This is not altruism, it is enlightened self-interest.

Another aim of the common energy policy must be wider inter-connection of electricity and gas supplies. Already a start has been made with the cross-Channel cable. What are we going to do now to help Greece with inter-connection? A cable from Italy to Greece is bound to come up in the future with Community help. An interconnection with Spain and Portugal will also be an important necessity in the future. As far as gas is concerned, we must have security and flexibility of supply everywhere, which means that throughout the Community we must have connections with Norway, Algeria Holland and even with Russian gas supplies.

On energy prices and taxes there is a paradox. We need high energy prices to ensure conservation and avoid waste of energy, but on the other hand we need cheap energy supplies if we are going to make our industry competitive with other countries in the world. So we must intensify our energy investment in modernization, in cheapening indigenous energy, in coal and nuclear power. France has proved that this can be done, and we must follow its lead. We need cheap energy in order to be competitive with the USA and even with Comecon.

Finally, I hope that the new wind of change which is blowing through this Parliament will be infectious and will blow through the corridors of the Commission and the Council in Brussels.

President. — I call Mr Kirkos.

Mr Kirkos. — (GR) Mr President, some of the ideas in the report by Mr Tindemans, particularly those

relating to the future of our joint efforts, lead us to stress that the future of our Community is inextricably linked with the prospect of détente and peace.

The peoples of Europe have shown us that they want democracy, disarmament and peace. They want neither Pershing missiles and advanced military bases nor SS-20 missiles and dictatorship. If the European Community raises its standing *vis-à-vis* both the superpowers in order to stop the slide towards cold war and — why not? — 'hot' war as well, and if it succeeds in reversing the present trend, then and only then will the idea of integration acquire new prestige in the eyes of its own peoples and make decisive progress, and only then will the European Community acquire the identity without which our effort will be bogged down and come to nought.

We are aware that in the present circumstances such progress is difficult, but it is necessary. Taking the Polish tragedy as an excuse, the United States has recently been exerting enormous pressure on the European Community in order to suppress any independent tendency. We salute all those forces which are struggling so that democratic and socialist solidarity with the Polish people, whom we encourage with all our strength, does not become an excuse for a hysterical cold-war campaign, because that would not help Poland either and would jeopardize democracy and peace in Europe.

We call on the Council of Ministers to reject the American pressures and to work out an independent European position. Furthermore, we note with concern that in his report Mr Tindemans is mild in his comments about the Turkish junta, and this gives rise to an understandable mistrust of the interest shown in Poland. We call on the Council to reaffirm even more strongly the Community's call for an immediate stop to the trials, condemnations and torture and for the restoration of constitutional freedoms for the Turkish people and, at the same time, we wish to draw Parliament's attention most urgently to the grave consequences which may ensue from any toleration or support of Ankara's territorial claims against Greece. Only yesterday, the Turkish Defence Minister, Mr Bayülken, spoke in threatening tones, and Parliament would be making an extremely dangerous error to think that the situation involves a rise of chauvinism on both sides, as is usually stated in NATO circles. It involves claims on Greece's borders, which have been recognized in international treaties, and external pressure aimed at stopping the Greek people's move towards change and socialism. And what is more, it is not out of chauvinism but out of insistence on our proclaimed principles that we raise our voices in this House to demand the immediate withdrawal of the Turkish occupation forces from Cyprus and a just solution to the Cyprus problem, which, as Mr Willy Brandt stated on his latest visit, has been forgotten by Europe.

Kirkos

Mr President, I hope that during the Belgian presidency the Greek proposals will be positively studied and that solutions will be found which are favourable not only to Greece but also to the less developed countries of the Community, since it is obvious that, if the differences become greater instead of smaller, the EEC will finish up bankrupt. So Greece is not the naughtily child, but its voice is a cry of warning from the Mediterranean region, and both Parliament and the governments will have to heed this cry.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — *(FR)* Mr President, Mr Tindemans, let me first of all say how delighted I am to see our eminent colleague back here on the front bench of Parliament. The workings of fate are indeed mysterious, Mr Tindemans. A few weeks ago your group put a spoke in your wheel when you were trying to get elected as one of those who sit in the Chair here. I have no idea who got in your way, but anyway I welcome you here in the role which is not the one we were expecting a few weeks ago.

You know, Mr Tindemans, I really do sympathize with you because I fear you are going to be just as frustrated in your new job as you were in your old one. For a talented fellow like you, a convinced European, there is definitely cause for frustration if you are in this Parliament and happen not to be sitting with my poor little group but somewhere else.

However, Mr Tindemans, old chap, what an even greater frustration it must be to love Europe the way you do and to speak to us the way you did today. I read your words, except that they are not really yours. Mr Ruffini said more or less the same thing last year. But if your words are so feeble and if that is the best you can do, Mr Tindemans, at a time when tragedy is treading the world stage again and we are living through a holocaust which is a hundred times worse than what we had in Europe forty years ago, then I suppose it is time to ask a few questions. And that is what I am going to do in the two and a half minutes I have left.

Mr Tindemans, the fact that you are a Christian and were a Member of Parliament aligned you with the people in this Parliament who tabled a motion for a resolution which was adopted by an absolute majority in the House. We all followed our conscience and together with sixty Nobel prizewinners we called on the leaders of Europe to make 1982 the year they stopped opting for death and destruction. Let there be an end — we said — to the lament and lachrymation which were the lot of much of humanity. We need a new tune, Mr Tindemans. The few words you uttered were the same old things about development that

people have been trotting out for thirty years. The same goes for Turkey. Tit for tat, when it comes to keeping quiet. But at least where Turkey is concerned the silence is official. At least where Turkey is concerned you had the decency — I do not mean you personally but the ten governments you represent — to say nothing. But decency went by the board when it came to holocaust and genocide, and on the trumped-up basis of this structuralist subculture — which is to our credit on the Left, you know — you go on making development the shibboleth which means we can catch out millions of people more easily and with an easier conscience. The point is: can we see power in Europe become incarnate in you unless these contradictions collapse and unless you try to reconcile your integrity as a politician with power and your integrity as a person? You have to retain your integrity as one or the other. If you retain your political integrity, the result is death and destruction with the legacy of the Munich beerhall in Ankara and Warsaw and in the third and fourth worlds. I am not here to prophesy doom because first and foremost I am a militant, one who never gives up, and so it is hope that inspires me above all. What I fear, though, is this apparently reasonable approach which is in fact madness and which makes you keep your head in the sand. We cannot speak in 1981 or 1982 as we did in the heady days just after the war. We have failed and we are the cause of this death and destruction, more to blame than anyone else. I may be anticlerical but let me remind you, Mr Tindemans, that John Paul II and all the popes have laid at our door a failure which is far greater than any for which our predecessors were responsible. And you come here to offer us your dismal words and this embarrassed silence.

Speaking as an Italian Radical, Mr Tindemans, I do hope that if only for an instant in the course of the year you might find it in you to speak out as a Christian, as a man and as a European, even if it goes against the power you represent. That power is so fragile and so remote from the ideals that are supposed to inspire it that a mere whiff of bold truth might save it, and it is a word of rescue we need for Turkey, on which we are going to vote shortly.

I think those are the main points I wanted to make, Mr President. Thank you.

President. — The President-in-Office of the Council has asked to speak now for pressing reasons which we must recognize. In calling Mr Tindemans now, I apologize to the speakers who are still down to speak in this debate.

I call the Council.

Mr Tindemans, President-in-Office of the Council. — *(FR)* Mr President, I must apologize to you and to the Members of this House, but owing to the weather

Tindemans

I am obliged to leave by 6 p.m. at the latest, since the plane placed at my disposal cannot land or take off later. I must therefore ask you to allow me to reply immediately.

I must also apologize for the Secretary of State, Mr De Keersmaeker, who is due to speak in Berlin tomorrow and who therefore had to leave us earlier this afternoon.

(NL) In my speech this afternoon I tried to react to the current defeatism with regard to European integration. It is obvious that in other institutions — not here in this House, where the majority wants more to be done towards the unification of Europe — the will to move forward with Europe is sometimes lacking. For this reason I took the liberty to point out what I regard as the three most important reasons why the first pioneers of Europe after the Second World War felt it necessary to strive for European integration, namely reconciliation in Europe, the desire not to repeat the pre-war economic follies and to make Europe an important entity in world politics. I have tried to adapt the programme of the Belgian presidency to these three main objectives and have included what I regard as essential now. Obviously, I could not cover everything which we ought to do. That is set out in the action programme. In my brief address I merely wanted to sketch its broad outlines and describe its essential features. I would therefore refer you to the action programme because — and I take the liberty of making this point — I had the impression that some speakers this afternoon had not read it.

(FR) I don't like talking about myself. It was Pascal, I think, who said that the 'I' is detestable. But apart from Gaston Thorn, the President of the Commission, I am the only one in this House who took part in the Helsinki Conference and signed the Final Act, which has been so frequently discussed lately. I therefore know exactly what I am talking about when I denounce what is happening in Poland, because Poland and the Soviet Union signed the Final Act along with the rest of us.

(Applause)

During the inaugural debate of the government of which I am a member, I told the Belgian Parliament, in reply to a question from a member of that Parliament, that I would defend human rights wherever they were threatened in the world, whether in the north, south, east or west. So if there is anyone in this House who thinks that I have overlooked certain countries where human rights are not now respected or where they are violated, let him not think that I have tried to justify or gloss over what is going on in those countries. I am afraid it was impossible for me to give a list of the countries in which human rights are not respected, but I believe it was my right and duty to denounce more particularly what is now happening in Poland, a friendly country with which we have so

many links. In the debate, the first which this House has held concerning the dangers which threaten Poland, I spoke on behalf of my group and said that part of my country was liberated in 1944 by Polish soldiers. Poland is indeed part of Europe, and I repeat that the friendship which the Community feels towards Poland is so great that it was our duty to denounce vigorously — and continue to do so — what is now going on in that country.

(Applause)

(NL) I am prepared to do this wherever human rights are violated. As I have clearly stated, I regard this as my duty, but . . .

(FR) At this point I should like to address Mr Pannella in particular.

I would first like to thank him for the tone he adopted at the start of his speech. However, I could no longer agree with him towards the end. Mr Pannella, I recently read a sentence by Paul Valéry, which I was reminded of almost automatically while listening to you: 'Half truths are worse than no truth'.

(Applause)

When denouncing truly unacceptable situations, we should not refer to other unacceptable situations to distract attention from the original problem. That is what I wanted to tell you. Apart from that, I would like to thank you once again. In the beginning, you were very reasonable, and I could go along with some of what you said; but I no longer agreed with you towards the end. When I spoke about the economic situation, I said that we should avoid the economic errors and follies of the pre-war period. I also spoke about hunger; excuse me repeating myself, but I have taken part in the two or three debates on world hunger held in this House. We should provide substantial aid to save the victims of hunger as far as possible. But we should also have the courage to tackle the problem at its roots. That means that we should do our utmost to improve farming and food production in the developing countries threatened by hunger. That is the crux of the matter, and we should have the courage to develop that policy, otherwise there can be no lasting solution to this terrible problem.

(NL) I would also like to take this opportunity of thanking all those who have expressed confidence in the Belgian presidency, for their words addressed to me personally and for their encouragement. I thank all those who have expressed constructive criticism concerning the Belgian programme. Obviously, I cannot cover everything, but if we manage, during our presidency, to fulfil our mandate of 30 May 1981, I personally believe that we will not only have made a positive step forward but that we will also have averted a major crisis in the Community. If we cannot reach agreement on the British problem, if we cannot resolve

Tindemans

the problem of the budget, if we find no solution to the farming issue — and I could mention more problems — we shall create a severe crisis which would be very damaging to the Community. Our mandate is therefore very important.

We shall not be able to implement a new policy until the problem of the mandate is settled. When this House rightly discusses social policy and regional policy, we know that funds must be made available and that they cannot be found until, first and foremost, the problem of the mandate and hence that of the budget is resolved.

(FR) Several members have said that I have not discussed the problem of the 1982 budget.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the attitude of the Belgian presidency is that we must achieve a political solution on the basis of negotiations between the Council, Parliament and the Commission, but above all between the Council and Parliament. We could possibly apply to the Court for a clear and precise statement concerning the distinction between obligatory and non-obligatory expenditure. We feel that the budget drawn up and adopted by Parliament should be accepted pragmatically; but we must seek a political solution among ourselves in order to avoid these squabbles and conflicts which have been recurring for three years and which may be repeated once again. It is an unhappy situation for both Parliament and the Council to have to deal repeatedly with such crises. The Belgian presidency hopes to persuade the other member countries to accept this pragmatic solution and to cooperate in achieving a permanent solution to this problem.

(NL) I have also spoken here about the Genscher-Colombo proposals. These go much further than the proposals drafted by both foreign ministers, because they concern the future of political cooperation in Europe. How can we take fresh initiatives, how can we, as ministers meeting within the framework of the Community, try to achieve something which, although perhaps not the ideal solution, results in the approximation of policies with the help of the Treaties, political and intergovernmental cooperation or action and of measures which do not come under these three headings, and how can we place them all in the same sphere. Hence the proposal to accept an official instrument and entrust the entire matter to the European Council.

There is, moreover, the problem of the majority or unanimity principle, which also raises the question of the more effective functioning of the institutions. If we can achieve positive results with the help of the *ad hoc* working party and the Council of Ministers on the basis of the Genscher-Colombo proposals, we shall have made a major step forward in this period, and despite the present crisis and the defeatism to which I have alluded, we shall have made considerable

progress, which some people would perhaps not regard as spectacular, towards increased cohesion in Europe.

(FR) I would also like to comment briefly on the economic crisis. Mr Glinne, Mr Van Miert and others mentioned not only the crisis but also unemployment among young people. I also referred to this in my address. What I did not say — but this can be found in the text you have received containing the action programme of the Belgian presidency — is that we want to prepare another mammoth Council session, that is one attended by the finance ministers, the economic affairs ministers and the social affairs ministers. Such a session has already been held but — and allow me too to make a criticism — this first session was not prepared in the most satisfactory way. We therefore wish to hold another special Council meeting, but it must be properly prepared because we expect a great deal from it. Any proposals to combat unemployment should be put forward at that meeting. You will find that in the document which has been distributed to you.

I would therefore ask these members not to act as if I had not made any proposals in the social sector or on unemployment in the Community.

I have also put forward a new industrial policy. I have spoken about the energy policy and about the science policy. I shall say no more, but all those who are concerned and familiar with these problems will know that they are of key importance for combating the economic crisis effectively.

I also referred once again to the European Foundation. Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the idea of creating a European foundation in Europe for the purpose of spreading information on European ideas, the European way of life, its culture and civilization in other continents was, if I may be forgiven for saying so, already mentioned in my report requested in 1974 by the Heads of State or Government. I launched this idea thinking it would be an excellent means of creating in Europe a climate in which the people of Europe could feel more unified, their unity being founded not only on the work of politicians or technocrats who are concerned and familiar with European issues, but it was also intended to engender a genuine people's movement on which our political activities towards the unification of Europe would be based.

I was pleased to see in the French Government's memorandum that the idea has at last been re-adopted and that there is now some hope. Conditions are almost right for the European Foundation to come into being during the Belgian presidency. I would like to tell Parliament that I shall be the first to welcome this.

(Applause)

Tindemans

(NL) I would also like to comment further on the institutions. We have already done this and have met the three Presidents, the President of Parliament, the President-in-Office of the Council and the President of the Commission. We are now all trying to seek a better understanding and better functioning, and I shall do my utmost to attend Parliament's Question Time, or I shall ensure that the Council is ably represented. The Council would thus be represented and could, if necessary, reply from a political standpoint to the questions put by members of this House. I took part in the elections to the European Parliament and have acted as President here, and so I do not feel that Parliament's powers should be reduced. On the contrary, I think they should be increased.

(Applause)

(FR) In his speech, Mr Glinne was kind enough to quote from an interview I gave on Belgian television, in which I referred to the frustration which might be felt by some members of this House precisely because they do not have enough powers or responsibilities. Those who have been active in national parliaments or governments will know what I mean, and I think the frustration of some members of this Parliament is due to the conflict between, on the one hand, their good intentions, talents and great political skills and, on the other, the barriers preventing them from applying their ideas on a European scale. I shall therefore help you in your struggle for real powers and greater influence in Europe.

(Applause)

I have been accused of not respecting the Treaties. Allow me to refer you to a sentence in my document in which I said I consider that one of the roles of the Council is to ensure, with the Commission, that the Treaties are observed. I stressed this so much that some of my associates warned me that ensuring respect for the Treaties was the Commission's task. That was why I added 'with the Commission'. But in my view the Council should also do its utmost to see to it that the Treaties are fully respected.

(Applause)

I have already discussed the 1982 budget and human rights, and you have referred several times to the present situation in Turkey. The Community has done the following in this area — I quote from a document of September 1980: 'The Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Nine held an exchange of views on the situation in Turkey and expressed concern at the turn of events in that country. They took note of the assurances given by the military authorities concerning the rapid re-establishment of democratic institutions, the observance of human rights and the guarantees regarding the treatment of those politicians currently under house arrest. They are deeply anxious that these assurances should be fully and speedily put to affect. It

is in this spirit that the Community will pursue its cooperation with Turkey'.

In December the Ten suspended approval of the project for financing electric cables planned as part of the exceptional aid of 75 million ECU decided on in 1980. And in November the Ten decided, for the time being, not to conclude the fourth financial protocol negotiated and signed in June 1981.

Those are the concrete measures! A few days ago I was able to meet my Turkish partner, to whom I gave a clear account of the opinion of the Ten concerning the measures adopted in Turkey. I informed him of the conditions which Turkey must fulfil if it wishes to continue its association with the Community. You will know that on New Year's day General Evren announced that this year he would organize a referendum and that direct elections would be held next year. In any case, we intervened in the interests of human rights. As far as the arrests of the trade unionists are concerned, we reacted at Community level and called for explanations. The Community will base its attitude on the policy which Turkey pursues.

I have talked about the institutions, the situation in Turkey, unemployment and food aid. Those were the main questions put to me. I thank all those who spoke and shall be sending some a written reply.

Mr Glinne asked me, basing his question on an interview, whether I had changed my outlook on becoming President-in-Office of the Council after having been a member of Parliament. I must point out that this was a literary allusion which I made on Belgian television. I was thinking of the play by Jean Anouilh *Becket ou l'Honneur de Dieu*, where the Archbishop says to the King 'I no longer serve the king, I now serve God'. He wanted to tell the King that he had taken up a different position. Obviously, the position of a member of Parliament is not the same as that of a member of the Council! However, as a former member of this House, I shall do my utmost to have the best possible relations with Parliament. I have always striven towards the goal of direct universal elections to the European Parliament. 25 years ago, when the Jean Monnet Committee was first concerned with this question, I was already a member. I also wanted to take part in the first direct elections in Europe. I can assure you that as a member of the Council, which is by definition a temporary position, I shall endeavour to have the best possible relations with you.

(Applause)

I cannot now dwell further on political cooperation, the situation in the Middle East or the attitude of the Ten in other areas. However, I do regret the fact that civil authority has been replaced by a military regime. I made the same declaration 10 years ago: I would like

Tindemans

to repeat it today and say that it applies to all countries.

We have only six months in which to develop the entire programme. I must say it is not much, and in the report which bears my name I proposed that the duration of this mandate should be doubled. Such a proposal has never been accepted before and many people complain at national level about the enormous amount of work which a country has to do when it takes over the presidency of the Council. It is true, six months is not a long time, but with your help and if we come up with some good ideas, we can achieve a great deal over that period.

As far as Spain and Portugal are concerned, I have informed you of the measures which we have recently taken. There have already been meetings of policy makers and of officials from the foreign affairs departments, and we shall be holding a number of special meetings at ministerial level.

(*NL*) I would like in this connection to reply to Mr Penders' assertions that we are merely trying to appease Spain and Portugal, that they are unable to join the Community or will be kept waiting a long time and that a means has therefore been found of letting them know that we are interested in their membership.

Mr President, there was a time, while the Community still consisted of six countries, when we were accused of being a rich men's club. That was the usual expression in English. We always objected to this notion and made it clear that all democratically governed European countries which accept the Treaties and the rules of membership could join the Community. Well, Spain and Portugal have adopted democratic systems and want to become members, and I do not see why we should not allow them to do so. But this obviously does not mean that we should not do our utmost to avoid new problems and difficulties and that we should not use the transitional period in order to settle a number of problems so as not to have to deal with them once they have joined. In this situation political cooperation has been used as a gesture of goodwill, but this adds to the delay and difficulties of these countries' accession. I therefore hope that appropriate measures will be taken in good time to avoid difficulties when the time for accession comes.

It is a little known fact that we have already reached an agreement on Mediterranean farm products. That was an initial result. Those in this House who have complained that we neglect the southern part of the Community are therefore mistaken. On the contrary, we are very active in that area and hope to achieve effective solutions with the help of social and regional measures.

I would like to thank all those who have so far made a positive contribution. I am thinking of Mr Antonozzi,

Mr Hänsch and Mr Van Miert and others who in their reports urged that we should strive for better relations and an improvement in the situation.

Finally, it is clear that there is a basic desire in this House to achieve progress in Europe, to improve relations between the institutions and to achieve the best possible understanding between the Council and Parliament. During the Belgian presidency we shall do our utmost to bring this about.

(*FR*) To avoid any misunderstandings, I repeat that the Belgian presidency will do all it can to improve the position of Parliament and relations between the Council and the Members of this House.

To wind up, I would like to refer to a comment by my compatriot, Mr De Gucht. He mentioned the Titanic disaster, saying that the designer of that ship cannot have been proud of not having foreseen the catastrophe. By the same token, he feels that my report is worthless because of the disasters which await us.

I would say in answer to Mr De Gucht that the designer of the Titanic could have been very proud of his work. What caused the loss of the ship was the lack of wisdom and skill of those in charge of it. I would therefore appeal to Parliament to act with wisdom and skill.

(*Applause*)

President. — I wish to thank the President-in-Office of the Council for the answers he has just given. I echo the words of all those who have wished him luck and I hope that he will not encounter too many icebergs.

4. *Membership of committees (vote)*

President. — The next item is the vote on the membership of Parliament's committees.

I call Mr Bangemann.

Mr Bangemann. — (*DE*) Mr President, neither my group nor I have any objections to these lists but I feel this is the right time to inform the House about something in connection with this item on the agenda. I should like to announce that the Bureau, and thereafter the House of course, will be involved in realigning the terms of reference of the Political Affairs Committee and the Legal Affairs Committee on the subject of human rights. I think this point is of interest to the House.

President. — Thank you for your announcement. We shall take note of it.

President

I call Mr Pannella on a point of order.

Mr Pannella. — (*FR*) Mr President, Rule 92 states that committee members shall be elected during the first part-session following the reelection of Parliament. Nominations are addressed to the Bureau which places them before Parliament. I think I am right in saying that the nominations have been addressed to the Bureau and that the enlarged Bureau has considered them.

Our new President has stressed that he intends to define the terms of reference of the various institutions. I note that we have started with some confusion, which is perhaps not serious but which legally speaking still amounts to confusion. I would point out that the Rules of Procedure must be followed more carefully.

President. — I can assure you, Mr Pannella, that the proposals in question were in fact drawn up by the Bureau.

I call Lady Elles.

Lady Elles. — Mr President, I just want to be certain that this matter of the competencies of the committees is being decided by the Bureau before being presented to Parliament. I just wanted a reassurance on that point.

President. — Of course, Lady Elles, I can give you that reassurance.

I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (*FR*) Mr President, I thought things were quite different at the meetings of the enlarged Bureau and the chairmen of the committees. Naturally, I am always delighted when our plenary powers are reinstated, but we ought to behave in a more precise fashion.

President. — The appointments of members of committees are therefore ratified.¹

5. Joint debate (continuation)

President. — The next item is the continuation of the joint debate on the statement by the President-in-

Office of the Council and the motions for resolutions on Turkey and Poland.

I call Mr Romualdi.

Mr Romualdi. — (*IT*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I regret the fact that Mr Tindemans has practically wound up this debate before all those with their names down to speak have had their say. There have already been other occasions when we have complained about this rather strange practice because we assume — although I am reluctant to say so for myself — that we all have some small contribution to make to the discussion.

At any rate, having listened carefully to Mr Tindemans' first speech and also to the one he has just made, I wanted to say to him that he has come forward as the President of the Council with a programme which is extremely vast. We really do hope that it will be possible to retain at least part of this programme, and I say this because — up to now unfortunately — we have made a great many promises but have actually achieved very little. For a time Mr Tindemans was known in Italy as the advocate of a Europe progressing at two speeds, since he had produced a report — which he himself mentioned here today — which more or less said that it was impossible for all the Community Member States to advance at the same speed, to such an extent that it was thought that Europe was threatened with two different types of development towards two different aims and maybe even with two different goals in view!

But in recent years — alas — Europe has not advanced at either speed; it has practically ground to a halt and it is difficult to see how it could resume its progress and go forward given the conditions in which it finds itself — described by Mr Tindemans — especially the critical economic conditions which he underlined. Mr Tindemans reminded us of what he had written in his report, which dates from 1974, if I am not mistaken. At that time he asked himself the question: why are we building Europe? When he asked himself this question, he thought that he was able to provide an answer, namely, that in the years immediately following the war, the threat of a cold war and the need to pool all the available resources and to collaborate to reconstruct what had been destroyed during the war as quickly as possible had acted as a spur and given a great boost to European unification. That was followed — said Mr Tindemans in his report — by a period of prosperity and détente when people did not feel the same need or urgency to build Europe.

At this moment in time, in the light of the political situation and the faltering policy of détente, which I referred to just now, as well as the social and economic crisis we are in, I should like us all to commit ourselves to making a firm and positive effort.

¹ *Motions for resolutions entered in the register (Rule 49): see minutes.*

Romualdi

Given the gravity of our present problems, they should at least act as a spur for us to get moving again. This is our earnest hope, among other reasons because we do not think that the political problems listed in the Tindemans report and with which we are confronted almost daily are problems which can be faced — as some would like us to do — separately: all our political problems should be regarded as aspects of a whole. The problems of the Middle East are indeed nerve-wracking but they are linked to those of the Persian Gulf and of many other countries stretching as far as the Indian Ocean and the Horn of Africa, and they are also linked with all the political, economic and social questions which affect the Third World. When all these problems are taken together they practically add up to the entire North-South dialogue which we have not yet managed to promote any further. In turn, this last set of problems is also at the basis of East-West relations, which are dominated by a ploy of the Soviet Union which, through its satellite countries, is trying to encircle the free, Western world in a struggle in which all the countries of the world are involved to a certain extent.

The problem of Poland must be examined within this context. Woe betide us if we delude ourselves that the problem in Poland is simply that human rights have been violated. When communist Poland, communist Russia and the other communist countries signed the Helsinki Agreements, we already knew that they had no intention of committing themselves to human rights but merely wanted to gain official approval for the Yalta agreement which had divided Europe — and which everyone is talking about nowadays without actually saying that this division has been sanctioned and approved by Helsinki.

That is why we should like the Polish question to be considered a central issue, as the most dramatic emblem of a situation which involves the balance of power and peace in the world and the balance between safety and freedom. That is the contribution — albeit late — that I wished to make to this debate and I hereby conclude.

IN THE CHAIR: LADY ELLES

Vice-President

President. — I call Mr Plaskovitis.

Mr Plaskovitis. — (GR) Madam President, since Mr Tindemans stated that 'owing to the weather' he was obliged to leave the House before hearing all the speakers, I also definitely think that there would perhaps be very little point, in his absence, in going into PASOK's views on what he said. It is, however, typical that, while once again unreservedly stressing

his opposition to and dismay at what has happened in Poland, he hardly managed to say a few words on the situation in Turkey, despite the fact that anguished voices have been heard from all sides. But Mr Tindemans wants to negotiate, be concerned and hope for liberalization, and to appeal to the Consultative Assembly, which is drawing up a new constitution, the constitution of a republic to the liking of Turkey's military dictators, and he still keeps on hoping for an improvement of the situation within certain time limits. We are aware of this, and in Greece we experienced the same thing for eight whole years until the danger of disaster and war in the Middle East and the resistance of the Greek people managed to overthrow the Greek dictators.

But what Mr Tindemans repeated here and in his second speech shows the mentality which persists, this incorrigible error from which the international organizations and our own Parliament are suffering, or perhaps not the Parliament itself but either those who wish to speak on behalf of Parliament or those who have promised that they will cooperate with this Parliament. In the meantime, Madam President, we are receiving an increasing number of telegrams about new tortures being inflicted on people who have done nothing but claim their workers' and trade unionists' rights in Turkey. In the meantime, Mr Bayülken, as Turkish Minister of Defence, yesterday delivered statements from which I should just like to raise one or two points. He said that Greece's attitude, if it remains the same, will ultimately lead to disappointment and that the Turkish armed forces are prepared to deal with any eventuality. This was stated yesterday by the Defence Minister of Turkey, which is supposed to belong to the West, which is supposed to be an ally, which is supposed to be receiving or at least negotiating aid from the European Community and which at present, as is perfectly usual for dictators everywhere, is threatening peace in the Middle East.

What does Mr Trindemans' concern about the Middle East mean? Israel is occupying the Golan Heights, the Turks are threatening peace in the way just described, and tension is continuing in the Middle East as a result of the fact that Cyprus has been occupied for eight years, while at the moment Turkish forces are every day violating human and political rights in Cyprus. Despite all this, we continue to hope that the regime will become more liberal, we continue to hope that without any substantial action on our part the Turkish people will be able to liberate itself from the rulers who are oppressing it and who constitute a danger throughout the Eastern Mediterranean.

I very much regret that Mr Tindemans is not here to listen once again to the anguished voice of a representative of a country which, after what it suffered and sacrificed during the Second World War and during the troubles which followed it, wants and hopes for nothing more than peace, détente and human decency throughout the world.

Plaskovitis

That is what I wanted to say, Madam President, and that I regret that 'owing to the weather' Mr Tindemans was unable to hear all the voices which are represented in this European Parliament.

President. — The Chair joins you in your regret that the Council was not here to hear your statement and will ensure that Mr Tindemans receives a copy of the speeches which were made on this subject after his departure.

I call Mr Habsburg.

Mr Habsburg. — (DE) Madam President, like Mr Plaskovitis, I regret that the Council is no longer represented, for we now rather have the feeling that our speeches have 'missed the bus'. On the other hand, I am glad to have this opportunity to welcome you, Madam President, and to tell you how pleased we are that you are now chairing our proceedings.

In his speech, the President-in-Office of the Council made a number of very welcome observations, which were the more so since we know the author of the Tindemans report to be a genuine European. This is especially true of his remark concerning the Council's unanimity rule, which has all too often made that institution the agent of narrow-minded nineteenth century nationalism and thus has added considerably to the difficulties and setbacks of European politics.

Mr Tindemans is also an expert on foreign policy, which is of vital importance to us today since we can no longer ignore the great dangers of Soviet aspirations of world domination. Mrs Thatcher has rightly commented that the United Kingdom joined the Community more for reasons of security than for economic reasons. The most important problem of foreign policy at present for us Europeans is the situation in Poland, since it is becoming clearer every day that those observers who have known since the military takeover that the dictator Jaruzelski is merely the puppet of the foreign dominant power were right. Kabul and Warsaw differ only in form, not in substance. This was a point made clearly by my good friend, Adam Fergusson, and I can only echo his words.

Mr Tindemans has told us that he will be speaking on behalf of the Community at the CSCE follow-up conference at the beginning of February. I welcome this and would ask him to make it quite clear that we Europeans find it unacceptable, under any circumstances, that on the orders of an imperialist super-power Poland should be robbed of its self-determination and the Poles of their freedom. As long as the situation in Poland remains unchanged, there can be no real *détente* — if indeed it has ever existed. The Political Affairs Committee will also be discussing Poland next week, since the motions for resolutions

which have been tabled are being referred to it in agreement with their authors. I hope that we shall then adopt the suggestion by Mr Klepsch and Mrs Maciocchi of sending a delegation from the European Parliament to Poland to talk to all the forces in that country, to study the situation, draft a report and make proposals.

I also welcome the suggestion that food aid for Poland should be continued only as long as we are completely sure that it is the people of Poland and not their oppressors who benefit. The danger that Community aid will be misused does not depend solely on the countries which receive it. It is built into our relations with the State-trading countries, since these enjoy a monopoly as buyers and can therefore choose their partners on the basis of political considerations. I need only mention the name Jean-Baptiste Doumeng to make my point clear. Even the Commission, which has been depressingly discreet in this affair, has admitted that this person is involved with supplies to Poland, but it will not tell us what profits he is making, and so suspicion has naturally arisen.

It is our democratic duty towards those who elected us, that is the taxpayers of Europe, to make this aspect of foreign trade much more transparent than it has been in the past. We have a right to know whether anyone stands to gain from the generosity of the people of Europe, and if so, who.

The President-in-Office of the Council has taken on a difficult task. We trust that the author of the Tindemans report will not disappoint our high hopes.

President. — I call Mrs Boserup.

Mrs Boserup. — (DA) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, my Party has said clearly on numerous occasions that it dissociates itself from the violations of fundamental freedoms in Turkey and Poland and I will therefore not spend any time on this. Instead I would use the little time at my disposal to comment on what the President of the Council, Mr Tindemans, has had to say and not spend time considering the usefulness of doing such a thing.

The name Tindemans is a household word in my country since the Tindemans' report of 1975 on European Union almost became a best-seller in Denmark. The Danish translation was sold out long ago and we cherish our dog-eared and tattered old copies. Why should this little Scandinavian Member State take such a great interest in Mr Tindemans' report? To be quite frank, it is because we regard it with a mixture of repudiation and aversion.

The Tindemans' report said — and this has just been repeated — that the people of Europe should be fired with enthusiasm for European Union and should be

Boserup

persuaded to believe that this would give them a better future. However, the expectations of the working class, whom I represent here and who make up a large proportion of the population, are now very small since they know as well as Mr Tindemans that political power comes after economic power and that the working class will have economic power when they manage to overcome capitalism — and they know full well that they cannot expect any help from the European Community in this respect. For the rest, they have only to read the Commission's fifth economic policy programme which states, among other things, that all we can expect is that the percentage of unemployed will remain stable.

Why should the workers and the 10 million unemployed have any enthusiasm for this, I should like to know! Aren't people expecting a little too much? I know at any rate that it is difficult to arouse enthusiasm.

However, whether there is enthusiasm or not, the plans for European Union are brought out at regular intervals and touched up. At the moment these plans go under the name of the Genscher-Colombo proposal, and it is typical of these broad proposals incidentally that they aim at concentrating power in the European Council and downgrading the Treaties in favour of political cooperation, cooperation between the governments and ministerial meetings where the right of veto is very limited. And why does Mr Tindemans insist that if Spain and Portugal accede to the Community the right of veto will have to be abolished? As I see it, it should be the other way around. The more we are the more cautious we should be, as otherwise we might end up flying in the face of both old and new Member States.

I see that the time available to me has unfortunately come to an end so I will finish by saying that I have strong reservations about Mr Tindemans' wish for a common position at the Disarmament Conference. We in Denmark have nothing to do with European States who act as death merchants.

President. — I call Mr von Hassel.

Mr von Hassel. — (DE) Madame President, before the matter is forgotten, I would like to say that the European People's Party, in accordance with the suggestion made this morning by Mr Hänsch, is withdrawing the motion for a resolution by Mr Klepsch, because it is to be discussed next week in the Political Affairs Committee.

Unfortunately, however, a great deal of time has been spent today just discussing Turkey. I regret this, since it is customary during plenary sessions of Parliament not to hold detailed debates until the Political Affairs Committee has discussed the motions for resolution

before it — and it has received many concerning Turkey — and has passed them on in the form of a recommendation to be discussed by Parliament. The Political Affairs Committee has already completed the first reading of the report, of which I was appointed rapporteur. This report was submitted before the summer recess in 1981. The first reading in October prompted only a few minor observations and I, as rapporteur, was to return to Turkey to update the report. Suffice it to say in this connection that Parliament's Bureau did not approve this journey.

We are all united in abhorring the obvious violation of a large number of important principles. All of us, both in Parliament and in the Council — which will be discussing the same topic next week on the basis of carefully researched evidence and the results of journeys made by delegations to Turkey — have condemned violations of human rights, torture and executions, wherever they are perpetrated, whether in Iran, Afghanistan or Turkey. We all think — and on this point this House is of one mind — that the rights of trade unions should be restored and guaranteed and that the death sentences which have been passed should not be carried out. We do not think that we are interfering in Turkey's internal affairs or violating its sovereignty by speaking out against the death penalty.

But we Christian Democrats object to a practice which was very much in evidence here this morning — for example, in the Communists' speech on their motions for resolution and in that of Mr Pannella — in which the situation in Poland and Turkey are treated the same. While Turkey was still a democracy, there were about 25 deaths a day resulting from terrorism. In Poland a free trade union has been trying by peaceful means to reform society, but there were no deaths until the military government intervened and martial law was declared. One of the reasons for the adverse development in Poland is that Poland was subject to outside influences, pressure was applied by the Kremlin and Poland's neighbours in the socialist bloc pressed the Poles to let the military take over. Turkey is now 're-democratizing' itself — quite a different process. In Poland the opposite is happening. There, the freedom won by Solidarity is now being stifled.

With regard to Turkey I therefore think we have every reason to support the re-democratization process; but now we fear — and I am sorry that Mrs Gredal is not present — that there is no desire to go to Turkey to examine the situation on the spot or, for example, to discuss with the leader of the party friendly to us, Mr Ecevit, what the Europeans should actually do. If you were willing to travel to Turkey, Mr Ecevit would make it very clear to you that all aid for Turkey and all links between Turkey and the West should be maintained and strengthened and not interrupted or scrapped, because that is the only way in which the re-democratization process can be placed on a sound footing. Although it has been said in the motions for resolutions and in the speeches made here that the

von Hassel

actions of the military government in Turkey have so far given no cause for confidence, I would point out that my report presented at the end of May 1981 mentioned Turkey's plans with regard to a timetable; this timetable has so far been observed.

I therefore think that before we discontinue and cut off everything we should wait and consider helping Turkey to return to democracy — and we cannot achieve this condemning the Turks but by helping and cooperating with them, which will make the road to democracy easier than if we now break off everything and abandon them. Chaos would then soon return.

President. — I call Mr Bournias.

Mr Bournias. — *(GR)* Madam President, I have already had an opportunity to severely condemn those who are responsible for the Polish tragedy, who are responsible for the agony of the Polish people. Today, unfortunately, I do not have time to repeat or expand upon what I have said on this issue. I shall simply confine myself, speaking on behalf of the representatives of the New Democracy Party, to presenting a statement on Turkey:

The representatives of the New Democracy Party would like to draw the Assembly's attention to the question of the re-establishment of democracy in Turkey. We shall be shouldering a major responsibility if we confine ourselves to sending people to Turkey to study the well-known facts and if we allow the flagrant violation of human rights to continue — the executions, the official terror exercised by the Turkish junta and the oppression of the Greek population in Cyprus. Accordingly, we declare that we will vote in favour of the motions in question. Personally, Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I have no doubt that the Assembly's vote will be condemnatory of the Turkish Government. This is our duty to our electors in the ten countries that constitute the Community. Otherwise the authority of the European Parliament will suffer irreparable damage.

President. — I call Mr Beyer de Ryke.

Mr Beyer de Ryke. — *(FR)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, you see me in a very jovial and happy mood this evening. My joy springs from the friendship and the deep feeling I wish to express in greeting Lady Elles as President. I congratulate you from my heart.

My happiness stems from a discovery I have made. You see, ladies and gentlemen, until this moment, I had been having a vision of night falling and ghosts wandering through the guardroom of a Scottish castle and now, here in the afternoon, I find instead that a ghost has come to haunt the benches of this Chamber in Strasbourg and I must address my words to him.

That is what I would have said to Mr Tindemans, a man who many mistakenly believe to be racked with the doubts of a Hamlet.

I am right to say that they are mistaken because, on this occasion, Mr Tindemans had no doubts at all. When it came to choosing between Parliament and the train, he opted for the latter . . .

(NL) Mr President of the Council, I still have friendly feelings towards you and should like to welcome you in Parliament's midst, in the Parliament in which you always occupied a prominent position. Now you are here as Minister of Foreign Affairs in the Belgian Government, together with you Under-Secretary of State, Paul De Keersmaecker, whom I also welcome. Then there is Willy De Clercq in the post of Minister of Finance, and let us not forget André Damseaux in the provincial government. These are all former Members of the European Parliament who now hold ministerial posts in the new Belgian Government.

(The speaker continued in French)

Well, I am quite overwhelmed. At least, that is what I was going to say just now. I was going to say that I was overwhelmed because we were going to be able to take for granted an excellent and superb relationship which was going to — or, at least, should have been — cemented between the European Parliament and the Belgian Presidency. We seemed to be offered such promise, and already we are dashed with such disappointment! (Remember I wrote these words before Mr Tindemans had departed.) It is sad to think of so much disappointment so soon!

Yesterday, we elected a President. As you know, his election was the outcome of dissension among his political enemies, and of the obstinacy and stubbornness of some individuals. I suppose that the circumstances and results, the legitimate bitterness felt, the blows struck and the wounds suffered are all of scant importance since we do at least have a President. I have no doubt that he is an admirable fellow and here he is, the proud possessor of a right conferred on him by this Assembly. Ever since then, Mr President of the Council, I have regretted the fact — I would have regretted it in your presence and the regret is doubled since you are not here — that you yourself were not present yesterday to witness the splendour of the links between the Council, the Parliament and the Commission — represented by Gaston Thorn. A golden rule is never to fluff entrances, you see. Well, what were we offered this morning? We were offered in a Chamber that was far too empty, a speech which made all the right noises. In theatrical parlance, it would have been known as a flop, Mr President of the Council . . .

Yesterday, when he made his maiden speech as President, Mr Dankert quoted a phrase of David Wood's, applying it to Europe: 'A presence, if not a power'.

Beyer de Ryke

The Council, representing the Member States, is the main holder of such power, or at least it would be if its members could agree more often among themselves.

Mr Tindemans, you certainly have talent as a peace-maker. You should carry on in this role, but at the same time you should make an effort to stimulate your partners into action. Parliament feels that it must goad you on and it will do so. It will act as a goad on the Middle East question. In April, the deadline for the evacuation of the Sinai will expire. What will the post-Camp David situation be? How will Europe's policy be defined? The crux of the problem is to reconcile the rights and aspirations of two different populations, two races: the Jews and the Arabs. While listening to the radio this morning, I caught these words spoken by Moshe Dayan and evoked in a very moving way by his wife; what he said was so true, so obvious and so profound and remember, he was addressing his own people to convince them of the truth of it. He said: 'We must live *with* the Arabs, and not in their stead'. As Europeans, it is our task to help them find the place which is rightly theirs, without provoking in Israel any more massacres, from which we ourselves would sooner or later perish.

We must be guided by a spirit of wishing to bring freedom to people, not enslaving them: that is Europe's task. How can we in Europe do anything but lament when we see that one of the nations in our midst from the beginning of our history is bound and suffering? It is not enough to pray for Poland. We must do something, act more promptly than we have done up to now and in a way which is both decisive and yet not rash.

I hope that the Madrid Conference will transform itself into a trial of Helsinki. Then we shall see who is guilty of killing *détente*. But time is getting on, Madam President, and I have no wish to flout the rules of this House, even though more serious violations have taken place.

I should like to conclude, if I may, with a little anecdote which is also about Mr Tindemans. I remember that I interviewed him one day about one of his predecessors, a Belgian Foreign Affairs Minister. I shall be kind enough not to mention his name. I asked Mr Tindemans what he thought about the policy of his predecessor. He replied: 'Oh, I know him well, I know him very well, in fact he's a friend of mine. He's been my friend for a long while. Do you really want to ask me about his ideas and his political acts?'. After hesitating for a moment, he replied 'Well, I really couldn't tell you'.

Well, Mr Tindemans, after you have been President for six months, I hope that nobody here will be unkind enough to ask you the same question. I hope you will be spared this and I hope that we, Europeans and Members of this European Parliament, will also be spared this.

(*Applause*)

President. — The debate is closed.

The motions for resolutions, by Mr Fanti and Mr Piquet and by Mr Pannella, will be put to the vote tomorrow at 9 a.m.

6. *Brucellosis, tuberculosis and leucosis in cattle*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-930/81) by Mr Maher, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on the

proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-726/81) for a directive amending Directive 77/391/EEC and introducing a supplementary Community measure for the eradication of brucellosis, tuberculosis and leucosis in cattle.

I call the rapporteur.

Mr Maher, rapporteur. — Madam President, may I take this opportunity to congratulate you on your election as Vice-President of the Parliament. It is nice to see that we have a lady in the chair. It is only a pity that there are not a lot more of them to maintain a balance with the men. I think that there is still perhaps an element of male dominance in this Parliament. There is a long way to go in this regard, but I am very pleased to see you there.

Madam President, for many years now the member countries of the European Community have been battling with animal disease, particularly brucellosis, tuberculosis and leucosis in their cattle herds. I don't have to tell this Parliament that these diseases are a serious threat to the health of human beings who consume the products from these animals, either eating the meat or consuming the milk in the case of dairy cows. These diseases are also of great concern in terms of the health and welfare of the animals affected by them. They inhibit free trade between the member countries and affect the income position of farmers, because diseased animals do not produce as well as animals that are healthy. It is important therefore for many reasons that we get rid of these diseases as rapidly as possible.

The European Community was so convinced of this that in 1977 it was decided to provide aid from the Community to the member countries engaged in the struggle against these diseases. It was probably believed at that time that by 1981 we would be on the last lap or even that we would already have reached the point where these diseases were no longer a threat. Unhappily that is not the case. In some countries there is still too high an incidence of these diseases. Hence the Commission is proposing that aid for these eradi-

Maher

cation programmes be continued for a further two years. The Committee on Agriculture took the view that we must support that move in order to try to ensure that we finally get rid of these troublesome diseases.

Of course, there is one side-effect of the eradication programmes that should not be overlooked. Slaughter of animals is the main means by which we eradicate these diseases, and in the case of dairy cows this has an impact on milk production in the European Community. This has been a very difficult problem for farmers. On the other hand it might be looked upon by some people as a positive effect, in the sense that as a result of the slaughtering programme there is less milk than there would be otherwise. However, I feel that we have to try to ensure that no further time is lost and that inside the next two years we can make an end of it and arrive at healthy herds in so far as these diseases are concerned.

If we ask why we have not made more progress, there are many reasons that could be given. One reason was that there wasn't available from the member governments — indeed this is borne out by the fact that the Community decided to intervene in 1977 with further finance — adequate compensation to enable the income position of farmers to be reasonably protected when the diseased animals were being taken from their farms. So the question of adequate financing or adequate compensation is exceedingly important in this fight against disease. It is the view of the Committee on Agriculture that if we are to reach the final stage in the next two years, it is important that the resources available are adequate, in other words, that the maximum number of diseased animals can be taken out of the herds and slaughtered in the shortest possible time.

Because of that, Madam President, the Committee on Agriculture has decided that the amounts proposed by the Commission should, in fact, be increased by 50%, so that an all-out attack can be made. The committee feels that if this is not done, then there is a danger that these diseases may drag on far beyond the two years and that we will have to spend a great deal more money before we finally reach the point where we have seen the end of them. The main recommendation coming from the Committee on Agriculture is that these financial resources be increased by 50%. It takes the form of an amendment, Amendment No 4, from the Committee on Agriculture which I am recommending to this Parliament.

We have three other amendments from the European Democratic Group in the name of Mr Provan and others. Two of the amendments add nothing to the existing text in my opinion. The third amendment is directly opposed to the recommendation from the Committee on Agriculture in the form of our unanimously adopted amendment seeking to increase the amount of resources. That particular amendment from

the European Democratic Group suggested that no further financing be made available over and above that being proposed by the Commission.

Madam President, that ends my comments on this report.

President. — I would like to thank you for your personal wishes and perhaps to recall that I follow a very distinguished woman President in this Parliament and that our present tasks are shared with another woman Vice-President, Mrs de March. I am not the only woman, but I am grateful for your comments.

I call the Socialist Group.

Mr Gautier. — (*DE*) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, during our debate on agriculture in December last year, Mr Maher and I had the pleasure of arguing whether or not unhappy hens lay more eggs. No doubt this topic will be taken up again shortly.

The subject of today's debate is somewhat more agreeable and more pertinent, as there is basic agreement among all the different groups. On behalf of the Socialist Group, I should like to say that we intend to support the Commission's proposal.

Mr Maher has just listed the most important aspects of the problem: health, costs, and also the obstacles to trade between Member States which continue to arise, particularly as a result of brucellosis. We also approve in substance the Commission's report on the success of the first three-year programme, although we do have some doubts as to whether this programme was uniformly so successful and wonder whether the Commission should not in fact take more care to ensure that Member States conscientiously implement this programme. I say this because some of the tables give us cause for concern — especially, Mr Maher, where your country is concerned. For example, the number of vaccinations against brucellosis has increased drastically in your country, which was not the purpose of the programme. I think that it is up to the Commission to introduce measures to discourage this tendency.

The difference of opinion between the Socialist Group and the majority of members on the Committee on Agriculture relates to the question of costs. Amendment No 4 by the Committee on Agriculture proposes that the subsidy per cow should be raised from 72.5 ECU — as proposed by the Commission — to 108.75 ECU. This would entail the additional disbursement of more than 17.5 million ECU from the agricultural fund and my group does not believe that this can be justified. We therefore appeal to the Commission — following a favourable decision by Parliament, which we assume will be forthcoming — to abide by its original proposal.

Gautier

We have a further objection, based on the fact that we cannot understand why Member States which carry out a programme promptly should be rewarded with far less money than those which allow themselves all the time in the world. If subsidies were to be raised as drastically as the Committee on Agriculture suggests during the programme, this would encourage some Member States to drag their feet over implementing the measures and to wait a couple of years on the off-chance that they would get even more money later.

We feel that we have to vote against the report by the Committee on Agriculture if European resources are to be managed in a responsible manner. The Socialist Group will therefore support the three amendments tabled by Mr Provan on behalf of the British Conservatives.

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

Mr Helms. — (DE) Madam President, I have already extended my best wishes to you privately and now I am able to repeat them here in this House. I wish you every success in your work for this Parliament.

Ladies and gentlemen, the 1977 directive for a three-year period of measures to eradicate brucellosis, tuberculosis and leucosis ought to be extended for a further two years, as the rapporteur has already explained.

The Commission's report which now lies before the Parliament makes it clear that unless the disease eradication measures are extended they cannot be brought to any successful conclusion. The relatively short time period laid down in 1977 has not been enough for all the Member States to carry out the measurements and tests needed to eradicate these dangerous cattle diseases. Nevertheless, in those Member States where the measures have been applied in a decisive and systematic manner, outstanding results in combating these diseases and illnesses have been achieved and that gives us the courage to believe that they can be completely eradicated in two years.

Now it turns out that leucosis has been on the increase again in some Member States, as an increased number of new cases has been recorded. Apart from the danger to cattle and the by no means inconsiderable material losses sustained in livestock production — since these diseases can flare up at any time — there is, in my opinion, another important aspect to consider when eradicating these diseases: we need to protect human beings from these insidious and dangerous illnesses; in other words, we need to safeguard them from infection. There is an urgent need to continue with these measures for this reason alone, namely the danger to the health of all citizens in our Community.

The measures we have had up to now need to be extended — as the two previous speakers have already pointed out — for yet another reason: to abolish existing or incipient obstacles to trade. We are all well aware how many obstacles to trade within the Community still exist and I certainly believe that we should avoid adding any further ones. For this reason, I welcome, on behalf of the EPP Group, the Commission's proposal to extend the campaign against these diseases, as it is absolutely essential.

I should like to stress how grateful we are to Mr Maher for the excellent report he compiled. It is certainly thanks to him that his report was adopted by a large majority in the Committee on Agriculture. On behalf of the EPP Group I should like to state that we will give our wholehearted support to the report in the form in which it was adopted by the Committee on Agriculture even with the modifications and rises — of costs, for example — which have already been mentioned. I will come back to that in a minute. On this point there were no differences of opinion between the various Groups and although the previous speaker has just said that these rises in costs are not admissible, I feel that both the rise in costs and the rise in the compensatory subsidy for animals and hence an increase in the fund of around 17.5 million ECU are all essential, if we are to be able to bring matters to a successful conclusion within two years.

We believe that these measures should be brought to a halt in two years' time, as should the rise in costs and the improved subsidy, which are necessary at the present time, not just because of our current inflation rate but also because they are really needed to motivate all those concerned with this problem. What is really crucial is to encourage those involved in cattle production to give these measures their wholehearted support.

I should like to ask the Commission to correct any shortcomings in the Member States' schemes over the next two years. We expect the Council to take action immediately and hope that all those involved — particularly cattle producers — will give their firm support to these sensible and imperative measures.

President. — I call the European Democratic Group.

Mr Provan. — Madam President, may I, like my colleagues, welcome you to the chair. We are quite convinced in our group, having nominated you and got you elected, that your talents and authority will have a substantial influence on the future role of this Parliament and we wish you well.

I have a special interest in this debate because my wife was afflicted with brucellosis as a result of drinking cream whilst on holiday. I also had a herd with brucellosis slaughtered after importing some cattle which

Provan

passed on the disease when added to my herd. We therefore welcome the Commission's proposal to extend the right to eradicate this serious disease.

We do not believe, however, that it is right in principle to increase the level of financial contributions to the Member States's percentage. We think that that is wrong because if you start increasing the percentage after a five-year programme it will mean that in all future programmes we are likely to see dilatoriness coming in and Member States not taking up the cudgels to fight the battle early enough, hoping that at the end of the day they will get an increased contribution from the Community. We believe that that principle has got to be adhered to, not only in this scheme, but for all future schemes, and that is the subject of my amendments and why we have them down to Mr Maher's report.

Otherwise we find it a good report and my other amendments are purely technical to try and clean up the rest of the paragraphs to make them fit.

President. — I call Mr Eyraud.

Mr Eyraud. — (*FR*) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I am afraid that we are obliged — and I hope you will excuse me — to get involved in quite a technical discussion, since we are tackling the tricky subject of the eradication of a set of diseases, namely, tuberculosis, brucellosis and leucosis, which affect animals in the Community. We need to consider the medical aspect of the problem, the consequences on milk and meat production and the financial implications involved. In the case of tuberculosis and brucellosis in particular, we need only point out that these contagious animal diseases can have serious consequences on human health — our colleague Mr Provan has already alluded to this — which have been and still are extremely serious in a number of regions in the Community.

While it is true that tuberculosis has receded to a great extent in Europe during the last forty years, thanks to the action of various antibiotics on acid-fast bacteria such as Koch's bacillus, it nevertheless remains true that a number of cases of tuberculosis are still seen in hospitals in rural areas. Whenever an epidemiological survey is carried out, it is often discovered that the reinfection of a flock of sheep is at the origin of the outbreak.

In the case of brucellosis, it is even more true to say that the brucellosis bacterium affecting sheep or goats — which is very widespread within the Mediterranean area — and that affecting cattle and human beings, better known by the name of Malta fever, are interchangeable where infection is concerned.

The eradication of these diseases has had an effect on production, since over a million — a high figure —

head of cattle were slaughtered in 1978, 1979 and 1980. The figures for 1981 are not yet known, but I believe that they will be lower than those of previous years because these diseases have not been so prevalent, thanks to prophylactic measures. By the end of 1981, approximately 1 400 000 cattle had been slaughtered and there are about 400 000 at most which need to be slaughtered in the two years to come and for which it is proposed to extend Directive 77-391.

Having considered these figures, and also the geographical area where the diseases are prevalent, especially brucellosis and tuberculosis, the French Socialists do not think it is admissible for the Commission to draw a connection between prophylaxis and milk production or meat production from cattle which, as it happens, is just about self-sufficient, since it amounted to about 7 million tonnes in 1980, before Greece came into the Community. What in fact often happens is that the farms which need to be reached are in mountainous or deprived areas where farmers have little choice but to raise livestock. They are therefore obliged either to give up farming and join the ranks of the unemployed or to replace completely their stock. That is why it is essential to take prophylactic measures to combat these diseases and at the same time to make use of complementary measures, such as that contained in Amendment No 1 tabled by the Committee on Agriculture to increase the slaughtering subsidy by 50% to a level of 108.5 ECU for each bovine animal slaughtered.

According to my calculations, this would not give rise to an expenditure of 52.5 million ECU, but only of about 43 million. Even though a majority has come out against this increase in the Socialist Group, we, the French, believe that such a measure will help to safeguard human health both by its power to encourage the Member States to extend their national campaigns against cattle diseases and to encourage their farmers as well.

President. — I call Mr McCartin.

Mr McCartin. — Madam President, first of all I would like to congratulate you on your elevation to this office and to say that I sincerely believe that you will perform your duties there with the same concern and efficiency that you have always done in every office that you have taken up.

I would like, with Mr Provan, to declare my personal interest in the eradication of animal diseases since I too have more than once had to have a herd slaughtered and have suffered serious problems with imported animals, living as I do in an area of low-density agriculture where disease was not very prevalent until we started to import animals from areas where more intensive agricultural methods were carried out.

McCartin

At this point I would like to congratulate the rapporteur on the efficiency with which he prepared the report.

The measures proposed by the Commission are designed to continue the scheme for the eradication of animal diseases for a further two years. The work must be allowed to continue without interruption. I think that it is important that we should not lose the momentum that has built up because we would lose what we have invested so far. I think that the proposal of compensation by the rapporteur and the Committee on Agriculture is a very good one since inflation has played havoc with the amount of money that was made available. The argument put forward by Mr Provan is invalid in that this disease is still with us. If we are to eradicate it for the sake of human welfare in this Community and to improve the efficiency of our food and agricultural industry then I think we must provide farmers with the incentive to eradicate this disease from their herds.

I think the flat-rate contribution provided by the Community is low compared with the value of animals slaughtered. The more prosperous Member States, it should be pointed out, have paid farmers the full market value of animals eliminated from herds as a result of this disease. Of course we should not confuse this with compensation because compensation means compensating farmers for the resultant disruption of their particular system. We have not done this anywhere but what we have sought to do in some countries, and still do in several Member States such as the United Kingdom, is to see that farmers get full market value for stock slaughtered. In other countries this is not the case, so here again we have a national aid in some countries over and above what is available in the others. I think the proposal to increase this is reasonable.

I would suggest that the rapporteur has been rather conservative in his estimate of what farmers actually need by way of an increase. I think the better results obtained in some Member States were due not only to the technical efficiency with which the schemes were implemented but also to the level of compensation paid to farmers. The real cost of the eradication scheme to the Community is probably negligible at the present moment because of the reduction in milk production caused by the slaughter of herds and there is no reason therefore why the Commission should not agree with the amendment proposed by the Committee on Agriculture. I think all the other points I intended to make have been made.

President. — I call the Commission.

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (DE) As the last speaker in this debate, Madam President, I should first of all like to add my own wishes for your success

to the many which have already been pronounced in this House today on the occasion of your being elected Vice-President by a convincing majority. The Commission unreservedly echoes these good wishes.

Firstly, I should like to thank the rapporteur for his painstaking and informative report.

The Commission notes with satisfaction that Parliament has adopted a favourable attitude to its proposal. We are also grateful to the individual speakers in this debate. We will carefully look into all the suggestions that have been made, especially those which concern improvements to monitoring.

To recap on events, let me remind you that Directive 77/391/EEC initiated a programme in 1978 to combat the dangerous diseases of brucellosis, tuberculosis and leucosis in cattle. Since then, the programme has achieved appreciable results. After being found to be infected, more than 1.5 million cattle have been slaughtered, with the result that cases of these diseases have fallen dramatically. It must, however, be admitted that herds in some Member States are still infected. For this reason, it is vital to pursue the measures which have been introduced if we are to achieve complete eradication of the diseases. If the measures were to be discontinued at this stage, this would increase the risk of new infections in herds which have up to now been free of disease, and this would ultimately lead only to a further increase in overall costs. Hence, the purpose of the proposed amending directive is to institute a two-year programme to eradicate the three cattle diseases I have mentioned.

I should just like to say a word about costs. It was estimated that the three-year programme from 1978 would cost about 130 million ECU. So far, 98 million ECU have been used. The remaining 32 million ECU could be used to finance the proposed supplementary programme. These general observations are particularly important with regard to two aspects of Mr Maher's report. In the draft motion for a resolution, a reduction in the amount of milk produced in the Community is connected with a fall in the number of cows due to these veterinary measures being applied. I cannot make the point plainly enough that, since the purpose of these veterinary measures is to improve the health of livestock, they were developed and implemented with veterinary aims in mind. In the Commission's opinion, this principle should continue to be maintained in the future.

The second aspect of the report on which I wish to comment concerns an amendment to Article 5 of the Commission's proposal, namely, the suggestion that the subsidy to farmers affected by the programme should be raised considerably, from 72.5 ECU for each cow to 108.75 ECU. The Commission acknowledges in this suggestion Parliament's desire to promote the eradication of these cattle diseases. We definitely regard this as proof that you approve of our

Narjes

work and as a token of encouragement but, as you all know, we are in a very difficult situation with regard to the budget. For this reason, the Commission believes that the subsidy should be kept at its current level. In this way, we could stay within the financial framework of 130 million ECU that I mentioned just now. I should like to add the further point that, if we were to raise the subsidy to farmers, this would have the effect of condoning the behaviour of those who had dragged their feet for too long before disposing of their sick animals, while at the same time penalizing those farmers who, in accordance with the Commission's and the Community's wishes, immediately cooperated in the eradication of these diseases.

I would therefore ask you all to approve the Commission's proposal in the form in which it was submitted. We would be willing to accept Amendments Nos 1 and 3, but would urge you to reject Amendments Nos 2 and 4 for the reasons which I have just outlined.

President. — The debate is closed. We shall now proceed to the vote.¹

(...)

Paragraph 3 of the motion for a resolution — Amendment No 1

Mr Maher, rapporteur. — Madam President, Amendment No 1 is null and void, because it proposes a direct negation of the decision we have already taken to increase the contribution by 50%. That was the purport of the Committee on Agriculture's Amendment No 4.

President. — Can I assume therefore that Amendment No 1 is withdrawn?

I call Mr Provan.

Mr Provan. — No, Madam President, I would like my amendment to be maintained. I think there was a certain amount of confusion when we took the first amendment, which was in fact to the Commission's proposals. Now we are voting on Mr Maher's report and I think all the amendments to Mr Maher's report, and therefore Parliament's report, should stand.

President. — I call the rapporteur.

Mr Maher, rapporteur. — Well, Madam President, if this Parliament has already decided to advocate an

increase of 50% in the contribution, as proposed by the Commission, then how can Mr Provan's amendment No 1 be accepted? It reads as follows: 'points out that the level of compensation has not been increased since 1977 when it was already considerably lower than the normal 25% EAGGF contributions towards structural improvements; believes however that it would be wrong to raise the level at this stage of the programme as that would discriminate against those that took early action.'

We have already decided to raise the level, Madam President.¹

President. — I call Mr Eyraud.

Mr Eyraud. — (FR) Madam President, I just wanted to say that we voted on an amendment and I see no reason to change it.

President. — I wished to give Mr Provan the opportunity of formally withdrawing his amendment, but since he has not, I think that I must read out to the House Rule 54(2), which says that an amendment shall lapse if it is ruled out by decisions previously taken on the text during the same vote. It would seem to me that this rule applies in this particular case. I hope the House is in agreement with me on this point.

(...)

Paragraph 5 — Amendment No 3

President. — Is the amendment maintained, Mr Provan?

Mr Provan. — It is withdrawn.

President. — I call Mr Gautier.

Mr Gautier. — (DE) I should like to take over the amendment, since I believe there is a rule in this House that an amendment cannot be withdrawn by its author just like that. If an amendment has been tabled and then for reasons of cost the same amendment must not be tabled again, it can be taken over by someone else. I should like to do that in this instance.

(...)

Paragraphs 6 and 7

¹ The report of proceedings gives only those parts of the vote which gave rise to speeches. For a detailed account of the voting, see the minutes.

¹ The rapporteur also spoke: — AGAINST Amendment No 3.

Mr Gautier. — (DE) Madam President, I should like to ask for a separate vote on paragraphs 6 and 7. In the case of the amendment by the Committee on Agriculture there was some confusion over the vote on the directive. A separate vote on paragraphs 6 and 7 would enable us to achieve a clear decision, because in fact we are against paragraph 7 which requests the Commission to incorporate the proposed amendment. As I said, I should like a separate vote on paragraphs 6 and 7.

(...)

President. — Explanations of vote may now be given.

Mr Provan. — I would like to explain my vote because I think we have got into a situation where Members coming into the Chamber altered the initial vote of Parliament on the amendment to the Commission's proposals and I think the votes that followed have shown that the report was not really going to be acceptable in its existing form. Therefore I shall be voting against the report as such, seeing that sufficient Members were not here initially to have the will of the House properly shown.

(Parliament adopted the various texts)

7. Regulation on the movement of goods

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-799/81), drawn up by Mr Carossino on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, on the

proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-449/81) for a regulation introducing arrangements for movement within the Community of goods sent from one Member State for temporary use in one or more other Member States.

I call the rapporteur.

Mr Carossino, rapporteur. — (IT) Madam President, there exists a real and heartfelt need to simplify the frontier formalities affecting the importation of goods for temporary use in one more Member States of the Community, a need which has been supported by this House on many different occasions. The proposal from the Commission to the Council for a regulation implementing arrangements for movement within the Community of goods for temporary use is designed to cater for this need and to facilitate exchanges, especially in frontier regions, of people, businesses and individual workers, who are often forced to carry with them the equipment they need for their work.

This measure is also intended to facilitate other categories of people such as journalists, artists, and musicians who on their trips to various countries are obliged to carry their instruments with them. We are dealing with a small but significant step towards the opening up of frontiers. It is, if you like, a measure which, although limited to a specific sector, is also important on a psychological level to the fostering, among the citizens of Europe, of greater confidence in the Community.

I draw your attention to the legal form of a regulation which was adopted by the Commission for this measure — and is one of its particular merits — because it seems to be the best way of obtaining a uniform procedure throughout all the Member States of the Community. This proposal for a regulation, however, is not designed to change in any way existing agreements such as the ATA agreement which make provision for simple procedures of particular advantage.

During the discussion by the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs on the period of validity of this carnet, two possibilities came to light, either a period of validity of not less than six months with the possibility of almost automatic extension upon simple request by the user, or, perhaps better, the immediate fixation of a period of validity of not less than twelve months. Both options seemed worthy of consideration, but the proposal for a six-month period of validity prevailed on account of the special nature of this simplified procedure which is different from normal authorization procedures and therefore should be distinguished from them by its period of validity. This measure was given the unanimous approval of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, and the Committee asks Parliament both to approve this measure also and to request the Council to adopt it as soon as possible. By simplifying the procedure for the crossing of frontiers and favouring the movement of persons and goods, this measure will contribute to the strengthening of the Common Market.

President. — I call the Socialist Group.

Mr Albers. — (NL) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I am pleased to be able to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group on the excellent report by Mr Carossino and the equally excellent proposal by the Commission. Any question concerning movements from one Member State to another — whether it be of goods or persons — deserves our attention, particularly when we consider that there are still so many obstacles. There are still bottlenecks in the transport of goods and services and we should warmly welcome any proposals likely to alleviate the situation. However, in spite of proposals of this kind checks must continue to be made. This is unavoidable in view of the differences in tax systems and the way excise

Albers

duties are levied and, however regrettable this may be, there is no way of getting away from this fact. When dealing with proposals of this kind, therefore, we should give careful consideration to the forms and formalities required when crossing borders. We welcome the fact that the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs has succeeded in making a few further improvements and bringing about a certain flexibility by means of the amendments it has tabled.

There are two proposed arrangements which must be based on a Regulation by virtue of Article 235 of the Treaty, which means that the decision in the Council must be made unanimously and we hope that this will indeed be the case. On the one hand, there is the question of a Community 'carnet' for temporary movements and on the other hand a simplified arrangement for certain categories. This simplified arrangement, in particular, may be of great significance for movements between border regions. Reference is made, in this context, to artists and sportsmen who need to carry around their works or equipment. The new arrangement will represent a considerable improvement of the situation for these people. However, we were surprised — and I should like once more to draw the attention of the Commission to this point — that market stall-holders were not included in these categories, since in the frontier regions these people regularly travel from one country to another and need to take certain equipment, such as scales etc., with them in order to do their work and I do not think this category should be forgotten since we have frequently been approached by market stall-holders from frontier regions who do in fact encounter difficulties when crossing the border. I should like to draw the attention of the Commission to this point once more.

For the rest, we wholeheartedly support the Commission's proposal with the amendments tabled by the Committee on Monetary Affairs, which we support because they will permit the arrangement to be applied with as much flexibility as possible. We hope that this arrangement will be a step towards a further simplification of customs arrangements, which is so urgently needed in this Community.

IN THE CHAIR: Mr MØLLER

Vice-President

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

Mr von Wogau. — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in his capacity as President-in-Office of the Council, Mr Tindemans this morning drew an

historical comparison when he mentioned the time before the Second World War, the mistakes and heresies in the field of economic policy and the protectionism and autarkic ideas which were rife at that time, and drew attention to the disastrous economic and political consequences.

We are currently, I think, in danger of making the same mistakes and if we wish to avoid doing so, any initiatives aimed at opening up the internal Community market still further or at least keeping it open are of particular importance. It must be made clear and apparent once and for all to the citizens of the ten countries represented in this Parliament that they are living in a Community, and this will only be possible if the frontier barriers which still exist are finally abolished. This is also essential if we are to achieve another vital objective. If we are to re-establish our competitiveness in the sectors and technologies of the future, we are going to need a Common Market which really works, and this will not be possible unless these frontier barriers are eliminated. Furthermore, re-establishing our competitiveness at international level is the only way in which we will be able to deal effectively with unemployment in the European Community.

The point we are discussing today is, as it were, one of the many tiny stones which go together to form the mosaic I have just mentioned. We are discussing the problems of tradesmen, artists, photographers and television journalists, particularly in the border regions, whose involvement in European competition nowadays takes them over the borders. I might perhaps describe in detail what a tradesman from Alsace would have to do if he were to accept a job in Baden. First of all, he would have to go to the Chamber of Commerce to have a 'Carnet' made out with details of all the tools he was intending to take with him. Then he would have to show all these tools and the list to the official at the border when he came to cross it and on his return he would again have to prove that he had not sold a hammer or chisel, for example, in the other country without paying the VAT. Going through all this once is enough to shake one's faith in Europe and anyone who has to do it more often will at least go from being a committed European — which the inhabitants of the border regions tend to be — to at least a very much less committed European.

It is a very good thing, therefore, that the Commission has made this proposal which we are debating here today since even if it does not provide the final answer, it will nevertheless substantially simplify the situation in the maze of red tape which people still have to go through at the borders. Firstly, it will no longer be necessary to lodge a guarantee, secondly the customs authorities will be able to issue a document without people having to go to the Chamber of Commerce first, and thirdly, this document will be valid for crossing the border without further complica-

von Wogau

tions for a longer period. This is perhaps not ideal, but it is nevertheless a step in the right direction and for this reason we wholeheartedly support the approach adopted by the Commission in its proposal. We have tabled a number of amendments which we are sure the Commission will take into account, but I should like to stress on behalf of my Group that we warmly welcome this proposal. We are also a little proud at the fact that over the two and a half years it has existed, this Parliament has repeatedly drawn attention to this point and hence probably also contributed to the fact that the Commission has finally submitted this proposal.

Now, of course, it is up to the Council of Ministers, which at the moment is responsible for the greatest holdups in the work of the Community, to take the necessary decision, and we expect the Council to get down to the necessary work without delay.

I should like to take this opportunity of saying that we expect a great deal from the forthcoming Belgian Presidency. There are a whole series of dossiers outstanding from the last six months, which have become submerged in the great mass of things we are currently debating and hence been forgotten about. We hope that the Belgian Presidency will now unravel this Gordian knot. I realize that this will require a great deal of sensitivity on the part of the President of the Council but this will be vital if this overall problem and the many smaller problems awaiting decision are finally to be solved.

President. — I call the Commission.

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (DE) Mr President, I should like first of all to express my particular thanks to the rapporteur for his lucid and well-founded report, which contains various suggestions and proposed amendments which form a valuable contribution towards the solution of a problem which is of considerable significance for the further development of the internal Community market. I should also, however, like to thank the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and all its members for the tenacity, constructive spirit and goodwill with which it has for years now returned again and again to its work on the question of an arrangement in this difficult area.

We realize how valuable this help has been, and the fact that the Committee has given us this help is in itself enough to emphasize the importance of this proposal on the temporary import of tools and equipment for the realization of the Common Market. Mr von Wogau is quite right in saying that our ultimate goal has not yet been reached, but this is nevertheless a decisive step along the road to an internal market totally unencumbered by red tape and border formalities which is what we are ultimately aiming at. This is,

of course, as I see it, more a question of the abstract economic aspects of improved conditions for the exchange of goods but however important this aspect may be, the proposed regulation touches on a quite tangible concern of the man in the street as regards the free movement of goods, i.e. that the plumber, the breakdown firm, the photographer, the journalist or the television reporter should be able to carry out his work and offer his services on the other side of the internal borders with the least possible problems when taking the tools of his trade over the border.

This is vital if the border regions of our Member States are to grow together and if the situation in these regions is to be regularized from the Community point of view. In border regions, border checks and formalities affect the citizens in their daily lives, which means that nowhere else does he have such first-hand experience of the effects of these measures.

I should like to thank Mr Albers for his reference to market stall-holders. They are not affected by this regulation since in our Resolution of 23 October, we provided the basis for improvements to the situation of this group too by means of a simplified customs clearance procedure. This is a different area but one of which we also take into account, and all these things come under the general heading of the efforts we are making to ultimately bring about a situation similar to that in the Benelux countries between all the Member States.

The same thing applies in the case of the temporary import of vehicles as in the case of the temporary import of tools and equipment. I might remind you that a Commission proposal on this subject has been before the Council for nearly six years without a decision having been taken and we cannot send this new proposal on its way, which I am sure will not be entirely plain sailing, through the Council departments without remembering this other problem child. Finally, there is also the question of duty-free allowances for travellers, which the man in the street will quite obviously regard as reflecting the extent to which the Community genuinely and meaningfully exists.

There is no need on this occasion for me to stress how much the Commission regrets the fact that the proposals aimed at increasing these duty-free allowances, which this House emphatically called for, have been blocked in the Council. As long ago as last year, therefore, the Commission had already grouped together all these proposals, in view of their considerable importance, and included them in its action programme for the strengthening of the internal market. This action programme which, as I said, was included together with other things in the draft for a Council resolution, is aimed at bypassing the specialized departments and appealing directly to those who bear the overall responsibility for the fate of the Community and drawing their attention to the political dimension of these various technical measures.

Narjes

There are indications that they acknowledge this responsibility and if so, this would not least be thanks to the vigilance and efforts of this House which have once more been so much in evidence in today's debate. I regard the fact that the Commission can to a great extent adopt your amendments as a visible sign of this fruitful cooperation between Parliament and Commission. Only in a few cases does the Commission have minor objections on details of wording, for example, paragraph 10 is, in the eyes of the Commission, rendered superfluous by paragraph 4 and in paragraph 1 it agrees with the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, i.e. that six months are better than twelve if we are to prevent evasion and fraud. For the rest, it goes along with all the proposals.

President. — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

8. *Transport of dangerous substances*

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

- report (Doc. 1-357/81/rev.), drawn up by Mr Gatto on behalf of the Committee on Transport, on the transport of dangerous substances;
- report (Doc. 1-355/81/rev.), drawn up by Mr Seefeld on behalf of the Committee on Transport, on the transport of radioactive substances and waste.

I call Mr Gatto.

Mr Gatto. — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we have recently been reminded of the importance of the safety regulations governing the transport of dangerous substances by the announcement of the opening of the trial of those responsible for the fatal road accident which happened in Spain in 1978 and in which 287 people lost their lives, when a lorry loaded with ethyl gas exploded near a caravan site.

Another accident in Canada in 1980, which caused a chlorine leak and necessitated evacuation on an unprecedented scale, prompted Mr Baudis to table his motion for a resolution on the transport of dangerous substances. In another motion for a resolution, Mr Sherlock and others have requested the implementation of a simplified hazard action code.

Subsequent to the tabling of this motion for a resolution, the Committee on Transport entrusted me with the task of drawing up a report on the transport of dangerous substances. Up till now, there has been no Community action in this field. Despite a request from the Council, the Commission has not yet drawn up

proposals on the harmonization — taking account of safety requirements — of the rules relating to the transport of dangerous goods.

The Commission, in fact, pointed out that current safety regulations governing international traffic are covered by the ADR (road), RID (rail) and AND (inland waterways) agreements, as well as the IMDG rules relating to maritime transport and the IATA rules relating to air transport.

After consideration of the situation, the Committee on Transport is of the opinion that there should be no overlapping of competences in this field between the Community and existing international organizations, but it also believes that the Community has a significant role to play in support of these organizations, a role which cannot be declined.

The Committee on Transport considers that the various existing international agreements in this field and the relevant recommendations provide for the application of satisfactory rules. Nevertheless, it considers that other measures are necessary and asks the presiding committee to insist on their implementation.

These measures are:

- ratification of the ADR (European Agreement concerning international carriage of dangerous goods by road) by all Member States;
- harmonization of sanctions against non-compliance with ADR rules;
- coordination of national research into the causes of accidents involving the transport of dangerous substances;
- examination, jointly with the competent national authorities, of the possibility of reducing the concentrations of traffic carrying dangerous substances on certain routes;
- promotion of special training for the drivers of road vehicles carrying dangerous substances;
- establishment of a uniform hazard action code throughout the Community;

For these reasons, ladies and gentlemen, I ask you to approve the motion for a resolution and the reasons behind it which were unanimously approved by the Committee on Transport.

President. — I call Mr Seefeld.

Mr Seefeld, rapporteur. — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the question of the safe transport of radioactive substances and waste is one of the problems taken up by the Committee on Transport

Seefeld

immediately after the first direct elections in 1979 and included on a list of the sixteen priority issues we intended to deal with. Mr Doublet was originally appointed rapporteur on this subject in October 1980. However, since he had to give up his office in June 1981 I, as Chairman of the Committee on Transport, completed this work and submit to you today a report which was adopted unanimously by this Committee. I should simply like to make a few introductory remarks on this overall problem. Fortunately — and I stress, fortunately — there have not as yet been any accidents during the transport of radioactive substances, which is becoming more and more frequent. However, the picture might be quite different even tomorrow. In its analysis of the overall problem, the Committee on Transport came to the conclusion that the safety requirements left something to be desired and should therefore be improved. Requirements are largely based on recommendations by the International Atomic Energy Agency and are laid down in a number of international agreements. These, however, have not as yet been ratified by all the Member States. Nevertheless, improvement of the safety requirements should go hand in hand with harmonization at Community level so as to avoid discrepancies in the safety regulations giving rise to additional risks. This would mean that plutonium, for example, on its way from the reprocessing plant in La Hague to Hanau near Frankfurt would have to be transhipped at the border.

This report goes into the current problems involved in the transport of radioactive substances and waste and deals with gaps and shortcomings in the existing regulations. It recommends specific measures aimed at increasing safety and eliminating obstacles to the intra-Community transport of these substances on the basis of a Commission document. The proposals contained in paragraphs 4 to 13 of the motion for a resolution should bring us a lot closer to our goal, i.e. to make the transport of radioactive substances as safe as possible. That is our main concern.

I should also like to draw your attention to the improvements advocated by the Committee on Transport, i.e. firstly, avoidance of unnecessary storage and hold-ups during the transport of these substances, particularly at the internal borders of the Community; secondly, harmonization of the relevant national legislation and in particular the establishment of a standard system of authorization and standard forms; thirdly, compulsory special training for persons involved in the transport of radioactive substances and standard certificates testifying to this special training; fourthly, selection of transport routes on the basis of population density or, in other words, avoiding highly populated areas; fifthly, the creation of an adequate emergency service, particularly in the border regions; sixthly, timely and comprehensive information to the local authorities regarding any transport of radioactive substances through the territories for which they are responsible, and seventhly, objective and regular information to the public, with a view to avoiding unrest.

In addition, we also call for ratification by the Member States of the recommendations contained in the International Atomic Energy Agency Agreement. Any Member States which have not yet ratified this agreement should do so without delay. The Commission, for its part, should draw up proposals for Community action in this field and, we think, set up a special working party for this purpose, the members of which should include national experts. The report currently before you, ladies and gentlemen, deals with all of these proposals in greater depth than is possible in the short time available to me. A number of you have, I see, tabled amendments. I should like, if I may Mr President, to state my views regarding these amendments when we come to vote on them. I do not think I need to go into them in detail today.

The Socialist Group, which has appointed another speaker as well as myself, has asked me, for reasons of time, to tell you before she comes to speak that she wholeheartedly supports the general ideas. The various amendments which have been tabled also show that certain individual aspects are to be amplified somewhat.

I should like, in conclusion, to thank all those who helped in the work on this report and who know what difficulties this vital issue has presented. If we manage to take some of these demands home with us and raise them with our national governments, everything necessary to guarantee safety will, I think, be done. There should be no delay in introducing the measures necessary for ensuring safety in the transport of radioactive substances. The citizens of our countries expect us to take all the steps necessary to guarantee their safety and this is why I produced this report.

President. — I call the Socialist Group.

Mrs Viehoff. — (NL) Mr President, on 11 July 1980 Mr Gendebien's resolution on the transport of radioactive substances was referred to the Committee on Transport. It is regrettable that it has taken until today for us to get round to debating this subject. This is regrettable for two reasons. Firstly, because optimum safety in transport of this kind is urgently needed and secondly because if this resolution had been adopted before the budgetary debate, the Council would perhaps not have deleted the 500 000 EUA from the 1982 budget, i.e. the money required if this resolution is to be put into practice. What is worse is that amendments have been tabled with a view to watering down this resolution, and by people who are in favour of nuclear energy to boot — that is to say the very people who should bear a great responsibility for the greatest possible safety for the population and our Community in this field. After all, if it was up to the opponents of nuclear energy there would hardly be any question of transport of radioactive substances.

Vichoff

I should like to defend three amendments which have been tabled. Amendment No 20 to paragraph 3 really speaks for itself. No one in this Parliament would be pleased to see an increase in the amounts of radioactive substances transported, which is why I have used the word 'unfortunately'. This is not intended as a value judgment on nuclear energy, but merely to make the point that an increase in the amount of radioactive substances transported would please no one. I should like to make this quite clear in order to avoid any misunderstanding.

Amendment No 19 calls for the deletion of the words 'first of all' from paragraph 4 since our aim must always be to keep the amount of radioactive substances transported to a minimum, since it will never be possible to achieve absolute safety.

Then there is Amendment No 21 to paragraph 5 which proposes replacing the word 'harmonized' by 'optimized'. This, I think, would be in the interest of consistency, since paragraph 2 also mentions 'optimum safety' in transport, so it is logical to repeat this in paragraph 5. These are minor modifications to an otherwise good resolution and we hope, therefore, that it will be adopted in this amended version and that the amendments aimed at watering it down will be rejected since, if you compare this resolution with the resolution on the transport of dangerous substances, it would appear that some people are more concerned about other substances than about radioactive substances which, as no one will deny, are at least equally dangerous as other substances such as those mentioned in the first report.

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

Mr Bournias. — (GR) Mr President, the two reports before us deal with the same subject, namely security measures for the transport of dangerous substances. In fact, there are relevant international agreements which most, if not all, of the Community countries have signed and which partly cover the question. I say partly because they do not relate specifically to the problems of radioactivity, and I think that this is where the problem lies. For, if the transport of radioactive substances and waste has hitherto been relatively sporadic, in the near future it will be much more frequent. Therefore we must envisage not only interdiction measures but also security measures, which are referred to in detail in the motion for a resolution by the Committee on Transport. I shall not repeat them, since they are provided for under international agreements into which they have been incorporated. The relevant recommendations of the International Atomic Energy Agency are clear.

I would simply stress that it is essential that, for the protection of the population as a whole and of those employed in this sector, the following should be done:

- firstly, ratification of the agreements by those countries which have not yet done so;
- secondly, the problem should be tackled not only at local, regional and national level but also at Community level;
- thirdly, a special permanent working party should be set up, as referred to in the proposal, to deal with the problem and submit an annual report to Parliament. My country does not produce radioactive substances but imports them ready made. The legal provisions in force in Greece specifically relating to the transport of radioactive substances are contained in Law 191 of 1974 and are based on the relevant regulations of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

As for rail transport, Greece has ratified the RID agreement and in its administration always takes account of the regulation on the transport of dangerous goods.

Maritime transport is governed by the Decree of 1949 ratifying the IMCO agreement, which was amended by Law 1146 of 1981, which relates to dangerous cargoes and provides for the setting up of a Committee on the Maritime Environment.

Greece has ratified the international agreements on air transport, and the ratification of the international ADR agreement on road transport is pending.

Lastly, I must point out that in 1956 Greece ratified the agreement on the establishment of the International Atomic Energy Agency and as a member of that organization has since applied, through the Greek Atomic Energy Commission, its regulations on the safe transport of radioactive substances.

My country therefore fully accepts the motion for a resolution before us which seeks to improve the safety standards in the transport of radioactive substances and waste through populated areas.

President. — I call the European Democratic Group.

Mr Turner. — Mr President, I confidently expect that a lot will be done as a result of both these reports if the Commissioner responsible is Commissioner Narjes. I must say I am very impressed by his enthusiasm for everything he does.

Now, first of all I would like to deal with Mr Seefeld's report on nuclear material. Naturally we are all concerned about this problem. You never know when there is going to be an accident. In my own constituency I not only have a nuclear power station and stuff is shipped away every week, but also Felixstowe port where waste is brought from the continent at

Turner

regular intervals. So far in Britain there has been a very high level of practical safety precautions. Of course, so far as legal requirements are concerned we have the International Atomic Energy Agency. But, as I say, accidents are always possible and I believe it is quite right of Mr Seefeld to propose that the Community should ensure that it oversees the requirements and practices for safety in the transfer of nuclear materials.

I would just like to pick out one or two matters. First of all I think that paragraph 7 on training of personnel is extremely important. Secondly, paragraph 9 on integrated emergency procedure is also very important. Thirdly, paragraph 10 on publicity is very important because civil servants are very prone to keep things like this secret because they think that ordinary people ought not to know what is going on, and where secrecy is unnecessary it is bad. I would like to commend Mr Moreland's amendments on these various matters and he has dealt with these in some detail.

There are two other matters: paragraph 8 states that one should try and avoid centres of dense population for routing. Now very often that is not practical, and I believe the real answer is not to focus on this but to ensure that our safety procedures are sufficient for transporting nuclear waste wherever it is. Secondly with regard to paragraph 13 on local authorities, I believe they most certainly should be kept fully informed of all arrangements and should be cooperated with the whole time. But I am not sure that it would be right to lay down a proposal that the local authorities in each country should necessarily have the primary responsibility, I think that is a question of how things go in each country.

An entirely separate matter, and I think the most serious one, is the mismatch at the frontier between the regulations and the practices of different countries. Now that must be stopped. Of course, here we come to a word which is a favourite, I know, of Mr Narjes the Commissioner, namely harmonization. Certainly we want uniform, harmonized compliance with the requirements of the IAEA and also of the practices of the various countries at the frontier. Therefore, I very much commend paragraphs 4, 5, 6, and 10 of Mr Seefeld's report.

Now if I might come to the second report, that by Mr Gatto on the transport of toxic loads, again my constituency is in the heart of this because we have all the traffic between the Midlands of England and the Ruhr. Actually in Suffolk and Essex, which have had to put up with dangerous loads for some time, a consortium of the emergency services and the chemical industries has been set up which meets regularly and provides computer services for any incident, advice immediately on the spot, teams from the chemical companies to go and help the police and the fire brigade and finally, has a monthly meeting where it

considers in detail every single reported incident of a toxic load which in some way has leaked or gone wrong. It has a post mortem on the whole matter to find out what the cause was and to prevent it from happening again. I think that is extremely valuable. It was started in Essex and Suffolk and is, I hope, extending throughout Britain and I hope it does on the continent too.

But here again harmonization is vital in the marking of the vehicles. It is vital to have a single code on the marking of each vehicle, having one meaning in all the countries that the vehicle travels through from one end to the other of its journey. At present, on the continent you have the Kemmler code which identifies the toxic material itself and that is all. That is a great thing. In Britain you have the Hazchem code which first of all identifies the material and, secondly, gives an instruction as to what to do in the case of an accident. I believe that the Hazchem is a superior code because it gives immediate instructions to the emergency services so that any policeman or any fireman can immediately find out what he is supposed to do — whether he is to wear breathing apparatus, whether he is to use water or not and so on. And I would urge on the Commissioner the merits of the Hazchem code and I do hope it will be possible to adopt this. One can do it by adding to the Kemmler code, which already identifies the product: one can do it by adding to that the instruction for action which is found in the Hazchem code. You haven't got to get rid of the Kemmler, you can marry the two together, and I hope he will seriously consider that.

And so I most heartily urge paragraph 6 of Mr Gatto's report which says that we need a uniform hazard code.

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

Mr Gendebien. — (*FR*) In making my contribution to the discussion on Mr Seefeld's report, Mr President, I should first of all like to pay homage to our former colleague, Mr Doublet, who first drafted this report at the outset. Mr Doublet was an excellent colleague, being both capable and courteous.

The concern which led me to submit a motion for a resolution — which gave rise to the present report — was perfectly straightforward. It was not in fact my desire to relaunch the debate for or against nuclear energy. I just wanted attention to be drawn to a fact, namely, the existence of an increasing amount of radioactive material and waste in the Community and the increasing transport of this material in conditions which are not altogether safe, in our opinion, especially since these conditions vary from one Community Member State to another.

Gendebien

We felt, therefore, that there was an urgent need to rectify this situation because it is quite inadmissible — in our opinion — and here I am addressing both the Commissioner and the members of governments — that a fair number of international agreements or recommendations from the International Energy Agency have either not yet been ratified by some governments or are not yet enacted as law in some Member States. We are not immune from accidents. One occurred recently in the United States and there have been others in Japan. In addition, the emergency plans and the urgent measures to be taken should an accident occur do not seem to have been very well thought out in some countries. We believe that local authorities must be better informed and consulted more often.

Generally speaking, I think that it is absolutely vital for all the authorities to come to grips with these problems, whatever their opinions on nuclear energy might be. In this respect, I feel I really must denounce the Council for being shortsighted and pennypinching, as it has turned down the request for a somewhat paltry 500 000 ECU in the 1982 budget for studying ways of improving the conditions under which radioactive matter is transported. One need only consider the cost of investing in a single nuclear facility which, being of the order of 1 000 million ECU, is equal to 2 000 times — if I have calculated correctly — the amount of the measly sum requested by Parliament. Comparison of these two figures alone speaks volumes.

Once again, we are forced to recognize the hypocrisy of some speeches by government members and large political parties. 'Long live nuclear power', they cry, but they get away with the minimum they can where the safety and future of our people and our environment are concerned.

The most outspoken supporters of nuclear energy should demonstrate that they are the people who are most preoccupied with safety. That is not always how it turns out, unfortunately.

I should like to conclude, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, by thanking Mr Seefeld and all the members of the Committee on Transport for having taken the trouble to consider, to a large extent, the motions for resolutions which I had submitted. This will only hold true, of course, if Mr Seefeld's report is not watered down by amendments which remove the punch from it. I hope that this report will make both the Commission and the Council become aware of their responsibilities in this field.

President. — I call the non-attached Members.

Mr Eisma. — (NL) Mr President, I should like to repeat something which I have already said in this Assembly, i.e. that we take the view that far too large a

proportion of the Community budget is taken up by the development of nuclear energy at the expense of the development of alternative energy sources. As stated in the fifth recital of the Seefeld motion for a resolution, however, the problem of the transport of radioactive substances can be examined without giving an opinion as to whether it is necessary to have recourse to the development of nuclear energy although the question is obviously very closely related, particularly as regards the increase in the range of waste to be dealt with.

However undesirable this may be in many people's opinion, radioactive substances are with us and we must do something about dealing with them. In our view, Mr President, this report takes too little account of the origin of radioactive substances. For example, paragraph 7 of the explanatory notes makes no distinction between raw materials and waste from nuclear power stations on the one hand and radioactive materials used for medical purposes on the other. This confusion is reflected in Amendment No 20 by Mrs Viehoff which proposes adding the word 'unfortunately'. I also feel that it is unfortunate that the volume of transport of radioactive substances will increase in the energy sector. However, I do not take this negative view in the case of substances for medical purposes. I think this distinction should be made and it is unfortunately not made clearly enough in this report or in paragraph 7 of the explanatory notes. Nevertheless, we intend to vote in favour of Mrs Viehoff's amendments, because we go along with their intentions. We intend to vote against the many amendments which play down the dangerous aspects of the transport of radioactive substances, since this is far too serious a matter.

President. — I call Mr Moreland.

Mr Moreland. — Mr President, Mrs Viehoff, Mr Gendebien and Mr Eisma accused me, I think, of trying to soften this resolution: it is not our intention at all to soften this resolution. I have a suspicion that there is a slight confusion between their own views on nuclear power and the transport of nuclear waste; and I hope they will agree that whatever their views on nuclear power, we do have nuclear power-stations and nuclear waste has to be disposed of somehow or other.

I support the views of my colleague Mr Turner, but I would like to add one or two points in relation to my own amendments. The first is that we wish to emphasize that the carriage of nuclear waste has so far been successful and safe. We do not say that with any complacency, but the record is actually an extremely good one and it is extremely important that the first paragraph in the resolution be clear. We do not wish to create any worries on the part of the population.

Moreland

The second point we wish to emphasize is, quite simply, that it is important to implement the recommendations of the International Energy Agency. This is implicit in the report, but we thought that in one or two minor connections this was not quite clear in the resolution. For example, the International Energy Agency places emphasis first and foremost on the safety of the vehicle, rather than the route. After all, that is the fundamental thing, and I think it is fair to say that in the Community there is little doubt of the safety of the vehicle: here we can, I think, feel secure.

Finally, Mr President, we should not run away with the idea that a Community solution is always the best solution. There were one or two points, such as the Community certificates, where the Community was being recommended to do things which we were a little unhappy about.

Having said all this, Mr President, we do, of course, support the resolution. May I say this particularly warmly to Mr Seefeld? What has not been said so far in the debate is that Mr Seefeld, characteristically, has taken over somebody else's report. He often does this and, if I may say so quite frankly, I have the impression that he usually does it better than the original rapporteur would have done.

Finally, we are absolutely delighted to hear the rumour that we shall be nominating him again as chairman of the committee. I know it is a little controversial for a Conservative to say that he will be voting for a Socialist after having done so once before, but on this particular occasion I think the whole House will be with me.

(Applause)

President. — I call the Commission.

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (DE) Mr President, I should like to speak on the two reports by Mr Gatto and Mr Seefeld separately. The Commission has carefully studied Parliament's Resolution on the transport of dangerous substances, which is based on the lucid and excellent report by Mr Gatto and various amendments by Mr Baudis, Mr Sherlock and others. It welcomes the positive and balanced attitude this report takes to a very important problem which, it would appear, is becoming more and more complex every day. This problem is also, incidentally, being discussed by various other international organizations with particular competence in this matter.

The result of this study is that we can unreservedly go along with paragraphs 1 to 5 of the motion for a resolution. However, before I go into paragraph 6 in detail, i.e. the specific steps to be taken, I might remind this House that, with a view to avoiding duplication of effort we should not forget that it is difficult

to assign a role to the Commission in this field, which is in a state of constant development. Nor is it entirely compatible with the principles of a well-organized administration in view of the limited staff at our disposal and the small likelihood of changing this situation in the short term, for Community experts simply to repeat in Brussels what they have already worked out in Geneva or London together with experts from third countries.

I might add that the staff shortage has in the course of time become a bottleneck of political proportions and I would be very pleased if all the Members of this Parliament would draw the attention of the budgetary authorities to this political aspect during the deliberations on the budget, since it is a major obstacle to our doing our jobs in a responsible, appropriate and above all timely manner, so that, by dint of tenacity and persistence, they may contribute towards something being done about this situation.

For example, The Directorate-General on Transport has only two specialists on this subject, one of whom deals with inland transport and the other with maritime transport, and whatever these two cannot manage cannot be done. And now to the specific measures referred to in paragraph 6. We wholeheartedly agree with the first of these proposed measures according to which we should press for those Member States who have not yet ratified the ADR to do so as soon as possible. We can also go along with the harmonization of the planned sanctions against non-compliance with the ADR rules but are afraid that it may be impossible to harmonize a branch of secondary legislation in the Member States, since no efforts have hitherto been made to harmonize other sanctions in the transport or any other sector. These things are yet to be done.

The coordination of national research into the causes of accidents involving the transport of dangerous substances will be a very useful thing, provided of course that the available staff is sufficient to permit this to be done without delay. On the other hand, the following proposal which concerns reducing the ban on the transport of dangerous substances on certain routes is undoubtedly more a local problem and the Commission can hardly contribute towards its solution at Community level. The Commission stated its views on this question in its proposal regarding the weight of lorries which was approved by this Parliament in May 1981 and which left it to the Governments of the Member States to decide whether or not to ban vehicles carrying dangerous substances from certain routes or areas.

As regards the promotion of special training for the drivers of road vehicles carrying dangerous substances, this can be regarded as one of the most important initiatives to come from the *Institut belge des transports routiers*. Mr Gatto also mentioned the work of this Institute. We fully support this proposal and think that we should endeavour to have the special training

Narjes

courses included as part of the qualifications necessary for the issuing of a driving licence, on the basis of Directive No 76/914/EEC on training courses for drivers and Directive No 80/1263/EEC on the driving licence.

Finally, as regards the question of a uniform hazard action code, this is an excellent idea which should be put into practice even more widely than at Community level. It is, I think, currently being examined by the competent international organizations and the Commission will certainly be willing to give its support. For the rest, I should be glad to pass on the proposal made by Mr Turner concerning a uniform hazard action code to the Commissioner responsible for transport policy.

Mr President, you will, I am sure, have noticed that the Commission joins Parliament in its firm determination to do everything in its power to reduce the risks which might occur during the transport of dangerous substances and I can assure you that if it takes longer to carry out these proposals than we would all wish, this is simply due to the fact that we have not the necessary means at our disposal to work any quicker.

When we come to consider Mr Seefeld's report, we come up against two opinions which would appear to be somewhat divergent, not to say opposed. On the one hand, the Committee on Transport states unanimously that the situation as regards the transport of radioactive substances in the Community is not entirely satisfactory from the safety point of view, both from the point of view of protection of the population and the workers and from the point of view of the environment. The Committee on Transport therefore takes the view that several initiatives should be taken in this sector without delay.

On the other hand, your Committee on Public Health and the Environment considers the situation as regards the international transport of radioactive substances as highly satisfactory, particularly compared with international transport of non-radioactive but otherwise dangerous substances. The Committee adds that the Commission should therefore merely monitor development in this situation on behalf of the Community. The Commission takes the following view. Firstly, we realize that the volume of radioactive substances transported will increase considerably over the next decade. Secondly, we feel that even if the volume of radioactive substances transported were to remain at the present highly satisfactory overall level, certain immediate measures are nevertheless called for, particularly with a view to simplifying and clarifying procedures so that the present level may be maintained.

Furthermore, the Commission takes the view that in such a specialized field in which there has, for the rest, been effective international cooperation for many years, the technical aspects which may lead to the

introduction of Community regulations and arrangements should be gradually harmonized.

Finally, in spite of the reservations on the part of one Member State, the Commission has already taken certain steps which have led to some progress, such as extending technical know-how and bringing about a convergence of views among experts.

I might clarify this point by adding that the steps taken by the Commission have so far largely consisted of studies — as was in fact inevitable — primarily aimed at harmonizing the application of the recommendations of the International Atomic Energy Agency in the various Member States.

Our aim is to provide the authorities of the Member States with technical advice so that it will be possible to revise these recommendations when this proves necessary. The initial results of our work confirm the view that the problem of harmonization of transport forms must be thoroughly examined since otherwise restrictions on the crossing of the internal borders of the Community could be imposed on vehicles used for the transport of radioactive substances — and restrictions of this kind are the very things we want to eliminate.

Other studies concern purely technical questions, such as the testing of containers for the transport of radioactive substances. In this particular field, the work, which has been financed out of Community funds, has led to results which may in due course permit better application of the relevant regulations. It will be apparent, Mr President, after the points I have made, which were perhaps a little too technical, that it has been possible, on the basis of the Commission's attitude, to reconcile the proposal by your Committee on Transport with the attitude of your Committee on the Environment.

We are pleased at the fact that most of the problems have been clearly reflected in Mr Seefeld's report and motion for a resolution and in addition we are in fact already carrying out the recommendation by Mr Combe to the effect that we should close the existing monetary arrangements and ensure that they are adapted in the light of future developments.

The Commission welcomes the general approach of the resolution and congratulates the rapporteur on his extremely detailed analysis. In view of the manifold subjects and proposals to be looked into, the Commission reserves the right to study the resolution in detail, to draw up a list of priorities and then to inform Parliament and the competent Committee of the outcome of its work.

As regards the amendments tabled, I am pleased to be able to go along with all of them with the exception of No 6 and No 20. In the case of No 6 I would point out that in view of the *de facto* situation in the Member

Narjes

States it strikes me as indefensible to prevent the local authorities being informed. As regards No 20, it is a question of style whether one includes the word 'unfortunately' or not and the Commission has no strong feelings on the matter.

President. — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.¹

(The sitting was closed at 7.25 p.m.)

¹ *Agenda for next sitting: see minutes.*

SITTING OF FRIDAY, 22 JANUARY 1982

Contents

1. Votes	82	• Gatto report (Doc. 1-357/81/rev.): Transport of dangerous substances: Adoption of the resolution	83
• Fanti-Piquet motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-943/81): Death-sentence imposed on 52 Turkish trade-union leaders: Adoption of the resolution	82	• Seefeld report (Doc. 1-355/81/rev.): Transport of radioactive substances and radioactive waste: Mr Seefeld, rapporteur	83
Mr Pannella	82	Adoption of the resolution	84
• Carossino report (Doc. 1-799/81): Move- ment of goods within the Community: Mr Carossino, rapporteur	83	2. Adjournment of the session	84
Mr Davignon (Commission)	83		
Adoption of the various texts	83		

IN THE CHAIR: MR DANKERT

President

(The sitting opened at 9 a.m.)¹

1. Votes²

President. — We shall now consider two motions for resolutions on the situation in Turkey.

We begin with the Fanti-Piquet motion for a resolution on the death sentence imposed on 52 Turkish trade-union leaders (Doc. 1-943/81).

¹ For the items relating to approval of the minutes, Documents received, Reference to committee under Rule 49, Application of the Rules of Procedure, Membership of Parliament, Procedure without report and a decision on urgent procedure, see the Minutes of Proceedings of this sitting.

² The Report of Proceedings reproduces only those phases of the voting which gave rise to interventions from the floor. For details of the same, the reader is referred to the Minutes.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)

I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (FR) Mr President, since the vote that has just taken place was largely in favour, it seems to me quite pointless to maintain the other motion, tabled by myself. I therefore withdraw it.

President. — The Pannella motion for a resolution is accordingly withdrawn.

*

* *

President. — We come to the votes on motions for resolutions on which the debate is closed.

We begin with the Carossino report on the movement of goods within the Community (Doc. 1-799/81).

(...)

Article 4: Amendments Nos 4 and 12

Mr Carossino, rapporteur. — (IT) Mr President, I am in favour of both amendments, but if Amendment No 4 is adopted, Amendment No 10 will obviously fall.¹

(...)

President. — Having adopted the amendments on the proposal for a regulation, we must now hear the view of the Commission.

I call the Commission.

Mr Davignon, Vice-President of the Commission. — (FR) Mr President, the Commission can agree to the amendments that have been adopted. As regards Amendment No 11, we have a little difficulty with the expression 'simple demande': we should have preferred to see the word 'simple' omitted, but this is not an essential point.

(...)

(Parliament adopted the various texts)

*

* *

President. — We proceed to the Gatto report on the transport of dangerous substances (Doc. 1-357/81/rev.).

Parliament adopted the resolution

*

* *

President. — We proceed to the Seefeld report on the transport of radioactive substances and radioactive waste (Doc. 1-355/81/rev.).

(...)

Paragraph 1: Amendments Nos 7, 2 and 11

Mr Seefeld, rapporteur. — (DE) Amendment No 2 should be rejected, since the present degree of safety is not sufficient: it must be not only maintained but improved. Amendment No 11 should be rejected, since it leaves the impression that improvements in the present safety standards are entirely unnecessary.

Amendments Nos 7 and 8 lay, in my opinion, too much emphasis upon the fact that so far there have been no accidents in the transport of radioactive substances: this situation may change any day, and that is precisely what the report wants to prevent with its improvements in safety standards. Consequently, both these amendments should be rejected.

(...)

Paragraph 2: Amendments Nos 3 and 12

Mr Seefeld, rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, the wording of this motion for a resolution is, I think, sufficiently clear to merit being retained. I am therefore opposed to Amendment No 3, by Mr Combe.

Mr Moreland's amendment should, I think, also be rejected, but since a majority has just adopted his Amendment No 11, I should have no objections if this too were adopted.

(...)

Paragraph 3: Amendment No 20

Mr Seefeld, rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, this came up in committee. The amendment introduces the word 'unfortunately', which undoubtedly implies a political value-judgment. The committee, however, wanted to avoid committing itself either in favour of or against nuclear energy and to confine itself to the transport of such materials. Even though, to a certain extent, I sympathize with the point of view expressed here, I must point out that the Committee on Transport wanted to avoid a value-judgement of this kind. I apologize to Mrs Viehoff, but as rapporteur I cannot give this my support.

(...)

Paragraph 4: Amendments Nos 19 and 9

Mr Seefeld, rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, with regard to Mrs Viehoff's Amendment No 19, I see no reason why the word she wishes to delete should not be removed. Amendment No 9, by Mr Galland, provides an addition to what the committee has already stated in this connection: I therefore have no objection to it.

I should, however, appreciate it if we could vote first on Mrs Viehoff's amendment, since it concentrates on the committee's proposed text and would make only one change. That seems to me to be the proper procedure.

(...)

Paragraph 5: Amendments Nos 4, 14 and 21

¹ The rapporteur also spoke in favour of Amendments Nos 3, 6, 7, 11 and 13 and against Amendments Nos 1 and 5.

Mr Seefeld, rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, I begin with Amendment No 4, by Mr Combe, to which I have no objections: this could be accepted.

With regard to Amendment No 21, I should very much like to ask Mrs Viehoff and the representatives of the Socialist Group to agree with me that we keep the word 'harmonized' and, if you want, add 'and optimized', to make 'harmonized and optimized'. Harmonization is in any case necessary, but I have no objection to a subsequent optimization.

On Amendment No 14, I would say that harmonization at Community level is, as I have just explained, necessary to the extent that such transport is needlessly impeded and subjected to yet greater risks. This must be clearly stated, and I have the impression that the original wording is clearer than that offered in Amendment No 14. I am therefore against this amendment.

President. — The rapporteur is in favour of Amendment No 4 and against Amendment No 14. He has also proposed an oral amendment to Amendment No 21. This I must seriously oppose: the amendment cannot be modified by oral changes. Is the rapporteur, therefore, still in favour of the amendment or is he against it when it cannot be modified?

Mr Seefeld, rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, I must insist upon the harmonization, since this is the express wish of my committee. If, as you say, optimization cannot be added — which I quite understand — I have to refer to the agreement in committee and plead for harmonization.

(...)

Paragraph 7: Amendments Nos 10, 15 and 5

Mr Seefeld, rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, Amendment No 10, by Mr Galland, offers a more precise formulation, to which I have no objections. Amendment No 15 should be rejected, because a workable system for checking the training of transport personnel is absolutely necessary, and this can only be assured with the aid of Community certificates.

Amendment No 5, by Mr Combe, would frustrate the original purpose of this paragraph, which is the introduction of standard Community certificates, and I therefore ask that it be rejected.

(...)

Paragraph 8: Amendment No 16

Mr Seefeld, rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, it would be dangerous to differentiate the importance of various safety measures, since each is designed to remove a specific accident risk. I therefore ask that this amendment be rejected.

(...)

Paragraph 9: Amendment No 18

Mr Seefeld, rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, the addition contained in Amendment No 18 is superfluous. I am against.

(...)

Paragraph 13: Amendments Nos 6, 17 and 1

Mr Seefeld, rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, Amendment No 1 raises the question of compulsory consultation, which was rejected in committee because of its unavoidable 'negative' effects on the flow of traffic.

Amendment No 17 should be rejected for the same reason and the compromise solution — if I may put it that way — proposed by the committee adopted.

Amendment No 6 should also be rejected, since it forms the opposite extreme to what is proposed in Amendment No 1. I think the Transport Committee's wording is better and should be retained.

(...)

(Parliament adopted the resolution)

President. — On this occasion, I wish to express my especial thanks to a member of the staff who for many years has contributed to the smooth running of our work here. Mr Paul Heim, Director of Sessional Services, is about to leave us for the Court of Justice. On behalf of all of us, I wish to thank him sincerely for all he has done and wish him the greatest success in his new career as Registrar of the Court of Justice.

(Applause)

2. Adjournment of the session

President. — I declare the session of the European Parliament adjourned.

I wish you a good journey home. Beware of the icy roads.¹

(The sitting closed at 9.55 a.m.)

¹ For the items relating to motions for resolutions entered in the register under Rule 49, time-limits for tabling amendments, deliberations on petitions, forwarding of resolutions adopted, and dates for the next part-session, see the Minutes.

**Salgs- og abonnementskontorer · Vertriebsbüros · Γραφεία πωλήσεως ·
Sales Offices · Bureaux de vente · Uffici di vendita · Verkoopkantoren**

Belgique — België

Moniteur belge — Belgisch Staatsblad
Rue de Louvain 40-42 — Leuvensestraat 40-42
1000 Bruxelles — 1000 Brussel
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-Prensa

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

L-2985 Luxembourg - 5, rue du Commerce Tél 49 00 81

Debates of the European Parliament, published as an annex to the Official Journal of the European Communities, comprise:

- report of proceedings,
- annual indexes.

Sales

Annual subscriptions run from March, the beginning of the Parliamentary Year, until February.

Orders may be placed with the Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Payments to be made only to this Office.

Price (excluding VAT) in Luxembourg

Annual subscription 1981/1982: ECU 40.80 BFR 1700 IRL 29 UKL 25.50 USD 59.50

Single issue. price set accordingly in each case and shown on cover.

Prices do not include postage.

ECU 3.60

BFR 150

IRL 2.40

UKL 2.10

USD 5.25



OFFICE FOR OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS
OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

ISSN 0378-5041

L-2985 Luxembourg

Catalogue number: AX-AA-81-012-EN-C