

Annex

Official Journal

of the

European Communities

No 1-263

English edition

Debates of the European Parliament

1980-1981 Session

Report of Proceedings

from 17 to 21 November 1980

Europe House, Strasbourg

Contents

Monday, 17 November 1980	1
Resumption, p. 2 — Welcome, p. 2 — Membership of Parliament, p. 2 — Petitions, p. 2 — Documents, p. 3 — Texts of treaties, p. 3 — Order of business — Speaking time, p. 3 — Tabling of amendments, p. 6 — Procedure without report, p. 6 — Action taken on Parliaments's opinions, p. 8 — European Music Year, p. 8 — Question Time, p. 15 — Next sitting, p. 29 — Annex, p. 30	
Tuesday, 18 November 1980	32
Minutes, p. 33 — Statement by the Legal Affairs Committee, p. 33 — Documents, p. 34 — Committees, p. 34 — Iron and steel industry, p. 34 — Nuclear power-stations in frontier regions, p. 63 — Votes, p. 64 — Urgent procedure, p. 66 — Nuclear power-stations in frontier regions (contd), p. 66 — Tabling of amendments — Agenda, p. 83 — Near-East oil, p. 84 — Biomolecular engineering, p. 94 — Urgent procedure, p. 99 — Next sitting, p. 100	
Wednesday, 19 November 1980	101
Minutes, p. 103 — Documents, p. 103 — Early votes and urgent procedure, p. 103 — Eurocontrol, p. 112 — Political cooperation — Turkey, p. 112 — Annual report on the economic situation, p. 137 — Seat of Parliament, p. 152 — Question Time (contd), p. 159 — Urgent procedure, p. 172 — Next sitting, p. 172 — Annex, p. 173	
Thursday, 20 November 1980	190
Minutes, p. 191 — Documents, p. 191 — Welcome, p. 191 — Early votes and urgent procedure, p. 191 — Supplementary budget No 1 for 1980, p. 196 — Urgent procedure, p. 207 — Right of residence, p. 207 — Votes, p. 211 — Urgent procedure, p. 229 — ACP-EEC Convention, p. 229 — Fisheries, p. 252 — Next sitting, p. 282	

(Continued overleaf)

NOTE TO READER

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

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

Contents (continued)

Friday, 21 November 1980	283
Minutes, p. 285 — Petitions, p. 285 — Documents, p. 285 — Credentials, p. 285 — Procedure without report, p. 285 — Early votes and urgent procedure, p. 285 — Death penalty, p. 290 — Uganda, p. 294 — Feminist activists in the USSR, p. 295 — Referendum in Uruguay, p. 296 — Votes, p. 298 — Agenda, p. 310 — Butter sales to the USSR, p. 311 — New Zealand butter, p. 315 — Farm surveys in Italy, p. 325 — Food aid, p. 325 — Agenda, p. 326 — Generalized tariff preferences, p. 326 — Road transport, p. 327 — Agenda, p. 327 — Safe containers, p. 328 — Credentials, p. 328 — Next part-session, p. 328 — Minutes, p. 329 — Adjournment, p. 329	

SITTING OF MONDAY, 17 NOVEMBER 1980

1. Resumption of the session	2	<i>Mr Burke (Commission); Mr Patterson;</i>	
2. Welcome	2	<i>Mr Burke; Mrs Kellett-Bowman; Mr Burke;</i>	
3. Membership of Parliament	2	<i>Mr Møller; Mr Burke</i>	15
4. Petitions	2	Question No 2, by Mrs Nielsen: National	
5. Documents received	3	preferences in public procurement:	
6. Texts of treaties forwarded by the Council	3	<i>Mr Vredeling (Commission)</i>	16
7. Order of business — Speaking Time:		Question No 4 by Mr Adam: Non-ferrous	
<i>Mr Seefeld; Sir F. Catherwood; Mr Cottrell;</i>		metals industries:	
<i>Mr Rogers</i>	3	<i>Mr Natali (Commission); Mr Adam;</i>	
Procedural motion: <i>Mr Pannella</i>	5	<i>Mr Natali</i>	16
<i>Sir F. Catherwood (Committee on External</i>		Question No 6 by Mr Radoux: The economic	
<i>Economic Relations)</i>	5	situation in the Community:	
Procedural motion: <i>Mr Pannella</i>	5	<i>Mr Vredeling; Mr Radoux</i>	17
<i>Lady Elles; Mr Bangemann</i>	5	Question No 7 by Sir F. Warner: The impor-	
Procedural motions: <i>Lord Harmar Nicholls;</i>		tation of perry-pear juice concentrate	
<i>Mr Enright</i>	6	<i>Mr Haferkamp (Commission); Sir F.</i>	
8. Deadline for tabling amendments	6	<i>Warner; Mr Haferkamp</i>	17
9. Procedure without report	6	Question No 8 by Mrs Ewing: Compensation	
Procedural motions: <i>Mr Saare; Mr Rogers</i>		to fishermen for encroachment by oil	
<i>Mr Scott-Hopkins; Mrs van den Heuvel</i>		industry on fishing grounds:	
<i>Mr Pannella; Mr Galland</i>	6	<i>Mr Burke; Mrs Ewing; Mr Burke; Mr John-</i>	
10. Action taken by the Commission on the		<i>son; Mr Burke</i>	18
opinions and proposals of Parliament:		Procedural motion: <i>Mr Herman</i>	18
<i>Mr Purvis; Mr Natali (Commission)</i>	8	Question No 10 by Sir Peter Vanneck:	
11. Possibility of designating 1985 'European		Duty-free US imports of defence equipment	
Music Year' — Report by <i>Mr Hahn</i>		manufactured in the Community:	
(Committee on Youth, Culture, Education,		<i>Mr Haferkamp; Sir P. Vanneck; Mr Hafer-</i>	
Information and Sport) — (Doc. 1-345/80):		<i>kamp; Mr Scott-Hopkins; Mr Haferkamp</i>	19
<i>Mr Hahn, rapporteur</i>	8	Question No 12 by Mr Scott-Hopkins:	
<i>Mrs Vieboff; Mrs Gaiotti de Biase;</i>		Imports of tufted carpets from the USA	
<i>Mr Patterson; Mrs Pruvot; Mr Ansquer;</i>		<i>Mr Haferkamp; Mr Scott-Hopkins; Mr</i>	
<i>Mrs Macciocchi; Mr Papapietro; Mr Selig-</i>		<i>Welsb; Mr Haferkamp</i>	19
<i>man; Mr C. Jackson; Mr Balfé; Mr Burke</i>		Question No 13 by Mr Denis: Evasive	
(Commission)	9	answer by the Commission to Written Ques-	
12. Question Time (Doc. 1-570/80):		tion No 1058/80:	
• Questions to the Commission of the Euro-		<i>Mr Vredeling; Mr Denis; Mr Vredeling . . .</i>	20
pean Communities:		Question No 14 by Mr C. Jackson: Apples:	
Question No 1 by Mr Patterson: Overseas		<i>Mr Natali; Mr C. Jackson; Mr Natali; Mr</i>	
students' fees in the UK for Greek students:		<i>Scott-Hopkins; Mr Natali; Mr Turner; Mr</i>	
		<i>Natali</i>	21
		Question No 17 by Mr Berkhouwer: Link	
		between the United Kingdom and the conti-	
		nent:	
		<i>Mr Burke; Mr Berkhouwer; Mr Burke; Miss</i>	
		<i>Hooper; Mr Burke; Mr Doublet; Mr Burke;</i>	

<i>Mr Hutton; Mr Burke; Mr Albers; Mr Burke; Mr Turner; Mr Burke; Mr Møller; Mr Burke</i>	22	<i>Mr Haferkamp; Mr Fanton; Mr Haferkamp; Mr Welsh; Mr Haferkamp</i>	26
<i>Question No 18 by Mr Harris: Unfair competition:</i>		<i>Question No 22 by Mr Doublet: Halt in motorway construction:</i>	
<i>Mr Vredeling; Mr Harris; Mr Vredeling</i>	24	<i>Mr Burke; Mr Doublet; Mr Burke; Mr van Minnen; Mr Burke; Mr Patterson; Mr Burke; Mr Moreland; Mr Burke; Mr Albers; Mr Burke; Mr Purvis; Mr Burke</i>	27
<i>Question No 19 by Mr Penders: Education in European schools on the democratic character of European civilization:</i>		<i>Question No 24 by Mr Clément: Emergency FAO meeting on the food-supply situation in Africa and relations with the Community:</i>	
<i>Mr Burke; Mr Penders; Mr Burke; Mrs Boot; Mr Burke</i>	25	<i>Mr Burke; Mr Clément; Mr Burke</i>	29
<i>Question No 20 by Mr Davern: Farm incomes crisis in Ireland:</i>		13. <i>Agenda for next sitting</i>	29
<i>Mr Natali; Mr Davern; Mr Natali; Mr de Courcy Ling; Mr Natali; Mr Welsh; Mr Natali</i>	25	<i>Annex</i>	30
<i>Question No 21 by Mr Remilly: Reduced import levy on New Zealand butter:</i>			

IN THE CHAIR: MRS VEIL

President

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

President. — The sitting is open.

1. Resumption of the session

President. — I declare resumed the session of the European Parliament adjourned on 6 November 1980.

2. Welcome

President. — I have great pleasure in welcoming a delegation from the United States Congress, led by Mr Pease and Mr Winn.

(Applause)

This is the first meeting in the context of our six-monthly meetings which the delegation has made to the directly elected European Parliament.

The European Parliament attaches great importance to the meetings — the most recent, the seventeenth took place a short while ago in Copenhagen — between its delegation and that of the United States Congress.

I am also happy to welcome in the official gallery nine Members of the Greek Parliament whose appointments as Members of the European Parliament will take effect from 1 January 1981.

(Applause)

Their attendance at this plenary session will enable contacts to be established which will be most useful and beneficial when all our new Greek colleagues are appointed Members of the European Parliament.

3. Membership of Parliament

President. — The competent German authorities informed me on 13 November 1980 of the appointment of Mr Rieger as Member of the European Parliament to replace Mr Schmitt, who has died.

I welcome the new Member and remind the House that, pursuant to Rule 3 (3) of the Rules of Procedure any Member whose credentials have not yet been verified takes his seat provisionally in Parliament and on its committees with the same rights as other Members.

4. Petitions

President. — I have received various petitions whose titles and authors are set out in the minutes. These petitions will be forwarded for consideration to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions.

President

The minutes also contain details of various decisions concerning petitions.

5. *Documents received*

President. — Since the session was adjourned I have received from the Council, the parliamentary committees, the political groups and individual Members various documents which are listed in the minutes.

6. *Texts of treaties forwarded by the Council*

President. — I have received from the Council certified true copies of various agreements and acts. These documents, which are listed in the minutes of this sitting, will be deposited in the archives of the European Parliament.

7. *Order of business — Speaking Time*

President. — The next item is the order of business.

At its meeting of 16 October 1980 the enlarged Bureau drew up the draft agenda which has been distributed (PE 68-000/rev).

At its meeting this morning the chairmen of the political groups proposed a number of changes.

As Mr Beumer's report on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, on a directive on taxes which affect the consumption of manufactured tobacco, scheduled to be considered on Thursday (No 245) has been withdrawn from the agenda since it was not adopted by the Committee.

At the request of the chairman of the Committee on External Economic Relations, I propose to include in the joint debate on the iron and steel industry, entered on tomorrow's agenda, a report by Mr Martinet on EEC-USA relations in the steel sector (Doc. 1-565/80).

It has been proposed that a separate debate on the report by Mrs von Alemann, on the siting of nuclear power stations (Doc. 1-442/8) should be held tomorrow.

It has also been proposed that the oral question with debate by Mr Seligman on energy strategy following the Venice Summit of 23 June 1980 (Doc. 1-508/80) should be withdrawn from the agenda and replaced by an oral question by Mr Seligman and others on supplies of oil to the Community from the Middle East.

At the request of the Council I propose to enter at the beginning of Thursday's sitting a report by Mr Dankert, on behalf of the Committee on Budgets, on the draft amending and supplementary budget No 1 of the Communities for 1980, which has just been referred to us and which will be put to the vote immediately after the debate.

At the Council's request I propose to enter on Thursday's agenda, in place of Mr Beumer's report which has been withdrawn, a report by Mr Pearce on the generalized tariff preferences (Doc. 1-545/80). The debate will be held at the time scheduled for the Beumer Report.

At its meeting of 28 October 1980 the enlarged Bureau authorized me to propose that a report by Mr Moreland, on behalf of the Committee on Transport, on the Community quota for the carriage of goods by road (Doc. 1-555/80) should be entered on Friday's agenda.

At the request of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group) I propose to enter on Friday's agenda, after the Moreland Report, an oral question by this group on export refunds.

Finally, at the request of the Committee on Transport I propose to enter as the last item on Friday's agenda a report by Mr Key on the safety of containers in the European Community (Doc. 1-556/80).

Mr Seefeld. — (D) Madam President, before the agenda for this week is definitively adopted, I should like to make one request. As you know a motion for a resolution on the continued existence of Eurocontrol has been tabled.

I understand that you intend a vote to be taken on Wednesday to decide whether this motion by the Committee on Transport is to be considered under urgent procedure; if so the motion would be taken in the plenary sitting on Friday. I should like to ask you to see to it that the vote on urgent procedure is taken as quickly as possible to enable the motion to be adopted by Parliament before Thursday, 20 November. The reason is this: seven of the nine Ministers of Transport of our Member States will be meeting on 20 November and it would be ridiculous for this House to take a decision on 21 November. I therefore appeal to the common sense of the whole House and ask for your support, Madam President, in seeing to it that a decision is taken on this motion by 19 November. Otherwise our opinion will be valueless. In the interests of my committee, I therefore urge you, Madam President, to adopt the agenda in such a way that a decision can still be taken on this motion in the House before 20 November. I am counting on your understanding in this matter.

(Applause)

President. — We discussed this matter at length this morning. It is impossible to enter the request for urgent debate on the agenda before Wednesday, in the first place because the 21 signatures required have not yet been obtained. However, in addition, as you know, we have decided that, since it is impossible to have all the documents ready in time, that decisions on urgent procedure would no longer be taken on Tuesday. In fact, on many occasions certain Members took the view — and I believe that it was shared by the House as a whole — that a debate on urgency could not take place if all the documents had not been distributed. Therefore, henceforward these votes will only be taken on Wednesday or Thursday mornings. All the requests for urgent procedure have been placed on Wednesday morning's agenda to allow the documents to be distributed so that Members can have all the documents translated into their own languages before they vote.

If Parliament decides to hold an urgent debate it will then have to decide when this debate should take place.

Mr Seefeld. — (*D*) Thank you for your helpful attitude, Madam President. I should like to thank you on behalf of all my colleagues who, I believe, are performing tasks of great responsibility in the Committee on Transport.

Through their spokesmen in the Committee on Transport, all the groups have indicated their support for this motion and for the procedure indicated by me. I am assuming that more than 21 colleagues will lend their signatures to my request because this Parliament has often unanimously indicated its view that Eurocontrol must continue.

(*Applause*)

I hope that you will be able to overcome the formalities and help us to reach a reasonable decision. The meeting of Transport Ministers will end on Thursday afternoon. They would surely not understand our insistence on formalities at a time when the existence of a vital organization is at stake. I hope that reason will prevail.

(*Applause*)

President. — The House will decide on Wednesday.

Sir Frederick Catherwood. — Madam President, I am sorry that I am a little slow in coming back to the question of the timing of the debate on the GSP. You have — and I thank you for it — responded to my request to have it held before Friday, but as I understand the position, it is to replace Mr Beumer's report, which is the last one on Thursday night. The reason I

felt that we should discuss the generalized system of preferences at a time when we have a good attendance is that it is a critical debate, because the generalized system of preferences affects our relations with all the developing countries, which is most of the world, and so a lot of people will be looking at it. It is also a rather critical debate in relation to the newly-industrialized countries, and we are doing some new things. If we have a debate in the middle of Thursday night on a subject affecting the Community's relationships with about two-thirds of the world, it may not look very good.

I would very strongly suggest, Madam President, that instead of simply substituting it for Mr Beumer's report, we bring it forward and hold it on Thursday morning. We could then vote for it on Thursday afternoon, because again if we leave the vote until Friday morning it will be very difficult. I do not do this very often, but I do very strongly suggest that this is a critical report and a critical debate and should be brought further forward on Thursday.

President. — We already made an exception by including this report on a day when the agenda was already very full by reason of the addition of the debate on the supplementary budget. We were able to substitute one report for another, but we cannot upset the order of business; as all the reports for Thursday are important we cannot give priority to one of them.

Mr Cottrell. — Madam President, I would like to say something in support of my colleague, Mr Seefeld, who has spoken on the subject of Eurocontrol.

I would recall, Madam President, that we have already had one embarrassing incident with Eurocontrol when, because we were not able to debate a report in the previous part-session concerning the future of this organization, Parliament was placed in the situation where it had to send a telegram to the Eurocontrol Ministers meeting in Brussels to advise them of Parliament's opinion. It seems to me, Madam President, that when this House spends so much time discussing matters which are alleged to be of importance to the Community but which seem, to me at least, not to be, and when we have a grave doubt about an organization concerned with the lives of air passengers in the Community, then we should do as Mr Seefeld says and show some flexibility.

I would remind you, Madam President, that we have already voted in favour of this organization and the work that it is doing. Despite all that you have said, I really do support Mr Seefeld in calling for urgent debate, so that we can take a decision which, hopefully, will impress the Ministers before they decide the future of the organization.

(*Applause*)

President. — Mr Cottrell, there seems to be a misunderstanding. I already explained to Mr Seefeld that, if urgent procedure is adopted — and this cannot take place before Wednesday — it will be for the House itself to decide when the debate should take place.

Mr Rogers. — Madam President, the point at issue is not whether the House feels that the matter is urgent. I think we would all agree that it is. What Mr Seefeld is asking is when we are going to vote on it afterwards. There is a precedent here, because I myself was in the chair when the House actually made a decision to accept the urgency of a matter and then to fix a time for voting. Would this not also be suitable for Wednesday? We could agree that it is urgent and also fix a time for voting, which could be Wednesday, so that we could give an opinion before the Ministers meet. I hear someone say that the President said the same thing: Well, if she did, it did not come over quite as clearly in translation.

President. — That is what I just said.

Mr Pannella. — (*F*) Madam President, I should like to know whether procedural motions always take priority in this Assembly?

President. — Mr Pannella, as all the Members raised their hands for a point of order I gave them the floor in the order in which they asked to speak.

I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (*F*) Madam President, I simply want a clarification: what rule are we to apply? Are there any changes or are we going to discuss the agenda by raising constant objections for hours on end?

(*Laughter*)

President. — Mr Pannella, until the order of business is definitively adopted, I feel that everyone who so requests should be allowed to speak.

President. — I call Sir Frederick Catherwood.

Sir Frederick Catherwood. — Madam President, I would like to ask for a vote on the timing of the debate on the generalized system of preference, because I was asked to make this request on behalf of my committee. I really do not think that it is right that we should have a debate on our relations with so many countries in the world in the middle of the night, which is when this will happen. It really is, I think, absurd. We spend so much of our time thinking of our

relationships with third countries; we spend so much of our time thinking of the developing countries and their problems, and then, when it comes to the debate on the Commission's proposals for the generalized system of preferences for the next five years, which are very substantially different from those for the last five years, we schedule that debate right in the middle of the night. Our committee thought that this was an absurd thing to do.

I really cannot see, Madam President, why we need to do that. I entirely accept that there are other important items on that day, but quite frankly, looking down the list of items, I cannot see that there are any where the external relations aspect is so vital. It really does matter when we have this debate and how many people are going to be here. So I should like, on behalf of my committee, to ask for a vote on this.

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

Mr Pannella. — (*I*) Madam President, Rule 12 (2) of the Rules of Procedure reads as follows

At the beginning of each part-session, Parliament shall decide on the draft agenda submitted to it by the enlarged Bureau without alteration other than such alterations as may be proposed by the President or proposed to him in writing . . .

I therefore believe that this informal discussion is being unnecessarily protracted. We must either accept or reject the agenda submitted to us unless proposed changes have been made in writing. I do not think they have. That at least is the method which we have often followed in the past.

President. — Mr Pannella, Mr Seefeld's request was not a request to amend the agenda but merely a comment on the debate on urgent procedure. Sir Frederick Catherwood's request was submitted in writing, pursuant to Rule 12 of the Rules of Procedure, more than an hour before the sitting opened. Although Sir Frederick made this request on behalf of his committee, I must point out that he was the only one who signed it. Should I therefore consider that a motion to amend the agenda has been duly made?

I put the matter to the House, as it is something not provided for in the Rules of Procedure.

President. — I call Lady Elles.

Lady Elles. — Madam President, I would just like to refer to Rule 12 (2) regarding such alterations as may be proposed by the President. Well, you have kindly proposed that this report should be held late in the evening on Thursday, and I think therefore that Parliament has a right to vote on this proposal that

Lady Elles

you have had the courtesy to make to it. I would therefore support Sir Fred Catherwood in asking for a vote on your proposal to Parliament.

President. — I call Mr Bangemann.

Mr Bangemann. — (*D*) Madam President, I support Lady Elles's proposal; either we accept her suggestion that this item should be placed on the agenda for Thursday evening or we do not accept it, in which case the report will not be placed on Thursday's agenda. This is a concrete proposal.

President. — I put to the vote Sir Frederick Catherwood's motion.

The proposal to replace the Beumer Report by the Pearce Report is adopted.

I call Lord Harmar Nicholls.

Lord Harmar Nicholls. — Madam President, on a point of order I would like to say that I am sad about the decision that has just been taken. I believe that this Parliament ought to accept the President's ruling on matters connected with the actual carrying out of the procedures. I support Mr Seefeld's plea, but instead of asking the whole Parliament of 410 Members to make these decisions, we ought to leave it to the President and a small group to make these decisions and fix our agenda. It seems to me, Madam President, that if we are to be respected as a Parliament, then as many until it can sort out its own procedures. I would like to feel that we have confidence in the President we elect and that we allow that person to fix our agenda without throwing it open to all of this phony democracy, because it is phony and the sooner we achieve some greater efficiency the better for the future of this Parliament.

President. — I call Mr Enright.

Mr Enright. — My point of order is quite a simple one. I deplore the assumption that people will not be here on Thursday and Friday, which is inherent in what has been said in arguing for a change in the agenda. It seems to me, Madam President, that if we are to be respected as a Parliament, then as many people should be here on Thursday night and Friday morning as there are on Monday evening and Tuesday morning. I hope that you will uphold this principle, Madam President.

(Applause from various quarters)

President. — Are there any other comments?

The order of business is approved.¹

8. *Deadline for tabling amendments*

President. — I propose to fix the deadline for tabling amendments as set out in the draft agenda.

The deadline for tabling amendments to the draft amending and supplementary budget No 1 is fixed at 10 p.m. tomorrow.²

9. *Procedure without report*

President. — The titles of proposals from the Commission to the Council placed on the agenda for this sitting for consideration without report, pursuant to Rule 27 A of the Rules of Procedure are set out in the minutes.

Unless a Member asks leave to speak on these proposals or amendments are tabled to them before the opening of Friday's sitting, I shall declare these proposals to be approved.

I call Mr Sarre.

Mr Sarre. — (*F*) Madam President, we learnt last week that a South African delegation would be visiting the European Parliament during the part-session which is beginning today. The Bureau of the Socialist Group has already made a declaration stating that it will not receive this delegation and I think we should go even further. As you know, Madam President, this visit has been arranged by an agency which specializes in public relations on behalf of the racist regime in Pretoria . . .

¹ See minutes for order of business and for allocation of speaking time.

² See minutes.

President. — Mr Sarre, as this item is not on the agenda, there are no grounds for making a statement: this item is not provided for in the agenda. It could possibly be raised in the Bureau but there is no possibility of making a statement.

Mr Sarre. — *(F)* ... I would like nevertheless to express the hope that Parliament will show sufficient dignity to refrain from receiving this delegation.

(Protests by certain Members of the European Democratic Group)

President. — Mr Sarre, it is for each group to decide individually what it should do.

I call Mr Rogers.

Mr Rogers. — On a point of order, Madam President, with regard to the point raised by Mr Sarre, the agency he referred to also used the name of the European Parliament. Now what are you, as the custodian and President of the European Parliament, going to do about this?

President. — This matter can be raised in the Bureau.

I call Mr Scott-Hopkins.

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — On an entirely different matter, Madam President, I understand that during this week and particularly today a number of committees of the House are meeting, in particular the Committee on Budgets, the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning and the Committee on Agriculture. Now I understood that you were very much against this and Parliament had almost taken the decision to have a minimum number of committee meetings during plenary sessions, and particularly during Question Time. I am not quite sure exactly how this happened. All I would do at this stage is to ask you to look into it as a matter of urgency and perhaps come back to the House tomorrow morning or to the Bureau, whichever you decide, and say what your views are concerning this matter.

President. — Mr Scott-Hopkins, during the week preceding each part-session I receive from the chairmen of the committees a large number of requests for meetings. When these requests are not supported by adequate reasons I reject them.

However, in certain cases there is a genuinely urgent need for the committees to meet. This is the case where the Committee on Budgets is concerned: it must be enabled to prepare the debate on the draft budget.

The Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Regional Policy also have urgent matters to discuss.

However each time I give the authorization I do so with considerable regret, since they place a heavy burden on the administrative services as well as keeping Members from the Chamber.

At the same time I am grateful for your statement since it gives me an opportunity of asking everyone to avoid as far as possible organizing meetings during the plenary sittings. It is a point on which I am always extremely vigilant.

I call Mrs van den Heuvel.

Mrs van den Heuvel. — *(NL)* Madam President, I cannot agree at all with your view. I consider, on the contrary that it is extremely useful for Members of Parliament whose presence in the Chamber is not absolutely vital, to use the available time for committee meetings. If we used the time available to us to attend plenary debates in addition to committee meetings, this Chamber would always be fuller than it is at present.

President. — Yes indeed, Mrs van den Heuvel, there are cases where I have no other option but to authorize a committee to hold a meeting.

I call Mr Pannella on a point of order.

Mr Pannella. — *(F)* Madam President, I welcome the fact that, for the first time for 12 months, we are respecting the Rules of Procedure. If I am not mistaken you have on this occasion departed from your consistent practice of proposing the use of Rules 28 and 36 A in a manner which is not authorized by the Rules themselves. Thank you, Madam President, for restoring the rights of Members of Parliament in this area unless — but I hope not — I am mistaken.

(Laughter)

President. — Mr Pannella I must deprive you at once of your optimism and your satisfaction: I believe I announced already that speaking time would be allocated as set out in the draft agenda.

I call Mr Galland.

Mr Galland. — *(F)* Madam President, we cannot allow Mr Pannella to constantly raise artificial procedural points. I am very sorry, Mr Pannella, but speaking time is allocated in our debates in conformity with Rules 28 and 36 A of the Rules of Procedure. There is no other possibility. It is time for you to stop telling us

Galland

that we are failing to respect the Rules of Procedure in regard to the use of speaking time.

Your interpretation of the way in which speaking time could be used is scandalous. Read the Rules of Procedure, try to understand them and stop raising points which are completely out of order.

10. *Action taken by the Commission on the opinions and proposals of Parliament*

President. — The next item is the statement by the Commission on action taken on the opinions and resolution of the European Parliament.¹

I call Mr Purvis.

Mr Purvis. — Madam President, I refer to the resolution we passed last month on the disappearance of little girls in South East Asia — Document 1-494/80. I would like to ask the Commission if in fact they feel they are going to be able to fulfil the request in that resolution that the Commission should provide a report on the danger that these children are being sold into prostitution and on the trade in children between the Far East and Europe.

President. — I call Mr Natali.

Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission. — (I) Madam President, Members of this House will remember that when Mr Ortoli spoke on behalf of the Commission in the debate on this subject, he said that the Commission did not have the resources to prepare a report for submission to the European Parliament on this matter. Nevertheless we have asked our delegation in Bangkok to obtain all the relevant data for submission to Parliament.

Once we receive that information, we shall take care to forward it to the responsible parliamentary committee.

11. *Possibility of designating 1985 'European Music Year'*

President. — The next item is the report by Mr Hahn, on behalf of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport on the possibility of designating 1985 'European Music Year' (Doc. 1-345/80).

I call Mr Hahn.

¹ See Annex.

Mr Hahn, rapporteur. — (D) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, on 16 January 1980 sixty — two members of all the political groups in the European Parliament signed a motion for a resolution calling for 1985 to be declared European Music Year.

The reason for that motion was the fact that 300 years ago, in 1685, three leading European composers were born, Johann Sebastian Bach, Georg Friedrich Händel and Domenico Scarlatti.

On 29 May and 9 July the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport considered the draft report and unanimously adopted the present motion for a resolution. The committee welcomed the initiative taken by the authors of the motion dated 16 January.

There is surely no other area of European culture in which the basic feature of that culture, namely unity in variety, is so convincingly evident as in music. Europe's musical heritage is incomparable in the cultural history of mankind. It remains as vital as ever today and retains its universal validity. Each in its own way, all the peoples of Europe have contributed to it and although different languages and certain historical prejudices which are difficult to overcome are an obstacle to comprehension between the peoples, music is generally understood. Musical unity has long since existed in Europe. The integration of Europe in the sphere of music has already been completed. This is a symbol of the fact that the countries of Europe are bound together by culture far more than by economic links. Unfortunately this was not reflected in the budget debates in Luxembourg the week before last when almost all the amendments tabled by the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport were rejected.

Our committee proposes that European Music Year should be marked by guest performances by leading European orchestras, by music festivals and seminars, exhibitions on the history of music and special television and radio programmes. A year of that kind could provide the framework for special measures at both national and European level. The European Youth Orchestra, the European Choir and the European Federation of Young Choirs should play a leading part in this and perform, in particular, the works of the three great masters. But works by European musicians of all centuries and countries, as well as folk music and contemporary music should also be included.

European youth should play a particular part in European Music Year. The national governments should take the initiative of strengthening and improving music tuition in schools. Training centres for musicians and especially for music teachers should be improved and provided with satisfactory equipment. The school curricula should be examined to determine whether they allow music an adequate place. The

Hahn

organizations joined together in the European Youth Forum should also participate in European Music Year. The Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport is however of the opinion that the organization of this music year should rest with the Council of Europe rather than with the European Community. The Council of Europe has already organized successfully two previous events: European Natural Heritage Year in 1970 and European Architectural Heritage Year in 1975. It has wide experience and is able to contact a much wider circle of European countries and persons. We should therefore ask the Council of Europe to take up this suggestion. Nevertheless, the European Community should make an appropriate financial contribution. The Commission should prepare this.

As soon as the Council of Europe gives its agreement and presents a programme for the European Music Year the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport must once again discuss the participation of the European Community. We would ask the Assembly to approve our motion.

President. — I call Mrs Viehoff to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mrs Viehoff. — (NL) Madam President, there are advantages and drawbacks in proclaiming a music year or any other kind of year. The advantage is that action is taken which provides an incentive and may have lasting consequences for the future. The drawback may be that in a year of that kind one particular subject will be highlighted and money spent on special events which are organized, after which everything may be forgotten again. During a music year, the activities should concentrate on providing opportunities for young composers, soloists and performing musicians to participate in subsidized performances and competitions; there should be radio and television broadcasts of modern music, grammophone records of contemporary music should be issued, perhaps with subsidies when they are not commercially viable, and music teaching in our schools should be improved. In short, these activities must stimulate the creativity of young people and reach a wide public. Only then can a music year have any real purpose.

On reading the original motion for a resolution, in particular the last section calling for extensive celebration of the 300th anniversary of the birth of Bach, Händel and Scarlatti, we do not gain the impression that the European Music Year is to be given the content which we should like it to have.

The music year can most appropriately be related to the anniversary of the birth of the three leading composers but it must not lead to a situation in which carefully selected audiences of expensively dressed ladies and gentlemen attend gala concerts throughout

Europe for a whole year to listen to works by these composers. That would only be a negative phenomenon of the kind to which I referred earlier since in 1986 the whole business would be forgotten and there would be no change whatever in our overall attitude to music. Finally, we fully agree that the Council of Europe is the appropriate agency to organize this year and should therefore be asked to do so. If there are any problems it is not really for the European Parliament to take an initiative of its own.

Madam President, I have here two amendments. I do not know whether they still apply, but I should like to indicate my views. The first amendment relates to paragraphs 3 and 4. We are against it. The second seeks to state specifically in paragraph 5 that encouragement must be given to young composers and musicians. We are in favour of this.

President. — I call Mrs Gaiotti de Biase to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (C-D Group).

Mrs Gaiotti de Biase. — (I) Madam President, in the Committee on Youth and Culture, the Christian-Democratic Group approved the resolution tabled by Mr Hahn together with the accompanying report. We should of course like cultural policy in the Community to take on a broader substance than these purely commemorative proposals. We should like a Community cultural policy to exist but we cannot claim that it does exist as yet; we are nevertheless pleased that this motion should have come before Parliament thereby highlighting the importance of the work of this kind. We should not like the Community either — as the resolution rightly points out — to be isolated but hope that a joint initiative will be taken by all the member countries of the Council of Europe.

I believe that the motion for a resolution should emphasize and call attention to the growth in the interest taken by young people in music in all countries. This is one of many aspects of the revolution in leisure time which we may not yet always be able to assess in terms of its true political significance. The leisure revolution is a great challenge to our societies, since we must face the problems arising in this context by encouraging the use of leisure time as a factor for cultural integration, cultural communication and, in short, individual enrichment.

That, as I see it, is the background to the proposal regarding European Music Year which must not be reduced to a mere ritual celebration of the birth of these great musicians; that is merely the starting point for choosing this particular year.

In that sense I approve and express our interest in the resolution which has been tabled and in the individual proposals, while stressing the need for the Interna-

Gaiotti de Biase

tional Music Year to be used for a wider purpose than merely listening to music — it should rather be an occasion to improve the conditions available to young musicians and to lend them support. The Committee on Youth and Culture is at present examining the whole problem of the conditions experienced by cultural workers: the International Music Year could provide an opportunity to emphasize the conditions in which cultural workers in the musical sector are placed in Europe, in the nine Community countries. I therefore believe that this resolution should be approved by the Assembly.

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

Mr Patterson. — First of all, Madam President, I should like, on behalf of my group, to welcome the admirably succinct and unfortunately long-postponed report by Mr Hahn. We also welcome the idea of declaring 1985 International Music Year.

We on the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport are very well aware of the importance of cultural activities. We know that it is a medium through which Europe, for the first time as far as most people are concerned, can become a reality for millions of people. For most European citizens, music, architecture, painting, sculpture and the great writers and poets of Europe are a more powerful symbol of European unity than either, for example, the common agricultural policy or even the Common Market. I would go so far as to say that more people have heard of, and have certainly heard, the European Community Youth Orchestra than have heard the European Parliament. Europe as a civilization means more to people than Europe as an institution. It would therefore be sensible as well as right for us to do much more in the cultural field.

However, let us be realistic. See how few of us there are here at the moment to debate this matter! Remember, Madam President, what this Parliament did two weeks ago to the cultural budget of the Community. The Commission proposed to spend less than 0.1 % of the budget on cultural activities and the Council, supported by this Parliament, cut that back even further.

In these circumstances Mr Hahn's report represents a very wise approach in asking that, in the first instance at least, the Council of Europe be asked to be the main sponsor. To begin with the Council of Europe has resources to organize such an event. We, lamentably, do not. In the second place, the Council has experience in organizing such an event. In 1970 it organized European Conservation Year and then in 1975, Architectural Heritage Year. I need hardly remind you what we and the Council of the Communities did two

weeks ago to our own architectural budget. We voted it out altogether!

Finally, let us remember that European culture extends much further than the Community's frontiers. Can we really envisage a European Music Year that leaves out for example the Austrians: Mozart, Hayden, Schubert, Mahler, Brückner and so on. Mr von Habsburg is not here, but I am sure he would agree with me on this point.

Mr Hahn also suggests that the Community can make an important contribution to a music year: participation by the Youth Orchestra and the Choir. We can all do something to encourage sponsorship by national governments and national bodies and by industry and commerce. We in the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport as the explanatory part of this report points out, reserve the right to come back to this matter in the event of our request to the Council of Europe not being fruitful.

Finally, Madam President, who knows, by 1985 we in this Parliament and Community may have come to our senses; we may have voted some money to make a financial contribution of our own. I support the report, Madam President.

President. — I call Mrs Pruvot to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mrs Pruvot. — Madam President, I have listened to the chorus of all my colleagues this evening in support of culture. What a pity that they did not sing the same chorus two weeks ago in Luxembourg.

I support Mrs Gaiotti De Biase's words. I do not intend to repeat points that have already been made and shall confine myself to a comment on Mr Hahn's motion. We are firm believers in European identity and convinced of its importance and of the absolute necessity for action to develop and strengthen it. We therefore approve his report. However, I note once again the disparity between intentions, between the positions adopted by Members of the Assembly and the resolve shown by them when the opportunity arises of endowing the Community with the resources necessary for a cultural policy. I therefore wish to point to the paradox in paragraph 5 of the explanatory statement which was already introduced in paragraph 2: how can the Community be expected to take so many initiatives and undertake so many projects when a great many amendments tabled by the Committee on Youth and Culture were rejected in the 1981 budgetary procedure by the selfsame Members, or a good number of them, who signed the motion for a resolution which led to this report. And, as a corollary of that, how can the Commission be expected to contribute to the financing when the necessary appropriations have not been voted?

Pruvot

I am afraid that this motion for resolution will remain no more than an expression of pious intentions unless, between now and 1985, the Community has shown the determination to endow itself with adequate own resources and unless this Parliament takes a much greater interest in areas other than the Community of shopkeepers.

Can we reasonably ask the European Community to take part in cultural actions and lend its support to them when we refuse to provide the modest financial resources essential to such action?

Having said that, we must hope that rather than being a mere celebration, the designation of 1985 as Music Year should help to support and encourage both national and European efforts to stimulate interest in music and help our citizens to better understand the extent to which Europeans need to share their common culture.

Does this imply that an event of this kind should be held within the frontiers of our Community? I do not think so. We therefore support the rapporteur when he suggests that organization of Music Year should be left to the Council of Europe.

We consider that the largest possible number of countries should participate in this important event. This suggestion is also vital because we believe that successful cooperation between the European Parliament and the Council of Europe will be beneficial to the Community as a whole.

In this time of great difficulty for the arts and cultural workers in general, it is appropriate not only to promote but also to encourage any initiative designed to foster international understanding, respect and tolerance between young people throughout the world.

Ladies and gentlemen, you may remember that five years ago, at the initiative of the United Kingdom, the European Parliament decided that a symphony orchestra consisting of young musicians from the whole Community should be set up. The Youth Orchestra and Choir of the European Community referred to in paragraph 6 of the explanatory statement should participate fully in the events and festivities to be organized and, by definition, should receive full financial support from the Community. Every cultural contribution should be matched by a suitable financial contribution.

I should like above all to thank Mr Hahn for showing sufficient courage to draft this report and submit this resolution to us. I am convinced that, for some time at least, the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport will need to show a great deal of courage and perseverance in presenting the results of their work to this House.

The Liberal and Democratic Group which shares my concern in the problems of education and culture, will be voting in favour of Mr Hahn's motion for resolution.

President. — I call Mr Ansquer to speak on behalf of the Group of the European Progressive Democrats.

Mr Ansquer. — (*F*) It may seem paradoxical to designate one particular year as music year, given that music is an integral part of our cultural and daily life. We are all strongly in favour of the initiative taken by the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport and we wish to congratulate the rapporteur, Mr Hahn, on his outstanding report.

The committee rightly wishes to seize an opportunity — the opportunity to celebrate the 300th anniversary of the birth of three great European composers. I believe that in 1985 we shall be able to enhance public awareness in Europe of the importance of music in our lives: it is an art form, the expression of feelings and a means of communication between individuals and, therefore, a link binding all Europeans together.

We have time enough to organize this European Year. Let us use the available time to see to it that public opinion, by which I mean the citizens of Europe, is not disappointed. Let us see to it that events of real quality are organized to encourage creativity as some of my colleagues have just said. 1985 as European Music Year could also be used to launch a genuine cultural policy.

May I say to you, Mr Chairman of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, that we cannot be mere economists. It is true that we need a strong economy in our Community, but we should be failing in our duty as politicians responsible for European life if we did not go further and propose wider horizons to the peoples of Europe. I believe that men like Johann Sebastian Bach, Händel, and Scarlatti are ever present: they are eternal. Let us use their works as an opportunity to organize a cultural Europe, a Europe without frontiers, since music knows no frontiers, a Europe of the mind.

Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, our group entirely supports the motion tabled by Mr Hahn and hopes that the Community in its entirety, i.e. the Council, the Commission and the Member States as well as the many organizations and powerful technical resources available to us will all be brought to bear on this occasion to bring home to the peoples of Europe that music is not merely an art but quite simply an expression of life.

President. — I call Mrs Macciochi to speak on behalf of the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defense of Individual Groups and Members.

Mrs Macciocchi. — (I) Madam President, our group naturally supports this initiative but I must say that I have rarely seen a less musical text; there is no evidence of musical inspiration in this resolution whose wording seems to me cold and uninspired. Perhaps, however, the all-pervading bureaucratic tone of our proceedings would have made it difficult to adopt a different style for this particular motion.

Although the text is lacking in inspiration, it does reflect a praiseworthy intention. I am very sorry that this European year should not be proclaimed until 1985 when many of us who have lent their support to this proposal, will no longer belong to the European Parliament. Why should we look beyond the present life of this Parliament and why in effect commit ourselves to action which — however outstanding the genius of those whom we are to celebrate — will nevertheless be essentially commemorative in nature?

The problem is that we have no cultural policy and that it is not sufficient to celebrate musical geniuses of the past. Cultural policy is lacking in this Parliament but alive throughout Europe. As my colleagues well know there are centres which attract young people, intellectuals and artists such as the Bayreuth Festival where Wagner is not commemorated but brought to life again in our age through a conjunction of musical techniques and musical interpretation; there is also the Salzburg Festival and, I might add, the Venice Biennale. Those are three examples of places where Europeans come together. Perhaps these are examples of the only meeting points of culture, indeed of real European unity.

I would add that, in approving this resolution, we might also accept a proposal made by Mr Pedini in respect of the Venice Biennale to the effect that a festival of contemporary music should be organized to permit experimentation in the latest musical compositions including electronic and tonal music.

The Director of the music section of the Venice Biennale, Mr Mario Messinis, has already contacted Mr Pedini. In this connection, I personally would hope for a meeting between our Committee on Youth and Culture and the Director of the Biennale who is responsible for this initiative. I believe that an orchestra consisting of conductors and performing artists from Community and other countries should be formed in 1981 already (I do not see why we should confine ourselves as the resolution does to the European Community) — music knows no frontiers. The important thing is for this initiative to be put into effect by this institution as soon as possible.

A further more rapid and feasible action would be to take up the proposal concerning the Venice Biennale; I hope that the Committee on Youth and Culture and Mr Pedini personally will take the necessary steps as soon as possible.

For the rest I am pessimistic: I do not believe that we can make real progress in Community cultural policy and I do not think that celebration of 1985 as European Music Year at the initiative of this Parliament elected in 1979, can give us reason to claim that we shall have contributed to the cultural unity and rebirth of Europe and to the removal of those chauvinistic cultural frontiers which still exist.

President. — I call Mr Papapietro to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Papapietro. — (I) We welcome the initiative of proclaiming 1985 as European Music Year. We signed the motion for resolution and approved the report by Mr Hahn in committee.

We believe that this motion — which we should like to see adopted by Parliament and approved by the Council — has a considerable value not only for the purpose of a general refinement of musical taste and strengthening the awareness among Europeans of the extreme value of their cultural heritage but also for other more specific reasons. Parliament should seize this opportunity. Unlike practically all other parliaments, our Assembly was not elected by direct universal suffrage until some two decades after its foundation; as an institution of an economic Community we also have the task of improving Community awareness through the dissemination of cultural and historical knowledge of the countries of Europe.

Initiatives such as this with an eminently cultural and artistic value help the process of developing a European ideal by preventing Europe from being confined to a mere Community of markets, torn often by the tensions of interest groups. We therefore believe that the European Parliament cannot confine itself to merely proposing a European Music Year without contributing to its actual organization.

Four years remain before the start of 1985 and the Community and the Parliament must use that time to work on this matter to prevent this music year from degenerating into a mere commemorative ritual or into a few more concerts; nor is Community support for musicians or music teachers sufficient as referred to in the report. The Community must play a specific role to ensure that this music year leads to the acquisition of a richer heritage and becomes a landmark in the cultural history of Europe. It is therefore appropriate for the parliamentary committee, as indicated in its report, specifically to examine how Parliament and the Community can participate in the preparation and organization of music year.

We believe that our musical heritage, as indeed our general cultural and artistic heritage, must not be treated as a self-contained body handed down from past centuries. On the contrary our musical, cultural

Papapietro

and artistic heritage is also a basis for the search for new techniques, new modes of expression and new paths of musical creation which will enable us to give full expression to the multiple problems and many-faceted conscience of the present. This is one area in which we must work.

Many problems stand in the way of the organization of musical teaching; the role of music in the educational process differs from country to country; the system for the distribution of music, including music of the 17th and 18th century as well as contemporary experimental compositions, the organization of concerts and the record industry must be increasingly freed from the ties created above all by the privileged position of European monopolies. This could extend the audience for music to wider circles of the population and enrich our cultural awareness of music by reaching social groups which have up to now had no access to these forms of expression. Encouragement must be given to new and complex forms of creation through which our musical heritage and awareness can be enriched. We believe that this must be an opportunity to draw on the rich musical experience of other continents which have already offered technical and tonal contributions to many European musical experiments. We need more knowledge of those experiments to better understand the peoples concerned with whom Europe wishes to open a closer dialogue and wider exchanges.

We should like this music year to make a particular appeal to young people. The young have helped to enhance the impact of music on our era: Bach's music resounded in the churches of Prague during the spring of 1968 while Beethoven's Ninth Symphony has been heard in the great squares of Italy and other European countries to highlight its progressive and popular inspiration for youth. There are other forms of musical expressions specific to young people, and the European Music Year must help to promote an understanding of them, enabling problems belonging to the most elevated sphere of cultural awareness to be studied.

In the five years between now and the end of 1985, the Communists intend to work on these problems together with other colleagues who have shown such sensitivity in this matter to foster all aspects of European musical culture. We hope to submit practical proposals for action in the next few months.

President. — I call Mr Seligman.

Mr Seligman. — Firstly, Madam President, I agree entirely with Mr Papapietro. This festival does need proper organization. I am 100 % in favour of designating 1985, European Music Year; but I am 100 % against handing over this wonderful opportunity to the Council of Europe. If the European Community cannot find the modest sum of money needed to

promote this festival, we should be ashamed. We have four years to get a line in the budget for this proposal.

Now, Bach, Scarlatti and Handel are jewels in the crown of the Community — they are not Swedish, they are not Austrian and they are not Swiss; they are German, Italian and British. As you know, Handel was naturalized British and subsequently became a director of the Royal Academy of Music. Why should we throw away these magnificent Community assets by handing them over to the Council of Europe? 1985 will be a great musical year in any case. Why shouldn't it be an occasion to promote Community spirit?

Madam Pruvot has just said that the idea of the European Community Youth Orchestra was born in this Parliament in 1975, and it has done more to establish a favourable image of the Community in people's minds than any other single measure that I know of.

Now I understand that Mr Patterson's and Mr Hahn's reason for handing over this wonderful opportunity to the Council of Europe is that the Community lacks the funds and organization to manage such a project. I disagree entirely with this argument. There is no reason why it should be an expensive administrative burden on the Community. There are many national and international musicians' organizations, including the International Music Council, based in Paris, the Incorporated Society of Musicians and the Musicians' Union, as well as the 'Now' live music organization which is organized by Yehudi Menuhin and presided over by Edward Heath. All these organizations could be asked to help in a worthwhile project.

I presume that DG XII of the Commission would take this under their wing and arrange for some additional temporary staff. Money should come, as it does for the Youth Orchestra, from governments, the Commission and private enterprise. I have suggested that a Trust Fund should be set up during this year to help young musicians and this should be subscribed to by public appeal throughout the 1985 Music Year.

Madam President, music is a universal language and it speaks to everyone. Let us not lightly throw away this wonderful opportunity to harness the glory of these three great Community musicians of 300 years ago to the promotion of a wider and deeper Community spirit. We cannot celebrate Mozart, Beethoven, Haydn and Mahler this year, because they were not born in 1685 — they were born later. Their turn will come. The purpose of my two amendments is to delete paragraph 3 and 4, so as to enable the EEC to sponsor the 1985 Music Year, or at least, to do it jointly with the Council of Europe. Surely we must grasp this unrepeatable opportunity to win the hearts of young people in Europe.

President. — I call Mr Jackson.

Mr C. Jackson. — Madam President, since Mr Hahn's report, with a great deal of which I agree, was tabled last July, there has been time to consider further the implications of European Music Year. I want to suggest to this House first, that we can in fact be much bolder in our approach, and secondly, agreeing with my colleague, Mr Seligman, that we should make it a smaller event. We should restrict it to the European Community of nine, ten, twelve or however many it will be in 1985 is therefore not strange.

We are all familiar with the local musical festivals which take place in cities, towns or regions right across the European Community; and to suggest, a European *Community* Music Year for our extended Community of nine, ten, twelve or however many it will be in 1985 is therefore not strange.

But the reason why I would suggest this is of considerable importance to the Community is that the complex economic and political matters to which we normally turn our attention give our citizens little feeling of being in a Community with a human dimension. This is a serious failing. To quote the Treaty of Rome: 'We are determined to lay the foundations of ever-closer union among the peoples of Europe.' Such a union, I would maintain, requires a feeling of belonging. This feeling takes us away from economics to emotion, to matters of the spirit. One of the greatest bonds between our peoples is of course cultural, that we share the great intellectual heritage of Greece, carried forward by Rome and gaining over the centuries a specifically Christian character. Against this common background there is a rich diversity of cultural and in particular musical achievements from the Member States of our Community in which we can all take great pride.

Let us therefore, I say, take the lead in helping the peoples of our Community to take pride in the achievements of their fellow-citizens of the past. This can be a real help in creating the feeling of unity that we need to make our Community progress. Let us take upon ourselves, because we are the democratic representatives of the citizens of the European Community, the responsibility for designating 1985 European Community Music Year.

At this point, Madam President, I beg to move the amendments in my name giving effect to this proposal. I suggest to the House that, with our support and encouragement, this idea will take root and be a magnificent success. I believe it will gain the support of cultural foundations, of cities, of industry and commerce as patrons of the arts. The year 1985 is of course the tercentenary, as others have said, of three of our greatest composers. But think of what other talent we can call upon for concerts just coming from the Community: Beethoven, Benjamin Britten, Debussy, Delius, Elgar, Mendelssohn, Schumann. Of course, we shall all regret cutting out Mozart. I personally would hope that there might be those who

would argue that Chopin is not just Polish, but can be considered an adopted citizen of France. But these, I believe, Madam President are tiny disadvantages when compared with merit for our Community of having a European Community Music Year in 1985; and it is to this — dare I say? — slightly more adventurous proposal that the House will, I hope, give its support in the vote in due course.

President. — I call Mr Balfe.

Mr Balfe. — Madam President, this motion for a resolution originated with my signature and those of 62 others last year, and I am pleased it has now come to the Parliament. I suppose, as they say in Britain, that I ought to declare an interest because one of my own relatives, Michael William Balfe, was responsible for loosing a number of operas on the people of Ireland in particular, and Europe in general.

(Laughter)

The opportunity which the birth of three composers in the same year provides for organizing a tercentenary had not been missed before this motion for a resolution was formulated. There is already a committee in London set up to sponsor in Great Britain, European Music Year as far as Britain is concerned. The point I would like to make about the Council of Europe is that even the Council of Europe does not cover the whole of Europe. There is a considerable interest in these three composers in other parts of Europe that are not covered by the Council of Europe.

What I was aiming to do in putting forward this motion for a resolution was to get, within the different States of Europe, some coordination on what will, undoubtedly, be a fairly widely celebrated event; an event which has already, incidentally, attracted some attention in both Czechoslovakia and Eastern Germany. So we are talking about a cultural event which, I believe, will, as 1985 gets closer, have an increasing significance for different countries within Europe.

Unfortunately, although Mr Hahn has produced an excellent report, I must agree with some speakers, that we certainly could do more because there is a tendency in the report to say, let us hand it over to someone else. To those people who say that we have very little in the budget for this activity I would say, that I think that, if an imaginative proposal was drawn up and put forward, money will be found for it, because people within this Parliament would see that there was an identifiable object on which we could worthily spend money. It is my hope that we will be able to play our part along with other groups within Europe to get off the ground a cultural event which, I am sure, will unite many more people. I agree with the earlier speaker who said that more people have proba-

Balfe

bly heard of these three composers than have heard of the European Parliament. In short, we have an excellent opportunity to promote something which will be of value across political and national boundaries; I hope that support for this resolution tomorrow will be the first step of the positive initiative designed to take hold of that opportunity.

President. — I call Mr Burke.

Mr Burke, Member of the Commission. — (F) Madam President, I am happy to indicate the Commission's full support for the report and resolution by Mr Hahn which have at least three merits.

The first concerns one of the objectives assigned to European Music Year; I am not referring here to the development of public interest in music since fortunately enough that interest has never been more pronounced than it is at present and we are witnessing nothing short of a musical explosion; the objective of which I am thinking is the encouragement which should be given to musicians and music teachers: most of them, apart from the few musicians who are household names, lead a precarious existence. They are frequent victims of unemployment. It is therefore eminently desirable for European Music Year to be made also European Musicians Year.

The second merit of Mr Hahn's report and resolution is the idea of turning to the Council of Europe. Why? Because it would be impossible to pursue the cooperation with the Council of Europe which is so strongly desired by both sides if the Community and its elder brother in Strasbourg duplicate the same activities. Cooperation necessarily implies and begins with the elimination of duplication.

The Council of Europe has acquired a brilliant reputation by organizing European years such as the Architectural Heritage Year in 1975. Therefore, instead of seeking to compete with the Council of Europe on the same ground, the Community should direct all its efforts towards action in the cultural sector. This involves essentially improvement of the economic and social situation of workers in this sector among whom musicians are in the vanguard.

Finally the report and motion for a resolution by Mr Hahn have a third merit — on which I shall conclude — of proposing for the Community's contribution to European music year the aspects which best coincide with our possibilities and resources. As Mr Hahn suggests we shall ask the Community Youth Orchestra and Choir to make a worthy contribution to European Music Year by giving works by Handel, Bach and Scarlatti a prominent place in their 1985 programme. They might even devote almost all their concerts in that year to these three illustrious composers. That would be even more impressive.

President. — The debate is closed.

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

IN THE CHAIR: MR DE FERRANTI

Vice-President

12. Question Time

President. — The next item is Question Time (Doc. 1-570/80).

We begin with questions to the Commission.

Question No 1, by Mr Patterson (H-405/80):

Is the decision of the United Kingdom Government to charge Greek students in British universities the full overseas rate of fee — £ 1 380 to £ 5 000 per annum — throughout the academic year 1980-81 compatible with the Treaties, having regard to the fact that students from other European Community Member States will only be charged the UK rate — £ 216 to £ 1 105 — and to the fact that Greece becomes a full Member State of the Community on 1 January, and if not, what steps does the Commission propose to take to ensure compliance by the UK Government with its Treaty obligations?

Mr Burke, Member of the Commission. — The Commission has welcomed the announcement by the Government of the United Kingdom that students in higher education from Member States of the Community will as from now be exempted from tuition fees claimed from foreigners studying in the United Kingdom. This decision is in accordance with the report of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport adopted by the Council of Education Ministers during the meeting of 27 June 1980 in Brussels which states in paragraph 4(d) (17), and I quote: 'When tuition fees are payable in a Member State, those for students from other Community countries will not be higher than those applicable to home students'. However, in the case of students from a new Member State, a Member State may for reasons of administrative necessity defer application of this principle until the beginning of the first academic year after accession.

In the Commission's opinion the Government of the United Kingdom does not discriminate against Community citizens as the above-mentioned procedure will be implemented as from the first year of the accession of Greece to the European Community.

Mr Patterson. — I note that the Commission referred to reasons of administrative necessity. However, the reason given by the Minister of State at the Department of Education and Science, in the House of Lords on 4 June was not administrative necessity but the need to save £ 1 500 000. In this case, considering the very small number of students involved — probably only 1 000 — would the Commissioner not agree that it would be more in accordance with the spirit of the Community if from the beginning of next year the Greek students who are newly coming into the education system in this academic year, were to be exempted?

Mr Burke. — It would not be appropriate for me in this forum to comment on a reply given in another. Whatever my personal feelings might be about the desirability of the course advocated by the honourable Member, I am advised that the reasons which I have stated in my reply are indeed the reasons given by the United Kingdom for the action it has taken. I see no reason to criticize that action.

Mrs Kellett-Bowman. — Would the Commissioner not agree that, if the Council of Education Ministers met rather more often than has been the case in the past, they would be able to influence decisions such as this, because with a Member State such as Greece, whom we are only too anxious to integrate as rapidly as we possibly can into the Community, it is very important that they come in as full members and as normal students in the academic year, only one term of which will in fact have been covered before they come into the Community?

Mr Burke. — Well, as a former member of the Council and having attended meetings of Ministers of Education, and indeed as one who has just taken over Mr Brunner's responsibilities for the remainder of this Commission's mandate, I would personally like to see Ministers of the Member States meeting in Council

Unfortunately, it is not possible in the short time available to us between now and the end of the year effectively to do very much about getting a further meeting of the Council, much as I would like to do so.

Mr Møller. — (DK) Does the Commission believe that it is compatible with the Community Treaties for the Belgian government to require increased tuition fees from foreign students from other Member States? If the Commission does not think this to be in order, will it take steps to ensure that the Belgian government puts an end to this practice?

Mr Burke. — If the case is as stated by the honourable Member — and my information is not necessarily the same as his — it would be deplorable. But I under-

stand that there is no discrimination in any Member State in relation to this particular question

President. — Question No 2, by Mrs Nielsen (H-420/80):

In view of the increasingly common practice of giving preference to national undertakings in public procurement and in the formulation of tender specifications, will the Commission tell us precisely what it is doing to combat this practice, which is fragmenting the common market in breach of the Treaty of Rome, and will it state how many complaints of such discrimination on the basis of nationality it received in 1977, 1978 and 1979, naming the national authorities against which they were levelled?

Mr Vredeling, Vice-President of the Commission. — (NL) The directive on the coordination of procedures for the award of public supply contracts does not require the Member States to publish invitations to bid or to notify the Commission of them. If undertakings consider that these invitations contain discriminatory provisions they may contact the Commission which then has the possibility of taking action by means of the procedures stipulated in the Treaty. Since the entry into force of Directive No 7762 (EEC) in July 1978, the Commission has received two complaints from undertakings, the first of which felt itself disadvantaged by a discriminatory provision based on nationality in the invitation to bid while the second related to failure to award a contract although the undertaking concerned had tendered the lowest bid.

President. — In the absence of its author, Question No 3, will receive a written answer.¹

Question No 4, by Mr Adam (H-433/80):

Will the Commission give an undertaking to carry out an immediate investigation into the pricing, credit and delivery-term policies in the non-ferrous metals industries in order to ensure fair trading within the Community?

Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission. — (I) The Commission is closely following developments on the international markets for non-ferrous metals. It would remind the honourable Member that an inquiry can only be opened in this sector if precise information is available on infringements of Treaty provisions on competitions. It is therefore not possible to conduct a general inquiry into all non-ferrous metals.

The Commission has however undertaken various surveys in respect of zinc and aluminium in particular. There is a suspicion that zinc producers have distorted

¹ See Annex to the Report of Proceedings of 19 November 1980.

Natali

the normal conditions of competition within the Common Market. The inquiries have not yet been completed. Furthermore the Commission wishes to draw the honourable Member's attention to the 1975 decision on an agreement between aluminium producers better known as the IFTRA standards; that is just one example of action in this area.

Mr Adam. — The particular industry that I had mainly in mind was the brass sector which is active in my constituency, and I am sure that the people who are threatened at the moment with short-time working and redundancy will welcome the assurances that have been given. Do I understand from the Commissioner that the submission of evidence of unfair competition will result in an enquiry by the Commission into the trading practices within the Community?

Mr Natali. — (I) That fits in precisely with the answer I have given. We cannot conduct an inquiry into all non-ferrous metals but can only undertake investigations if the rules of competition are distorted. Surveys are now in progress in the zinc sector.

President. — In the absence of its author, Question No 5, will receive a written answer.¹

Question No 6, by Mr Radoux (H-444/80):

Because of the persistent crisis, reference is constantly made, and with good reason, to the weaknesses and alarming situations observed in various branches of industry in all the Member States of the Community.

Can the Commission say which industries are not affected by the crisis, or are actually expanding, so as to permit an accurate assessment of the overall industrial situation in the Community. This question is intended to apply to each sector individually.

Do the Commission departments have a section dealing with the prevention of crisis situations?

Mr Vredeling, Vice-President of the Commission. — (NL) For information on the development of the situation in the various sectors of the economy, the Commission is dependent on the statistical data furnished to it and on contacts with business interests. The Commission does not seek to identify systematically prospects in sectors of industry which have not been affected by the crisis or are in a state of development. In view of the varied nature of the different situations an attempt of that kind could not possibly give reliable results and would tend to highlight the symptoms rather than the causes of industrial change. The Commission's analysis relates rather to factors of a more general nature which affect industrial struc-

tures, e.g. the recent increase in energy prices, particularly in the price of oil, the innovative capacity of undertakings, the consequences of new technologies for employment and the measures of adaptation taken by the national authorities. The Commission does not consider it desirable to set up a crisis prevention bureau of the kind referred to by the honourable Member; still less than the national public agencies does it have the financial resources or authority to ward off a crisis. Like all other public bodies the Commission is in possession of data which are not always suitable for publication and it believes that excessive publicity in regard to sectors experiencing a crisis situation may spark off panic reactions or over-reaction far beyond the needs of the actual situation. The Commission considers that it would be irresponsible to act in that way.

Mr Radoux. — (F) As I listened to the Commissioner's answer I wondered whether I had formulated my question properly. I can only say that he did not answer my question. No part of his answer related exactly to my question. When I refer to a crisis prevention office I am asking whether such an office actually exists and not what its consequences are. When I ask which industries are not affected by the crisis I do not want an evasive answer. I view this reply as a form of diplomacy in very poor taste.

President. — Question No 7, by Sir Frederick Warner (H-445/80):

In view of the fact that the Council's answer to the last question on this subject, tabled by Mr Scott-Hopkins on 14 November 1979,¹ was highly unsatisfactory, and in view of the fact that this relatively small matter of principle has been under consideration for a number of years now, can the Commission tell the Parliament what progress it is making with the Austrian request for a tariff reduction on a quota of concentrated perry-pear juice?

Mr Haferkamp, Vice President of the Commission. — (D) In this matter the Commission has conducted market research studies in cooperation with the Member States. These have shown that adequate quantities and qualities of the pear juice concentrate in question are available in the Community. The Commission has also found that contact might be improved between the vendors and the purchasers of this product.

Sir Frederick Warner. — I think it is curious what very odd information the Commission sometimes collects. I do not know where they collected this information, for the view of the British perry makers in no way accords with what he says. They do not find that there are adequate supplies within the Community. I take it that the Commissioner was referring to supplies of Italian pears, which are not suitable. The British perry industry is quite prepared to make use of as

¹ See Annex to the Report of Proceedings of 19 November 1980.

Sir Frederick Warner

much imported Italian pear-juice as it can, but it can only use it in small quantities; and it must go outside, and does go outside, for the rest of its requirements.

Could I ask the Commissioner to take another look at this and to consult properly with the representatives of the perry industry in Britain in order to get a sensible reply?

Mr Haferkamp. — (D) The suggestion which the honourable Member just made will of course be taken up by the Commission. I stated myself in my answer that contacts between the vendors and purchasers require improvement and that there are ways of bringing about such an improvement. The Commission will gladly do all it can to help in this area.

President. — Question No 8, by Mrs Ewing (H-309/80):

Will the Commission state what plans they have to draw up proposals to ensure that fishermen receive compensation for loss of grounds by encroachment thereon by the oil industry, in view of the proliferation of pipelines in the North Sea, and has the Commission the intention to introduce a code of practice to be imposed on oil companies by the Member States' governments who grant licences to such companies?

Mr Burke, Member of the Commission. — The Commission does not propose to take any initiative in relation to the encroachment on fishing-grounds by oil companies. Oil companies already make some provision for compensation in cases of damage to nets or craft.

Mrs Ewing. — I am sure the Commissioner will not be surprised if I say I am disappointed with the answer, because the question clearly does not relate to the answer he has given. To stick to the question, could I ask the Commission to reconsider this and ask whether they are aware of the extent and gravity of this problem, that 830 square nautical miles are already sterilized representing a catch of about 2 000 tonnes a year, worth about half a million pounds in 1976 and worth more now? Will the Commission not consider two straightforward actions: first, either to designate no-go areas or else to ensure that no licenses are given unless arrangements are made for compensation of the value of the fishing; and secondly, to equate the loss of fishing grounds to this industry with the loss of fishing grounds to third countries when the quotas are being fixed, as this really is a giant octopus?

Mr Burke. — With the greatest respect, I think I have answered the question by indicating that we did not propose to take any initiatives. This does not mean that I wish to indicate that the information given by

the honourable Member was not interesting, but I must continue to take the attitude I have taken, even if this does disappoint the honourable Member.

Mr Johnson. — I take it that the Commissioner is not saying that the Commission is not concerned by the general problem of pollution of the sea resulting from oil exploration. That would be, I think, very unhappy news if he was saying that.

Mr Burke. — I can assure the House and the honourable Member that I have personally undertaken a tour of the nine capitals in connection with lessening the danger of pollution of the sea: so he can rest assured on that point.

President. — In the absence of its author, question No 9 will receive a written reply.¹

I call Mr Herman on a point of order.

Mr Herman. — (F) Mr President, I readily understand that an answer cannot be given when the Member who has put a question is not here, but there are Members present who stay in the Chamber to receive replies to the questions which they see down in writing; otherwise there is no point in being here. This is the third question which has escaped a reply. If the author must always be present the public character of this exchange of views becomes perfectly pointless!

(Applause from certain quarters)

President. — Mr Hermann, the rule is that you must appoint a substitute if you are not there yourself, and that must be done prior to the sitting. It would be unwise to do anything other than follow the Rules.

Mr Herman. — I am ready to be a substitute for anybody.

(Laughter)

President. — No, you have to apply to the President before the sitting starts.

Question No 10, by Sir Peter Vanneck (H-421-80):

Does the United States of America permit the duty-free entry of defence equipment and components for defence equipment which have been manufactured in the Community?

¹ See Annex to the Report of Proceedings of November 1980.

Mr Haferkamp, Vice-President of the Commission. — (D) The United States charge a duty on imports of defence equipment and on imports of component parts. In our answers to the written questions by Mr de Courcy Ling we referred to the most favoured nation clause applicable to exports from the Community to the United States. Moreover there are special provisions in the U.S. customs tariff to the effect that certain equipment required by government agencies can be imported without duty if a certificate is provided that this is vital, strategically important equipment as defined in U.S. legislation or material which contains energy substances necessary for general defence and security. It may be assumed that in view of the provisions which I have briefly outlined much of the defence equipment imported by the United States from the Community is in fact duty free.

Sir Peter Vanneck. — I am extremely pleased to hear that the majority is duty-free, because I am sure the Commissioner would agree with me that the armaments industry in the Community is important, not only for the defence of the Community, but also for the provision of employment. But I would ask him, in view of the necessity to endeavour at any rate to make the two-way street between supplies from the United States to this Community and *vice versa* a real thing, whether there are any duties which are applied by the United States which, if necessary, could be reciprocated by ourselves in order that we should maintain the two-way street and not manufacture ourselves at any disadvantage when it comes to exporting to the United States of America?

Mr Haferkamp. — (D) We have always stood by the principle of the freest possible movement of goods in both directions and we propose to continue to do so. I would remind you in this connexion of our efforts to achieve and unimpeded movement of goods during the GATT negotiations in the Tokyo round. Naturally this applies to the products in question. I should like to point out that the industries concerned are not merely producing defence equipment. There are also production, expenditure and investments for essential civilian purposes. The aircraft industry primarily serves civil ends but also manufactures products for other purposes. I want to emphasize that we strongly support the principle of the freest possible trade in both directions.

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — Does the Commissioner believe that European companies are getting fair treatment in tendering for defence contracts, both civil and military, in the United States?

Mr Haferkamp. — (D) We compiled a special code, not specifically for the armaments industry, but for the whole area of government purchases, for the first time

in connexion with the Tokyo round and in conjunction with the United States; the aim is to establish fair conditions for all companies submitting tenders to government agencies. It is in that context that we understand the honourable Member's question.

President. — In the absence of its author, Question No 11 will receive a written answer.¹

Question No 12, by Mr Scott-Hopkins (H-465/80):

In view of their answer to Oral Question No H-363/80, to what level does the rise in the import of tufted carpets have to reach, over and above the 300 % already achieved by the United States of America, before the Commission will impose quotas on these products?

Mr Haferkamp, Vice-President of the Commission. — (D) We have already dealt with this question on several occasions and have had many opportunities to explain the conditions under which it would be possible to take protective measures. Those conditions and rules are laid down in GATT. We adhere to the GATT provisions. We have carefully examined — on earlier occasions and indeed permanently — the influence which different energy prices have on the offer of the products in question here. As yet we have no clear reason to suppose that the difficulties experienced by this sector in the United Kingdom are due solely to increased imports from third countries. There are other reasons, for example the decline in consumption which in turn is related to the downturn in building activity. The general weakness of demand is thus an important contributory factor.

Our latest information is that imports have ceased to rise. You may rest assured that in the case of the special product referred to here and indeed in the whole synthetic fibres sector and other chemical substances related to the basic problem of energy prices, the Commission is keeping developments constantly under review. I am able to assure you that we shall intervene immediately if we see any possibility of doing so under rules and procedures by which we are bound internationally.

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — While of course accepting what the Commissioner says concerning some of the issues he has raised, I would ask him to take it from me that the damage which has been done to that particular industry in my country — and, I think, to other industries throughout the Community of the same type — is very grievous indeed. You cannot compete against subsidized feedstock, and that is what he and the Commission have been asking carpet manufacturers, not only in my country but in other countries in Europe, to do. I am glad he is keeping it under review,

¹ See Annex to the Report of Proceedings of 19 November 1980.

Scott-Hopkins

but if imports start to increase again will he take immediate action to see that is stopped and that a fairer situation of competition will exist within the Community *vis-à-vis* the United States?

Mr Haferkamp. — (D) Intervention by us would depend not only on a further increase in quantities but, even if the overall quantities fall, on other factors such as the infringement of GATT rules. This means that we should intervene whenever there is a possibility of doing so under GATT rules and procedures. This holds good in the matter of quantities and also in respect of subsidies or other forms of unfair competition.

Mr Seal. — I hope the Commission realizes that its action in imposing quotas only on man-made fibres has exacerbated the situation of carpet manufacturers, particularly in the UK, and this is causing great concern — nay, more than concern, it is causing many redundancies in my constituency of the most important carpet-manufacturing areas in the UK. Now, the Commissioner has talked about GATT, and because of GATT will the Commission insist that, unless the USA abolishes the quotas on the amount of naphtha, one of the feedstocks that they export to the EEC at the same price that their own manufacturers can buy it, tariffs are imposed at all levels of carpet manufacture, to offset the advantage enjoyed by US manufacturers? Surely this is required under the terms of GATT?

Mr Haferkamp. — (D) Unfortunately the matter is not as simple as that. Early in the year, at the request of the U.K. government, we placed a limit on imports of certain synthetic fibres used as primary products for carpet manufacture. Quite clearly this intervention at an earlier stage and the limit on deliveries further up the production chain does not make the products required by the carpet industry for its manufacturing activities any cheaper. Perhaps the difficulties experienced by the carpet industry are partly a consequence of intervention of this kind.

On the other hand there is also keen competition in the carpet industry within the Community, particularly in the case of synthetic fibre carpets. This competition has become even keener since, as I said earlier, demand has generally fallen in the Community as a result in the falling demand for residential building. Clearly the demand for these carpets has also fallen and competition within the Community has become more acute.

I wish to make a further observation: according to our calculations and the information given to us by industrial interests it is not true that the difference between the price of crude oil and gas in the United States and on the world market is the primary cause of cheaper

supplies from the United States. There are a number of other reasons why American firms can offer cheaper products. This lower price level is partly attributable to their modern production methods and higher productivity. We cannot explain everything by the difference in energy prices. We must also be cautious in deciding whether this energy price difference is a matter of subsidies. There are some branches of industry — which I do not propose to name here — in the Community where the same question might be raised. We must be careful in considering whether the energy cost price amounts to a subsidy within the meaning of the GATT rules against which appropriate action can be taken, if we are not to expose ourselves to even stronger attacks.

Mr Welsh. — In view of the Commissioner's rather hesitant and unsatisfactory reply to the question raised by my honourable friend, would he agree that the time has now come for a fullscale review of the Community's trading relations with the United States of America? Would he undertake to carry out such a review with the utmost dispatch, and would he further give us an assurance that he will report to Parliament on the substance of his review within the next few months?

Mr Haferkamp. — (D) I am always ready to discuss our trade relations here. But I am not at present willing to suggest that we should review our trade relations.

President. — Question No 13, by Mr Denis (H-469/80):

How can the Commission possibly be unable to give an exact figure for the profits which the five principal multinational agribusiness firms having their headquarters in one of the nine EEC member countries and doing business in the ACP countries acknowledge having made in each year since 1975, the date of the signing of the first Lomé Convention?

Mr Vredeling, Vice-President of the Commission. — (NL) Although the Commission's services compile data, information and statistics on various undertakings, including the multinationals, they unfortunately do not have comparable data which they could verify in order to provide an answer to the honourable Member's exact question. The acquisition of data in this area is normally effected for specific purposes but the data obtained does not always appear to be reliable. The Commission is not empowered to require undertakings to provide data for general use. The use of data from published sources involves certain difficulties as regards comparability and there is a further difficulty of checking the accuracy of such data.

Mr Denis. — (F) I would remind you that this oral question was tabled because the Commission stated in writing that it had no information on the profits of multinationals in the food processing sector. The Commissioner states that he has certain information. But I am still not satisfied because I would like the right of Members of Parliament to information to be satisfied. Could the Commissioner therefore explain to me why he does not have data which can in fact be obtained with the considerable resources available to the Commission? For example it is possible to compare the prices at which products are purchased in the developing countries with their market sale price in Community countries. In this connexion my colleague Henriette Poirier mentioned in her report for the Committee on External Economic Relations the example of tea: in Ruanda tea is obtained at a price ten times lower than the selling price in the Community. Some data could therefore be obtained and supplied to us. What happens en route between Ruanda and the Community? It would be interesting to know.

I cannot avoid seeing a link between this failure on the part of the Commission and its generally favourable attitude to the multinational companies which it does not show to the small farmers in our Community countries. I therefore wish to know what action you intend to take to make good this gap and what will you do to make sure that information is made available to elected Members of Parliament I intend to table a motion for a resolution on this.

Mr Vredeling. — (NL) Mr Denis is obviously not satisfied by my answer. The Commission itself is not satisfied by the present situation. It cannot obtain the comparable data which the honourable Member has requested and that being so it cannot supply this information.

I should also like to take exception to the suggestion that we are friends of the multinationals. I suggest that the honourable Member should ask the multinationals what they think of the Commission's latest proposal about the information and consultation of workers in such undertakings. He will then find that his suggestion of friendship is not accurate. Mr Denis also said something about filling gaps which exist at present and that is the very purpose of the Commission's proposal. The essential data must not only be provided to the elected representatives, as he suggested, but also to workers in the industries concerned. I think that we are on the right path with our proposals at present.

President. — Question No 14, by Mr Christopher Jackson (H-470/80):

In view of the growing surplus of apple production in the European Community and the growth of potential markets for apple products elsewhere in the world, will the Commission undertake to investigate the possibilities for apple exports from Community to third-country

markets and the arrangements that might be made to shift expenditure from intervention to spearheading an export drive, and does the Commission agree that this is one area where the Community may do without export restitutions and that the development of exports may, in time, eliminate the need for any Community financial aid for the apple industry?

Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission. — (I) We are not convinced that there has been an increase in surplus apple production in the Community or that there is a substantial growth in potential markets for apples in other parts of the world; we therefore do not think that an export campaign would be effective enough to enable refunds to be abolished and we therefore have no intention of eliminating the intervention arrangements.

Mr Christopher Jackson. — I was interested to hear the Commissioner's reply, for which I am grateful. Is the Commissioner aware that at the moment intervention regulations and spending favour southern-grown apples such as the 'Golden Delicious' at the expense of northern-grown apples and are the cause of considerable dissatisfaction in certain Member States? And will the Commissioner agree — I know that this is not a new problem — to examine the problem once more with the aim of removing any unfairness between the north and the south of the European Community regarding such intervention?

Mr Natali. — (I) Obviously there is a wide difference between the view of Mr Jackson and those of the Commission: I can only confirm the position which I stated in my answer.

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — There is a surplus of apples both north and south and there is no export potential for these apples. Will the Commission therefore look into ways of encouraging the use of those apples by turning them into apple juice, which is a product widely accepted throughout the Community. Perhaps a stimulus to this product would go some way to dealing with the surplus apples, but it needs help from the Commission.

Mr Natali. — (I) The suggestion made by Mr Scott-Hopkins is particularly interesting even though I am not sure it is technically feasible.

Mr Turner. — May I ask the Commissioner whether he refuses to look into the question of the fairness of the coefficients on apples or not? He seems to refuse, but even if he is right that the coefficients are quite fair, it is obviously felt amongst the northern countries that they are not. Is it not therefore justifiable for him to hold an inquiry and give a report on that point?

Mr Natali. — (I) As regards the coefficients for the withdrawal prices we have already changed them repeatedly whenever the market situation so required.

Nevertheless I would remind you that these coefficients only take account of the difference in the commercial value of the different varieties so that any derogation from this principle could lead to an increase in cost since an excessive price would be paid for certain varieties in comparison with others. We would also point out that the coefficients in question apply to the whole Community and allowance cannot be made for special situations in one particular Member State.

President. — In the absence of their authors, questions No 15 and No 16 will receive written answers.¹

Question No 17 by Mr Berkhouwer (H-476-80):

Does the Commission see any possibilities of implementing as a Community venture the plans now being drafted in England to link the United Kingdom with the Continent by constructing a combination of bridges, islands and tunnels?

Mr Burke, Member of the Commission. — An interesting problem arises in regard to the honourable Member's question. He asks the Commission to comment on a project for a Channel link put forward in recent days. But in days even more recent, I mean during the period since the honourable Member tabled this question, several other projects and suggestions have been put forward. There is now indeed a gratifying, if somewhat bewildering, variety of approaches from which to choose.

The honourable Member is, if I may say so, a veteran and respected advocate of a Channel link, so I am sure he is as happy as I am that this project, so long a dream, has now become the subject of concrete and urgent discussion. I only wish that it were feasible for another offshore island of the Community to benefit from a similar kind of exercise.

I particularly welcome the fact that much of the current discussion on a channel link has coincided with, and I believe has been stimulated by, the Commission's own proposals for a Community policy on transport infrastructure.

Not all of the proposals currently available would involve a financial intervention by the Community. Some would; others would not. Naturally I would prefer a scheme which envisaged Community intervention but it is clear that any project which improved the transport links between the United Kingdom and

the European mainland, however it were funded, would be thoroughly welcomed. I would hope for a Community role in the chosen project, but as the honourable Member is aware the decision regarding the selection of a scheme is one that falls to the Member States concerned in the first place. Once the choice has been made at national level, it is for the Member State to communicate this information to the Community in pursuance of the Council decision of 20 February 1978. Should the Member State concerned look to the Community for financial assistance this would call for the application of the draft financial regulation currently before the Council on the provision of assistance for projects of Community interest. As honourable Members will know, this regulation is still not decided upon by the Council. However, it is vital to press the point home that, for a Community policy on transport infrastructure to be developed, this regulation is essential. Moreover its passage would not lead automatically to expenditure. It is simply optional. Potential projects for aid would be dealt with on their own merits.

The regulation therefore offers the hope of providing really valuable aid for projects that would otherwise not go forward, but does not automatically involve a regular additional expenditure on the budget. I look, as I am sure honourable Members also do, for positive decisions in this field where Community action can make a worthwhile contribution.

Mr Berkhouwer. — (NL) I am satisfied with Mr Burke's positive attitude to my question suggesting that the construction of a tunnel under the Channel between continental Europe and the United Kingdom should be a Community enterprise.

Since two Member States are directly concerned and since too many different projects have been submitted, is the Commission prepared for its part to take initiatives in order to bring together on a Community basis all the possibilities which have been brought forward so as to prevent duplication of effort?

In any case this matter does not only concern France and England but rather the whole north-western region of the Community and many Members of this Parliament take a close interest in it.

Mr Burke. — I am happy to tell the honourable Member that the Commission has taken a number of initiatives. Indeed I personally have taken such initiatives over the last few years. We have commissioned a study, the results of which were given wide publicity at a press conference in London. We have mentioned the projects at a number of colloquia which we have organized. I have asked a number of questions in Parliament and made a number of speeches on the matter. So in that sense we have taken some initiatives.

¹ See Annex to the Report of Proceedings of 19 November 1980.

Burke

But I would remind the honourable Member that the Commission, following closely the policy lines which it put forward some years ago, is restrained in the manner in which it takes initiatives by the possibilities open to it under that decision. Furthermore, as I have mentioned in the reply to the question, these initiatives lie first of all with the Member States who can put forward such projects to the Committee on Infrastructure, the consultation can take place, and monies, if required, could then be made available under the financial regulation put forward.

So I would ask the honourable Member to understand that, insofar as it is possible for us within the terms of the policy we have been pursuing for a number of years now, we have taken every possible initiative, and I certainly would hope that this exchange of views today will give further impetus to this very desirable project.

Miss Hooper. — Whilst appreciating the Commissioner's statement in relation to his difficulties with the Council of Ministers, in planning a Community approach to the Channel tunnel, may we have assurance from the Commissioner that the backup road infrastructure will not be neglected so that for example the northwest of England, and Liverpool in particular, will not feel more than ever cut off from Community trade and prosperity? In Liverpool we like to think of ourselves as the front door of Europe and we are certainly the front door to that other island to which he referred. But in order to benefit from a Channel tunnel project, please may we have assurance that the backup link-up road and rail service will be there.

Mr Burke. — As far as I am concerned as Commissioner for Transport, I have given every possible help towards putting into legislation the policy of the Community on transport infrastructure, and it would be possible under the terms of that policy for schemes such as those outlined by the honourable Member, which are very important, to be put through. But we now await decisions by those who are in a position to pass the legislation. I can say that, within the limits of human possibility, we have done everything we can to further the projects so dear to Members of this House.

Mr Doublet. — (*F*) I share the concern expressed by your colleagues and the satisfaction felt by the author of the question on hearing the Commissioner's answer.

I do not know whether the time is ripe for the choice of the exact link which could be established between the United Kingdom and France and would certainly benefit the other Member States, especially the Benelux countries and Germany. But I do know that the Commissioner is wrong to refer the matter back to the Member States which have already proved their good will; the project was suspended five years ago but

seems to have been reopened again under particularly promising conditions today. The Member States must be made aware that they will benefit not only from the support but also from financial assistance from the Community. For that purpose I think that the Commissioner for Transport could usefully and effectively assist us by ensuring that the regulation to which he referred will be followed up by implementing provisions, and I hope that he will support us in asking for the Council of Ministers to take a decision.

We are now in the middle of the budgetary procedure and have proposed that some appropriations should be made available not only for basic studies but now also for feasibility studies. This is an area in which we can do useful work.

We hope that the Commission will help us to obtain the decision that we wish to see.

Mr Burke. — On the two points I reiterate my view that the policy line followed by the Community in this respect is the right one. As to the money, I have advocated that money should be put in the budget and have great pleasure in noticing that this House supports that general line. I will await the outcome of the budget discussions.

Mr Hutton. — Would the Commissioner confirm that the other island he spoke of in his initial reply is one with which he is closely connected, and would he tell us what the Commission is doing about the initiative, taken by members of this group, to bring about the dream that he spoke of in his reply?

Mr Burke. — I think that the possibilities of joining the two islands have already been canvassed by a number of people. I think, though, that one has to be realistic about the feasibility of such projects. I think it would be unwise to give too much hope that links of the same nature as those suggested across the Channel could, in fact, easily be effected between those two islands at this stage.

Mr Albers. — (*NL*) There are other projects in the European Community which are of great importance to the overall infrastructure. What is the Commission's view of the priority to be accorded to this link between the United Kingdom and the continent in relation to other similar projects such as a link between the Danish islands and the continent, the link over the Straights of Messina and infrastructural works such as the link between the Rhine and the Rhone?

Mr Burke. — When the Commission published its memorandum on transport infrastructure last year, it was careful not to suggest any priorities between the various suitable projects available to the European

Burke

Community. This, I repeat, is because the policy which we have outlined over the last few years enjoins on the Commission to respect the decisions taken by the Council on the initiative of the Commission. In other words, having set up an infrastructure committee representative of the Member States and the Commission, it is for that committee to set the priorities for the future. We are also, of course, involved in a discussion with the Member States in the Council of a bottleneck report, which was asked for by the Council, and that work will lead us a little closer to the definition of a set of priorities. But it is not for me as Transport Commissioner to indicate any personal preference; it is for the machinery which we have set up to do so.

Mr Turner. — The Commissioner referred to the need for a legal basis for the infrastructure policy. Is that to be obtained from a vote in the Council of Finance Ministers or that of Transport Ministers? Where would he advise us, and all those in our countries who are most concerned about this matter, to bring pressure to bear to make sure that we get this decision out of one or other of the Council of Ministers?

Mr Burke. — The proposed legislation is on the table of the Council of Transport Ministers. I think that is sufficient indication to the honourable Members as to how they should proceed from here.

Mr Møller. — (DK) I myself come from a small island in Europe which has for many years sought to establish a permanent link with the neighbouring countries in the South and East, i.e. West Germany and Sweden. That has not succeeded as yet because it takes a long time to make the necessary preparations, to draw up the plans and find the financial resources. I recognize the need for priorities. But I believe that the matter which we are discussing here should be priority number one for all the member countries of the Community. Since the days of Napoleon I the wish has existed for a link between England and the continent, and I wonder whether Mr Burke shares the view that this is not merely a matter between the governments or parliaments of the two countries but a matter of interest to Europe as a whole since the utmost priority must be given to all links of this kind?

Mr Burke. — I can confirm that it has been the firm desire of the Member States of the Community to proceed with transport infrastructure, but we have not yet got to the point at which legislation has been passed. I still would advocate that the House should take account of the Transport Infrastructure Committee decision and the consultation procedure set up in 1978 under which it is in the first instance, for the Member States most closely concerned to put forward proposals. Of course, it is always possible for Member States, acting outside of the Community context, to

deal with these matters. But I would prefer, as I think the House would, that this matter should be approached on a Community basis. However, if it is done on another basis, nobody will be displeased, but I think that we should conclude from this question and answer session to the existence of the desire of the elected Members of the European Parliament that the initiatives of the Commission over the last few years to get a transport infrastructure policy for Europe through, should now be given attention by the other bodies, and we should get some progress in the near future.

President. — Question No 18, by Mr Harris (H-477/80):

United Kingdom rabbit producers are complaining that they face unfair trading conditions in exporting to France following a ruling by the French authorities that as from May 1979 all imported rabbit carcasses must have their feet removed. The ruling was to have applied to home produced carcasses from May 1980, but until recently at least, this had not been enforced against French producers. The ruling means that exporters of rabbit carcasses to France lose 6.5 % to 7 % the saleable products, making additional work for the producers, increasing costs in total and reducing income from between 9 p and 15 p per kilogramme or up to £ 1 500 per load.

Will the Commission take action to ensure that exporters of rabbit carcasses to France do not have a commercial disadvantage?

Mr Vredeling, Vice-President of the Commission. — (NL) As soon as the Commission was made aware, particularly through the honourable Member's question, of the possibility of unfair competition between rabbit producers in the European Community, it asked the French authorities to give a complete survey of French national legislation on imports and sales of slaughtered rabbits on the domestic market. As soon as we receive that information we shall carry out a study and notify Parliament of our conclusions; for the time being I can only give a preliminary answer.

Mr Harris. — While thanking the Commissioner for the action he has already taken on this, I would ask him not let the matter drift on, because this unfair practice is causing problems, not only for rabbit-meat processors in the United Kingdom, but also to many hundreds of rabbit producers. Could he please bring what pressure he can to bear on the French authorities to enforce their own ruling, so that fair competition is once more restored in this trade.

Mr Vredeling. — (NL) I shall do my best.

President. — Question No 19 by Mr Penders (H-478/80):

President

Is the Commission prepared, in view of the emergence of racist and anti-semitic sentiments and statements, to give an impetus to education in European schools, on the lines established in French schools, in the democratic, peace-loving, tolerant and pluralist character of European civilization?

Mr Burke, Member of the Commission. — The Commission does not feel that a new impetus of this kind is necessary because the European schools are already conscious of the need to underline the importance of the characteristic attributes of European civilization mentioned by the honourable Member. In fact the statute of the European school provides that, in giving education and instruction, the conscience and conviction of the individual shall be respected, and the curriculum of the schools has included courses in social and civic education since 1978. The Board of Governors has been acting on an initiative of the Commission and inspired by a Council of Europe study.

Mr Penders. — (NL) I must say that I am extremely disappointed by that answer.

Does the Commission not agree with me that it is a great pity not to make use of this possibility to lend fresh impetus to the European Community? The specific character of the terrorist attacks in Bologna, Antwerp, Paris and Munich clearly shows that they were attacks against European society as a whole. I would also refer you to the discussion on the report by Mr Hahn which asks for emphasis to be placed on the European context. There is a new opportunity in this area and Mr Burke's reply has shown that the opportunity has unfortunately been allowed to pass. Does the Commission not share my regret that this should be so?

Mr Burke. — While not minimising in any way the importance of the matters raised by the honourable Member, I would point out that the Commission does not and cannot direct the European schools to devote more time to courses in social and civic education. The European schools are founded on an intergovernmental protocol — the Statute of the European school — which all Member States of the European Community have signed and ratified. The Board of Governors, on which all the Member States and Commission are represented, is the supreme authority of the European Schools, and it is not within the power of the Commission to make directives of any kind concerning them. However, I would like to point out, as I have already indicated in my reply, that the decision to introduce civic and social education stems from the report and resolution of the European Parliament dated 5 June 1975. Secondly, I would like to point out that the Board of Governors is regularly informed of questions posed by honourable Members concerning European schools and indeed of the replies given by the

Commission. I would therefore think that it is sufficient that this debate will be drawn to the attention of the Board of Governors so that the statements made both by the honourable Members and by the Commission can be given attention.

Mrs Boot. — (NL) Like the previous speaker, I find it a great pity that the Commission cannot give more information and has confined itself to this simple observation. I should particularly like the Commission to turn its attention to the subject of lessons focusing on European civics but I understand the Commission's answer that it obviously cannot give directives to schools; I should however like to hear from the Commission whether it is willing to report more regularly to the European Parliament on this.

Mr Burke. — I would not wish to bind my successor by the responsibilities we have assumed for the remaining two months, but I am sure that whoever takes up this responsibility will note the request made by the honourable Member and that, on the basis of resolutions and debates, these matters can be discussed for the future. There is no unwillingness on the part of the Commission to respond on these matters.

President. — Question No 20, by Mr Davern (H-482/80):

Will the Commission take immediate steps to avert a crisis situation for farmers in Ireland where estimates indicate that more than 50 % of farms of all kinds produced a family farm income in 1979 of less than IR £ 2 000?

Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission. — (I) As you know the Community has taken a series of special structural measures to improve the situation of agricultural incomes in the disadvantaged regions of Ireland. The Commission is now preparing its agricultural price proposals for the 1981-82 marketing year and these proposals will take account of the falling income of farmers not only in Ireland but throughout the Community.

Of course this decline in incomes is only one of the many factors to be taken into account. The Commission will give consideration to the situation of the agricultural markets taking into account also the need to remain within the limits of the Community budget.

Mr Davern. — I would like to thank the Commissioner for the non-answer. I would ask him whether he is aware that Irish farming incomes are now less proportionately than they were before membership of the EEC? Is he aware that I was not asking specifically and solely about the more backward areas, as he referred to them, but to all areas of farming income today? Would the Commission consider, in view of

Davern

the serious plight that Irish agriculture finds itself in, dropping the co-responsibility levy for all farmers in disadvantaged, unfavourable and hill areas as a gesture of its good will and a recognition of the severely low incomes of these people?

Mr Natali. — (I) The honourable Member's proposal is not acceptable to the Commission. I would however remind you that the Commission is perfectly aware of the situation of agriculture in Ireland and — as I said earlier — approved a series of Community structural measures in June 1980.

Mr de Courcy Ling. — Is the Commissioner aware that although many of us in this House sympathize very strongly with the difficulties of agricultural communities in the Irish Republic, Scotland, Brittany and the south of Italy, there does seem now to be a very strong case for taking part of the social burthen of the common agricultural policy out of the common agricultural policy altogether and into the Social Fund? Will the Commissioner assure us that he will recommend to the new Commission that this matter be considered in the context of budgetary reform which all of us, if we are honest, know must come when the existing own resources of the Community are exhausted in the course of 1981 or 1982?

Mr Natali. — (I) Mr Davern has clearly highlighted the problem. He knows that the Commission must submit proposals by June 1981. We shall obviously recommend to the new Commission that it follows certain policy lines indicated by him.

Mr Welsh. — Important as the farmers of Ireland and indeed elsewhere are, they do still represent a minority of Community citizens. Would the Commissioner therefore assure us that the Commission, inspired by a constant regard for the interests of all the people in Europe, will work for a better balance in the budget and not do anything to increase agricultural spending which might throw that budget further out of balance?

Mr Natali. — (I) The Commission intends to respond to these specific needs and not to open at this stage a debate on agriculture and on the budget which quite obviously cannot be covered in the three minutes at my disposal.

President. — Question No 21, by Mr Remilly (H-483/80):

How can the Commission justify the reduction of the already small import levy on New Zealand butter when the Community has a large butter surplus?

Mr Haferkamp, Vice-President of the Commission. — (D) The levy on New Zealand butter is intended to bridge the gap between the import price of New Zealand butter fixed by the Council and the price at which this butter is sold on the British market. The import price, on the basis of which this levy is calculated, was raised in October this year. At the same time the levy, i.e. the difference between the increased import price and the selling price on the British market, was not reduced by the same amount. That would have been possible but was not done. It follows that Community preference has not been reduced.

I consider it particularly important in this context that New Zealand should have declared its readiness to reduce by 20 000 tonnes the quantity of butter which it could have delivered in this calendar year. By this means New Zealand has made a not inconsiderable contribution to the stability of the Community butter market.

Mr Fanton. — (F) What is the cost of the reduction in the levy as determined from the agreements which the Commission has proposed to New Zealand, i.e. the importation of 19 000 tonnes with a reduced levy rate? What loss of revenue does this represent for the Community?

Mr Haferkamp. — (D) We have to make a rather complicated calculation to answer that. Allowance must be made firstly for the change in the levy and secondly for the smaller need, resulting from the smaller quantity of 20 000 tonnes, to cover exports by refund resources from the Community. This too, is not an absolute figure but depends on the world market price and on the exact level of the refunds granted by us. If the whole operation is worked out for a refund price of, say, 150 EUA per 100 kg, this would entail an additional cost of some 20 million EUA for the Community — but I repeat the calculation involves a number of variables.

Mr Welsh. — Would the Commissioner confirm that since the proposed New Zealand quota is actually less than 4 ½% of total Community production of butter, the effect of New Zealand imports on the Community surplus is only of marginal significance?

Mr Haferkamp. — (D) Our agricultural policy contains no aspects of marginal significance. If I may say so everything is of central significance. We shall have to see in this connexion how much we in the Community can sell on the world market. This year the quantity will be about 350 000 tonnes as against 300 000 tonnes in 1979. These two figures already show the relatively large but nevertheless only relative significance of the 20 000 tonnes.

President. — Question No 22, by Mr Doublet (H-484/80):

Is the Commission not disturbed at the fact that certain countries have announced a halt in motorway construction when increased public investment is needed to stimulate economic activity?

Mr Burke, Member of the Commission. — The answer to this question should be seen, in a sense, as a continuation of the question and answer exchange on Question 17 on the Channel link. The Commission's transport infrastructure policy is aimed at helping the Member States to provide the facilities necessary to meet the future social and economic needs of the Community. To this end the Commission has put forward several proposals, particularly a draft regulation, for financial assistance for projects that can be shown to be of Community interest. The downturn in development that the Community is currently experiencing reinforces the need to overcome problems in infrastructure development.

However, I believe that temporary difficulties should not be allowed to swamp the need to think of the future. I hope and believe that the Member States will look at both aspects in carefully weighing the level of public sector expenditure against the requirement to continue essential work upon infrastructures. As the Commission's study on bottlenecks made clear, considerable problems exist even in today's network, and recovery in levels of economic activity will add to these. A general cessation of new works to remove bottlenecks will have serious consequences for the future. I do not think that this situation has yet been reached, but the slow-down in activity experienced in a number of States gives grounds for concern and strengthens the case for a positive development of action at Community level.

Mr Doublet. — (F) At a time when we hear talk of restrictions in the use of energy resources it seems paradoxical to me to put questions about the policy for the construction of motorways. But I think that we must not sacrifice our medium and long-term needs to short-term considerations and I believe this is one area in which a long time elapses between the design, decision and commissioning phases.

Moreover this problem is very important as regards its consequences for employment which are our major concern, especially as, for the most part, the decisions come from the public authorities and there is thus a perfectly satisfactory and useful way of remedying the distortion between supply and demand which exists at present.

The Commissioner told us that he had made a proposal and that the Commission was looking into the matter. That is of course true, but we want far more immediate and precise practical action. I should

very much like to know what measures, other than the Commission's proposals which do not seem to have been put into practice, could be taken perhaps at Council level, since if the Council adopts a position that must lead to a distribution of appropriations and show the real wishes of the Member States, the Commission and the Council. I therefore hope that the Commissioner will indicate to us exactly how he stands on the matter of motorways, whether he wishes the crisis to continue or not?

Mr Burke. — I agree that there has been a downturn in the activity. Unfortunately, as I explained on Question 17 and again just now, the Community's policy does not allow it to enter into all the activity which is properly the domain of Member States. It is only into those large routes, which are deemed to be of Community interest, that we would offer a Community policy and the promise of Community help. But I would indicate to the honourable Member that under the decision of February 1978, to which I have referred on a number of occasions in the House, the Commission is required to be informed of major projects of Community interest. We are also informed, under Regulation 1108, of the total investment that has taken place on infrastructure for the three land modes of transport, and this is a subject of an annual report to the Council.

Now the action we can take as a Community is a different matter, and I have already explained on a number of occasions, and again here this evening, that we are limited as to the amount of action we can take. However, the decision of 20 February 1978, allows, and indeed requires, the Commission to inform the Council regularly, that is at least every 3 years, on the work of the Infrastructure Committee and on the plans and programmes of the Member States in the field of transport infrastructure. This report would be an appropriate means of informing the Council of any serious shortcomings in infrastructure planning. The information supplied by Member States on their plans could be compared with the estimates of future needs prepared by the Commission as part of its research programme.

So I am in agreement with the main thrust of the supplementary question asked by the honourable Member. The down-turn in economic activity, coupled with high rates of inflation, has led some countries to seek economies in public sector expenditure and this has, unfortunately, resulted in some cutbacks in infrastructure programmes. However, we need, as I have said already, to balance the needs of short-term monetary management with the long-term need to coordinate the growth of output and transport infrastructure. Only in this way will the worst effects of stop-go investment policy be avoided. However the main action here is for the Member States; we, in the present state of Community legislation, must simply

Burke

allow ourselves to act as a stimulus to them to get on with the good work.

Mr van Minnen. — (NL) I wish to put a direct question even through the thrust is quite different from that of Mr Doublet's original question and Commissioner Burke's answer. Does the Commission not regret the disappointment expressed in this question by Mr Doublet and above all by the manner in which the question has been framed? Does the Commission not share the view that the question as to whether motorways should be built is not so much one of a short-term economic nature as was the case with the Channel tunnels, bridges, islands and cableways referred to in Question 17; is it not on the contrary true that a realization has now come about that the construction of motorways is no longer desirable from the angle of environmental policy?

Mr Burke. — The Commission does not look with any great pleasure on any down-turn of economic activity particularly, speaking as Transport Commissioner, in the field of transport infrastructure. But I do not think that the environmental difficulties outlined by the honourable Member are the real difficulties where this question is concerned. I think it is a question of economic down-turn generally. I have not any great evidence that there is a substantial body of public opinion throughout the Community opposed to motorways on environmental grounds.

Mr Patterson. — To what extent will the Commission put pressure on the national governments to alter their priorities in motorway building in return for Community funds? As an example, and following the Commissioner's visit to the county of Kent in the United Kingdom, to what extent would he put pressure on the United Kingdom to complete the M20 motorway which is an essential link between London and the Channel ports and must be regarded as a Community, rather than a national, priority?

Mr Burke. — It would not, I think, be appropriate for me to put pressure on the United Kingdom Government, except to the extent that they might be persuaded of the public interest of the matter by the visit which I made to the area. I think that we may see a resumption of work in the not too distant future because of the eminently suitability of the link question. But I would ask the honourable Member not to pressure me into pressurizing Her Majesty's Government.

Mr Moreland. — Mr President, in view of this very pertinent question, and indeed in view of past statements by this Parliament on transport infrastructure policy, can the Commissioner give us an assurance that, at the Transport Council meeting on Decem-

ber 4, he will put in very strong terms his belief and our belief, that, at this time of economic recession, it is extremely important for the Council to give priority to measures which will stimulate the economy of Europe; that improving the transport infrastructure of the Community is clearly one of them; that it is about time the Council got off its backside on transport infrastructure and, indeed, that it is about time the Council got off its backside on implementing the Treaty of Rome's provisions on a common transport policy.

Mr Burke. — I shall continue to advocate the installation of a transport infrastructure policy for Europe at the Transport Council.

Mr Albers. — (NL) Is it not particularly necessary at a time of increasingly short oil supplies to advocate an improvement in our railway system and in the network of inland waterways to ensure that energy can be saved in the transport sector?

Mr Burke. — As the honourable Member knows, I have before the Commission at the moment a paper on railway policy which I hope will see the light of day in the not too distant future. I agree with him about the suitability of inland waterways as a means of saving energy.

Mr Purvis. — Returning to the original question which indicated that in times of financial stringency one of the first things to go usually seems to be capital expenditure on motorways, has the Commission undertaken, or does it intend to undertake, some sort of estimate of the energy-saving factors, the safety factors, the economic factors and the environmental factors involved in using motorways rather than ordinary congested roads, that might make it economical even in difficult financial times to justify motorway construction?

Mr Burke. — The direction of the Commission's policy in this matter takes into account, on a continuing basis, all the factors mentioned by the honourable Member.

President. — In the absence of its author, Question No 23 will receive a written answer.¹

Question No 24, by Mr Clement (H-486/80):

Has the Commission noted the conclusions of the FAO's emergency meeting on the food-supply situation in Africa? Are its conclusions consistent with the Commission's policy on food aid?

¹ See Annex to the Report of Proceedings of 19 November 1980.

Mr Burke, Member of the Commission. — The Commission was represented at the meeting FAO on the food situation in Africa on 19 September 1980 to which the honourable Member refers and also at the follow-up meeting on 17 October 1980. In general it agrees with the conclusions of the meetings and with the plan of action proposed by FAO.

As regards food aid in particular, there is no divergence between the above conclusions and the philosophy of the Commission, that is to say, coordination by FAO and the World Food Programme, accelerated deliveries of food aid already committed and the possibility of additional food aid to African countries most affected. The Commission is examining this last point, that is the additional food aid, as a matter of urgency and should be presenting appropriate proposals very shortly.

Mr Clément. — (*F*) I should like the Commission to explain to me how its position is compatible with that adopted by the Council on the development aid budget.

I understand that the Council is shortly to meet in Brussels — for the first time since the beginning of the year — to take a number of decisions on development, particularly as regards food aid to developing countries. What position does the Commission expect the Council to take in light of the sweeping cuts made by it to the development and cooperation section of the budget?

Mr Burke. — The answer which I have given outlines the policy of the Commission in regard to these matters. I do not think that I should, in this very delicate matter, try to anticipate the outcome of the discussion, much as one could speculate about it. I hope for a good result in that regard, but I would not wish to be pressed in anticipation of that result.

President. — The first part of Question Time is closed.¹

13. *Agenda for next sitting*

President. — The next sitting will be held tomorrow, Tuesday, 18 November 1980 at 9 a.m. and 3 p.m. with the following agenda:

- Joint debate on the Commission statement of 14 October 1980 on the Baduel Glorioso report, on an oral question to the Commission and on the Martinet report on the situation in the iron and steel industry
- von Alemann report on the siting of nuclear power stations in frontier regions
- Oral question with debate to the Commission, on the supply of oil for the Community from the Middle East
- Schmid report on biomolecular engineering
- Ferri report on the right of residence of nationals of Member States
- 3 p.m. *Voting time*

The sitting is closed.

(*The sitting was closed at 8.05 p.m.*)

¹ See Annex to the Report of Proceedings of 19 November 1980.

ANNEX

Commission action on opinions delivered by the European Parliament at the October 1980 part-session

1 As agreed with the Bureau of Parliament, the Commission informs Members at the beginning of each part-Session by way of consultation of the action it has taken on the opinions delivered at the previous part-Session.

2. At its October part-Session the European Parliament adopted twelve opinions on Commission proposals in response to Council requests that it be consulted.

3. At this part-Session Parliament discussed ten reports and delivered favourable opinions or did not ask for formal amendment in the case of the following proposals:

Report by Mr Clinton on the Regulation on the determination of import duties for mixtures and assortments;

Reports by Mr Ligios on the Decision introducing financial action by the Community for the eradication of African swine pest in Sardinia;

Report by Mrs Barbarella on two proposals, one for speeding up agricultural development in less-favoured areas of Northern Ireland and the other on the marketing of eggs, poultrymeat, cereals and cattle feeds in Northern Ireland;

Report by Mrs Cresson on the Directive on developing agriculture in the French overseas departments;

Proposal for a Decision adopting a Euratom and EEC programme in the field of scientific and technical training;

Proposal for a Decision on the protection of the Rhine against chemical pollution;

Proposal for a Decision amending Council Decision 78/384/EEC adopting a multiannual research and development programme in the field of paper and board recycling (indirect action);

Proposal for a Regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 337/79 on the common organization of the market in wine;

Proposal for a Decision on European Social Fund operations to assist textile and clothing workers, migrant workers, persons affected by employment difficulties (young people under 25) and women;

Proposal for a Directive amending Directives 70/457/EEC and 70/458/EEC on the common catalogue of varieties of agricultural plant species and on the marketing of vegetable seed.

4. In two cases the European Parliament asked the Commission to amend its proposals under the second paragraph of Article 149 of the Treaty and adopted amendments which the Commission said it was prepared to accept in part.

Report by Mr Fischbach on the Directive on the taking-up and pursuit, as regards credit insurance, of the business of direct insurance other than life assurance

Here the Commission is re-drafting the proposal for a Directive under the second paragraph of Article 149 of the Treaty. The new text will incorporate most of the amendments proposed. In view of the complexity of the questions involved, particularly with regard to Article 1 on export credit insurance and the manner in which the equalization reserve is to be calculated, the Commission is obliged to hold certain talks before adopting a final position.

Report by Mr Muntingh on the Regulation on common arrangements to apply in respect of imports of whale products

An amended proposal taking account of the amendments proposed by Parliament is under preparation and is to be sent to the Council and the European Parliament shortly.

5. The Commission took the opportunity to inform Parliament of the assistance it had granted disaster victims since the previous part-Session

(a) *Financial aid*

The decision had been taken to grant 150 000 EUA to Grenada to repair damage caused by the hurricane Allen.

One million EUA had been made available to refugees in Djibouti following a worsening of their situation.

One million EUA had been granted to Algeria following the earthquake in El Asnam.

(b) *Emergency food aid*

The Commission had decided to grant emergency food aid to two countries.

This involved:

500 t of powdered milk and 300 t of butter-oil for Peru where the North of the country was suffering terrible drought;

5 000 t of cereals, 500 t of powdered milk, 200 t of butter-oil and 450 t of legumes and a quantity of baby-food still to be determined, corresponding to 400 000 EUA, for the victims of the earthquake in Algeria.

6. The Parliament also gave its views on two Commission documents in reports by

Mr O'Connell on the Commission communication on a Community action programme for consumers,

Mr Pearce on the Commission communication concerning guidelines for the Generalized Scheme of Tariff Preferences for the period after 1980.

During the discussions the Commission expressed its opinion in detail on the Parliament's suggestions and wishes.

7. The Commission also gave its position and explained its point of view during the discussions on:
the report by Mr Rumor on preparations for the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe,

two reports by Mr von Wogau on the achievement of customs union and technical and administrative barriers to trade,

the report by Mr Schwartzberg on competition restrictions in air transport,

the report by Mr Hoffmann on developing air transport services and on civil aviation,

the report by Mr Jurgens on Community aid for rice for sowing,

three resolutions on the natural disaster in the plain of Albenga,

a resolution on the floods in France,

a resolution on the earthquakes in Algeria,

the report by Mr Dankert on the measures to assist the United Kingdom,

a resolution on terrorist attacks in Europe,

a resolution on the disappearance of little girls, channelled into prostitution, from refugee camps in South-East Asia,

a resolution on the conflict between Iran and Iraq,

the report by Mr Gillot on right of establishment for architects.

SITTING OF TUESDAY, 18 NOVEMBER 1980

<p>1. <i>Approval of the minutes</i> 33</p> <p>2. <i>Statement from the Legal Affairs Committee:</i> <i>Mr Ferri</i> 33</p> <p>3. <i>Documents received</i> 34</p> <p>4. <i>Membership of committees</i> 34</p> <p>5. <i>Situation in the iron and steel industry —</i> <i>Statement by Mr Jenkins, President of the</i> <i>Commission, on 14 October 1980, report by</i> <i>Mrs Baduel Glorioso (Committee on Social</i> <i>Affairs and Employment) (Doc. 1-463/80),</i> <i>oral question with debate by Mr Deleau and</i> <i>others (EPD) (Doc. 1-516/80), report by Mr</i> <i>Martinet (Committee on External Economic</i> <i>Relations) (Doc. 1-565/80):</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><i>Mrs Baduel Glorioso, rapporteur</i> 34</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><i>Mr Deleau</i> 36</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><i>Mr Martinet, rapporteur</i> 38</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><i>Mr Glinne; Mr I. Friedrich; Miss Forster</i> . . . 39</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><i>Point of order: Mr Pannella</i> 43</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><i>Mr Ansart; Mr Bangemann; Mr Davern; Mr</i> <i>Coppieters; Mr Petronio; Mr Didò; Mr</i> <i>Pedini; Mr Simmonds; Mr Leonardi; Mr</i> <i>Donnez; Mr Boyes; Mr Herman; Mr Spen-</i> <i>cer; Mr Calvez; Mr Peters; Mr Michel; Mrs</i> <i>Vayssade; Mr Bonde; Mr Davignon</i> <i>(Commission); Mr Vredeling (Commission);</i> <i>Mr Boyes; Mr Davignon</i> 43</p> <p>6. <i>Siting of nuclear power stations in frontier</i> <i>regions — Report by Mrs von Alemann</i> <i>(Committee on Energy and Research)</i> <i>(Doc. 1-442/80):</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><i>Mrs von Alemann, rapporteur</i> 63</p> <p>7. <i>Votes:</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><i>Hahn report (Doc. 1-345/80): European</i> <i>Music Year:</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>Consideration of the motion for a resolution:</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 60px;"><i>Mr Hahn, rapporteur</i> 65</p> <p style="padding-left: 60px;"><i>Adoption of the resolution</i> 65</p> <p style="padding-left: 60px;"><i>Point of order: Mr Sherlock</i> 65</p>	<p style="padding-left: 20px;"><i>Baduel Glorioso report: Situation in the iron</i> <i>and steel industry:</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>Adoption of the resolution</i> 66</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><i>Martinet report: Situation in the iron and</i> <i>steel industry:</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>Adoption of the resolution</i> 66</p> <p>8. <i>Urgent procedure</i> 66</p> <p>9. <i>Siting of nuclear power stations in frontier</i> <i>regions (continuation):</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><i>Mrs Lizin; Mrs Walz; Mr Johnson; Mr</i> <i>Ippolito; Mr Calvez; Mr Capanna; Mr</i> <i>Gendebien; Mr Turcat; Mr Calvez; Mr</i> <i>Abens; Mr Sassano; Mr Damette; Mr</i> <i>Coppieters; Mrs Dekker; Mrs Bonino; Mr</i> <i>Oehler; Mr Skovmand; Mrs Weber; Mr</i> <i>Davignon (Commission); Mr Coppieters; Mr</i> <i>Davignon; Mrs von Alemann; Mr Coppie-</i> <i>ters; Mr Gendebien; Mr Davignon</i> 66</p> <p>10. <i>Deadline for tabling amendments — Agenda</i> 83</p> <p>11. <i>Community oil supplies from the Middle East</i> <i>— Oral question with debate by Mr Muller-</i> <i>Hermann and Mr Vergeer (EPP-CD), Mr</i> <i>Seligman (ED), Mr Linkohr (S), Mr Galland,</i> <i>Mr Calvez, Mr Ippolito and Mr Veronesi</i> <i>(Doc. 1-592/80):</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><i>Mr Muller-Hermann, rapporteur</i> 84</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><i>Mr Davignon (Commission); Mr Linkohr;</i> <i>Mr Herman; Mr Seligman; Mr Veronesi; Mr</i> <i>Galland; Mrs Hammerich; Mrs Charzat; Sir</i> <i>Peter Vanneck; Mr Davignon</i> 85</p> <p>12. <i>Multiannual Community programme in</i> <i>biomolecular engineering — Report by Mr</i> <i>Schmid (Committee on Energy and Research)</i> <i>(indirect action 1981-1985) (Doc. 1-521/80):</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><i>Mr Schmid, rapporteur</i> 94</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><i>Mr Gautier; Mr Fuchs; Mr Beazley; Mr</i> <i>Colla; Mr Burke (Commission)</i> 96</p> <p>13. <i>Urgent procedure</i> 99</p> <p>14. <i>Agenda for next sitting</i> 100</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><i>Points of order: Mr Provan; Mr Prout</i> 100</p>
---	--

IN THE CHAIR: MRS VEIL

President

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

President. — The sitting is open.

1. *Approval of the minutes*

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

Are there any comments?

The minutes are approved.

2. *Statement from the Legal Affairs Committee*

(continuation)

President. — Mr Ferri has asked to be allowed to make an important statement.

I call Mr Ferri.

Mr Ferri, chairman of the Legal Affairs Committee. — *(I)* Madam President, I thank you for giving me the opportunity for an announcement which I consider it my duty to make before the Parliament in plenary sitting. I would have liked to do this yesterday, but I was unavoidably detained and thus unable to be present at the beginning of the sitting.

As you will recall, on 14 December 1979 Parliament decided to initiate legal proceedings in the Court of Justice, seeking to invalidate a regulation which the Council had adopted without a parliamentary opinion. The regulation concerns isoglucose and can be found in case 139/79. The Court of Justice gave its decision last 29 October, and this decision has an important bearing on the role and function of Parliament.

I would like to quote in full three paragraphs of the substantive part of the judgment which are of particu-

lar importance to us. The first has to do with the admissibility of the Parliament's intervention, an admissibility contested by the Council. The Court rejected the Council's plea and admitted our appeal, declaring in paragraph 19 — I quote the French text of the decision:

'The first line of this article' — Article 37 of the Protocol on the Statute of the Court of Justice — 'lays down the same right of intervention for all the institutions of the Community. The exercise of this right on the part of one of the institutions cannot be curtailed without impairing its institutional position under the Treaty, in particular paragraph 1 of Article 4'.

This implies the recognition of Parliament for all purposes through its inclusion under the term 'institutions'. It is an extremely important point, in my opinion, because it allows our institution to intervene directly, when it is appropriate and politically expedient, in cases of legislative inertia on the part of the Council or the Commission. Such action would be based on Article 175 of the Treaty, which contains the same formula: 'The Member States and the other institutions of the Community may bring an action before the Court . . .'. Now the Court has recognized that Parliament is included among the institutions in all respects, and any limitation on the exercise of its rights in this area would be arbitrary and in violation of the Treaties.

Finally, the substance of the decision, which has to do with our consultative function, is expressed in paragraphs 34 and 35:

'The consultation stipulated in Article 43, paragraph 2, line 3, as in other parallel provisions of the Treaty, enables Parliament to effectively participate in the legislative process of the Community. This right is essential to the institutional balance laid down in the Treaties. It reflects at the Community level — if only on a limited scale — a fundamental democratic principle whereby the peoples participate through an assembly of their representatives in the exercise of sovereign authority. The regular consultation of Parliament in the cases set down in the Treaties is an essential procedural requirement and action taken without respecting that requirement must of necessity be invalid. It should be specified that the respect of this requirement implies the expression of its opinion by Parliament, and that the requirement cannot be satisfied merely when the Council has requested this opinion. The Council therefore has acted wrongly in referring to "consulta-

Ferri

tion" of the Assembly in the introduction to regulation No 1293/79.'

In its regulation the Council had, as the Court mentions, referred to 'the previous consultation of the Assembly' without the Assembly's having been able to express its opinion.

Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I believe that this decision of the Court, which is the Community institution whose task is precisely to see that the treaties are fully respected, sanctions the fundamental character of our consultative role in the legislative process of the Community. It is a limited role, since it involves consultation and not true legislative power, but an essential one nonetheless. Its importance to the institutional balance laid down in the treaties and to the principle of democratic participation through direct representatives of the people was perfectly underlined in this decision by the Court of Justice.

The implications that arise from this decision can, in my opinion, be significant. The committee over which I have the honour to preside is, with the authorization of the Bureau, preparing an own initiative report on the problems of the consultation procedure, and the decision quoted above furnishes a solid point of departure for our work.

I believed it to be my duty to inform Parliament directly concerning this decision so that there will be a record of it in our debates, and also because the mandate that I carried out as rapporteur of the Committee on Legal Affairs was given parliamentary approval. I am pleased, therefore, that the Court's decision has fully demonstrated the validity and fundamental importance of our arguments.

3. Documents received

President. — I have received various documents, a list of which you will find in the minutes of this sitting.

4. Membership of committees

President. — I have received from the Socialist Group a request that Mr Fich be appointed a member of the Joint Parliamentary Committee of the EEC-Turkey Association to replace Mrs Gredal.

Are there any objections?

The appointment is ratified.

5. Situation in the iron and steel industry

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

- the situation in the iron and steel industry, further to the statement by Mr Jenkins, President of the Commission, on 14 October 1980;
- the report by Mrs Baduel Glorioso, on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, on the closure of the Consett steelworks (Doc. 1-463/80);
- the oral question with debate by Mr Deleau and others, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, to the Commission on urgent measures to cope with the serious situation in the iron and steel industry (Doc. 1-516/80);
- the report by Martinet, on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, on EEC-United States relations in the steel sector (Doc. 1-565/80).

I call Mrs Baduel Glorioso.

Mrs Baduel Glorioso, rapporteur. — (I) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, in presenting this report in the name of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment on the closing of the Consett steel works I would like to begin with some statistics concerning the extraordinary nature of the current situation in the county of Devonshire, where the Consett steel works are located.

This region now has the highest unemployment rate in England: 16.6 %; 3 600 people were laid off when the steelworks closed on 10 September, and these lay-offs in turn have resulted or will result in unemployment for 10 000 more workers. There is an indirect unemployment; in the month of October there were 5 262 applications for 81 available posts. It is estimated that in December the inflation rate in the Consett area will climb to 28 %, but local authorities forecast that in the course of the coming year the rate will reach an incredible 50 %.

It is evident that the unemployment spiral set off in Consett is a typical one which is in no way peculiar to that region. Consett closes, and immediately afterwards the second local firm, a company dealing in automobile parts, closes in its turn, laying off 1 250 workers; a toy factory has already reduced its staff from 400 to 40. The basic pattern resembles that already illustrated in Lorraine and is typical of regions dependent upon a single industry: the entire zone, including entrepreneurs, small businesses, and tradesmen, is finally sucked into the morass of economic stagnation provoked by the closing of the region's principal industrial centre.

I can now say, with a satisfaction you can well understand, that the Economic and Social Committee is also looking into the situation at Consett. A year ago the committee's regional section visited Lorraine, and a

Baduel Glorioso

few weeks ago it was in Consett. It has already approved an opinion requesting particular intervention from the Regional Fund, together with related programmes. Today our Assembly in plenary sitting is turning its attention to Consett, and I think no one will object if, in the overall context of the steel industry crisis in the Community and the larger crisis in Community economy and production in general, we examine the particular case of a single company in one of the Member States. The Parliament should not only interest itself in such serious and typical cases, as it is doing, but it should also support the principle of European solidarity by making its presence felt and its voice heard; by speaking — as I and others have done in Consett and will do again on other occasions — to workers of other nationalities, of other countries, and of other groups. This is the second interesting characteristic of our initiative: the signatories of the resolution which forms the basis for the work of the Committee on Social Affairs include not only the local parliamentary representative, Mr Boyes, but also all the Members from the British Labour Party, two German Socialist members, two Dutch members, and finally myself, an Italian member of the Communist group. The issue has been taken up by a combination of forces which we must define as belonging to the European Left, a coalition which represents not only a feeling of solidarity with a particular and limited situation but also a conquest over the egotistical and nationalistic elements which weigh so heavily on all of us. I am convinced that the case is our common responsibility, all the more because it involves unemployment, the most serious risk that exists for a worker.

As before in Lorraine, we are today faced with the complete absence of any adequately projected conversion plan, and this lack has produced an uncontrolled and spontaneous restructurization. I am sorry that Commissioner Davignon is not here today, for at the beginning of last year we had a live debate on Belgian television: it was at the time of the Lorraine crisis, and I asked him — I was then filling another position — if he thought that this unplanned industrialization, this spontaneous capitalism, was beneficial. It certainly had no positive effects in France, where it cost jobs, nor in South Korea, where French entrepreneurs had invested in a steel works where labour costs were lower due to the situation in the developing countries, and kept lower by a military dictatorship whose army fired on workers who wanted to strike for higher wages. I said the same in reference to Lorraine, and it is not necessary to repeat it in regard to the United Kingdom.

The Commission predicts the loss of 150 000 jobs in 1980. Dramatic situations such as that in Consett will foreseeably multiply in single industry regions. Faced with these enormous problems, what does the Commission do? It responds by funding 10 000 jobs for 1981, with an interest rate subsidy of around 25 million EUAs, when at least 45 million EUAs are

necessary to provide 15 000 new jobs. I am well aware that last year the 45 million EUAs were not all spent due to an insufficient number of applications, but let us ask ourselves the reason for this bureaucratic incompetence or this inability to open the European channels for those in need or for those able to invest and create new jobs. Otherwise, the conclusion is always the same: this spontaneous restructurization, with its lack of any rational basis, is always paid for in the end by the worker.

The situation is becoming dramatic. The European Labour Union Institute announces on the basis of its investigations that if no counter-measures are taken, there will be 10 800 000 unemployed in the Community and 14 900 000 unemployed in the rest of Western Europe by 1985. These are incredible figures, and intolerable because of the justifiable social tensions they create. On the other hand, we do not ask that unprofitable businesses be maintained, nor that the problem be dealt with only in terms of alleviatory social measures and early retirement: we do not request only these measures because they are only necessary at the moment of the crisis, when jobs are lost. The Peters report should be approved by the Council of Ministers; the 112 million we obtained as the Social Committee for the invocation of Article 56 in the iron and steel sector must be available for use. These are certainly necessary measures, but they do not affect the essential problem. I met with the Works Council at Consett, whose chairman was 35 years of age, and even if some of his colleagues, who were 50-55, were satisfied with the early retirement pension and the not inconsiderable sum of money they receive upon dismissal, the young workers are rather asking for another job. A young man asked me: 'Can the European Parliament tell me where, in what sector and in what part of England I can find work?' Silence was my only response, for to answer honestly I would have had to tell this worker that his only prospects of employment were in Australia or Canada.

For these reasons, although not neglecting the necessary social measures, the report I now present is addressed especially to the governments and to the Commission, and calls upon their sense of responsibility in this matter. They should act to ensure progress not only in the traditionally backward regions, like Southern Italy, but also in regions which, like Lorraine yesterday and like Devonshire today, are stricken by the crisis and driven back to a preindustrial level, despite large resources in managerial ability, industrial capacity, labour, professional training, etc.

We urge the governments to coordinate the layoffs with plans for economic conversion to provide alternative employment in newly-created fields of activity. We ask the Commission to intervene with all the financial means at its disposal to create incentives for entrepreneurs and encourage new investments. We also ask the Commission, however, to indicate which, in the context of its North-North and North-South

Baduel Glorioso

negotiations, are sectors where the Community can further develop its productive activity, provide jobs, and find new means to increase employment.

Mr President, in conclusion I would like to quote a pathetic inquiry made to me by the workers of Consett: 'We followed Professor Friedman's rules' — strangely enough, the workers of Consett are familiar with these rules, for they were able to list them correctly: increase in production, cooperation with the company, all efforts made to guarantee the profitability of the business — 'but what good did it do us'? In my opinion it would have been better, not only for the workers of Consett but also for the European governments, to follow the guidelines of Professor Galbraith who just a few days ago was still stressing the need for a planned economy, and not only as a hope for the future but as a present reality which is in general taking the place of the laws of the marketplace. Such a system demands an active, not a passive, commitment, and therefore presupposes an ability on the part of the governments to exert control over the economic situation.

President. — I call Mr Deleau.

Mr Deleau. — (*F*) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, by tabling an oral question with debate to the Commission of the European Communities, pursuant to Rule 47 of the Rules of Procedure, on urgent measures to cope with the serious situation in the iron and steel industry, the Group of European Progressive Democrats seeks to open a wide-ranging debate in our Assembly.

The crisis in the iron and steel industry is unfortunately not a recent event, having its origins in the rapid growth of investments which resulted in a substantial increase in world steel production between 1946 and 1974. Since 1974 the crisis has accelerated.

The worsening of the international situation, which is affecting the car and building industries and public works in particular, has aggravated the situation in the European iron and steel industry, which is very dependent on the capital goods market. World economic growth prospects point to an overall decrease in the level of industrial investments. As a supplier to the various industrial sectors, the iron and steel industry is feeling the effects of this, which are unfortunately likely to continue.

The situation has been further aggravated by the fact that these last four years of stagnation, of anarchic competition, of rapidly declining sales prices have had serious financial and social consequences.

We have already said how absolutely essential it is to go beyond these voluntary measures, which, although necessary, are in our view inadequate. Certain steel

producers have not respected the voluntary Community measures and have thus helped to speed up the closure of major companies and the complete disappearance of industry from various regions.

This crisis was predicable, and we can but regret the delay in the introduction by the Community of the necessary measures for which the ECSC Treaty provides. It may surprise you to hear a Liberal calling today for intervention, while hoping that such action will be temporary. The situation demands it.

In view of the economic and social tragedy to which this crisis has given rise, doctrinal considerations must be abandoned in favour of action to safeguard the industry, to ensure it survives. As soon as the crisis began, an 'emergency plan' should have been launched and recourse should undoubtedly have been had to Article 57 of the Treaty at the time the 'Davignon plan' went into operation, because we are convinced that more jobs would then have been saved than endangered. This was one of the items in our platform for the election of this Assembly by direct universal suffrage.

But all that is in the past, and we can only say how sorry we are. The Commission's decision of 31 October, following on from the Council's unanimous view that Article 58 of the ECSC Treaty should be applied, albeit belatedly, can only be endorsed.

It is an essential decision. Since the summer of 1980 the European steel industry has witnessed a radical decline in the demand for steel at both Community and world level. This decline in demand has necessitated an appreciable reduction in Community production, which had to be properly organized if prices were not to collapse. The impossibility of arriving at a voluntary agreement among the producers had already resulted in an average drop in prices by about 13 % in September compared with the beginning of the year.

In the second quarter of 1980 it was no longer possible to ensure that the delivery programmes established by the Commission would be observed (they had been exceeded by almost 20 % by one Member State). If this situation had continued, the consequences would have been tragic and, in certain cases, irreversible for many companies and their workers.

The Commission was therefore forced to ask the Council to agree to the introduction of a system of steel production quotas for the companies in the iron and steel industry.

The Commission's decision was not only essential: it was desirable. My group had long been calling for such action, and its chairman recently said: 'In the steel crisis action must be taken at the right level and by effective means. In the case of the iron and steel industry . . . the right level is objectively the Community, and the effective means is Article 58.'

Deleau

In the light of these remarks, Parliament now calls on from the Commission to provide additional information on three points in particular:

The first concerns the Commission's statement that, while the quota system was in force, it would not resort to action to restrict imports under Article 74 of the Treaty. Does the Commission not feel that it is thus depriving itself, from the outset, of an important weapon in the negotiations it will have to enter into with certain countries outside the Community, all the more so as some countries, Spain for example, have not respected the agreements reached at the beginning of this year.

The second point concerns the practical procedures for fixing and monitoring the production quotas laid down by the Commission. It is quite obvious that all the Community's iron and steel industries are affected by the crisis. It is therefore equally obvious that the restrictions in production must be shared equitably among all the Member States. Can the Commission reassure us and give us any information on this point? The effectiveness of monitoring arrangements cannot be assessed until the new system has been introduced and is functioning. Parliament should therefore be informed half-way through the implementation of the anti-crisis plan.

Finally, none of these arrangements will have the desired effect unless ambitious measures are taken at social level. The inclusion of 112 m EUA in the Community budget to finance the readaptation of steel workers is very important in this respect. It would be unexpected to say the least if the Council did not agree to this appropriation, which had the unanimous support of this House.

In its desire to safeguard the jobs of thousands of steel workers, my group urges the Commission and Council to make rapid and generous use of the appropriate funds to ensure the implementation of the back-up social measures that are essential if jobs are to be saved in a sector that has already been hard hit by restructuring.

Let us turn quickly to the external aspect. We must again say in all seriousness that the present external policy measures should be more restrictive, since we find that certain third countries have not honoured the commitments they have entered into with the Community. Spain, it would appear, is a flagrant example.

In addition, the recent American statements on the reintroduction of a high trigger price and of accelerated procedures do little to alleviate our concern, all the more so as we have very recently heard that the United States intends to refuse to allow the import of special French steels, even though they form part of a pattern of traditional trade. I would ask the Commission what is the situation in this respect.

The internal arrangements for which Article 58 provides should therefore be supplemented by recourse to Article 74 of the ECSC Treaty, which refers to external arrangements which are more restrictive and therefore, in this specific case, more effective.

We feel that the combined application of Articles 58 and 74 of the Treaty alone will bring about an improvement in this tragic situation, which is the outcome of the recession and of restructuring.

We feel that, if employment in the steel sector is to be improved, if the financial capacities of the companies are to be restored, if the production capacities which will prove necessary in the future are to be maintained, these two articles must be applied together.

We also feel that, if this 'dirigistic' intervention takes place at Community level — and for a limited period, it is to be hoped — the Member States must also pursue a voluntary and lasting national policy aimed at resolving the steel crisis in the very near future.

After all, a state of manifest crisis must and can only be temporary. A lasting improvement in the situation will stem from the application of the Treaty through the introduction of restrictive measures and also through the acceptance by the Member States of objectives which must be achieved, by their agreeing to act in solidarity and in a spirit of loyalty one to the other.

But do we want — and I am coming to the end of my statement now — Europe to be credible in this situation? If so, and it is what we want, there must be no more mistakes made in bringing the restructuring of the iron and steel industry to a successful conclusion and in eliminating the anxiety of the workers in this sector and removing the burden of unemployment from our economies. Those in positions of responsibility in the Community, at all levels, must act without delay and with strength in the sectors threatened by the crisis before it is too late, because unfortunately the crisis is not affecting the iron and steel sector alone. At present economic growth is inadequate, and the economic prospects are not favourable in either the short or the medium term. With its 8 million unemployed, the Community has no more time to lose. It must draw up and introduce new measures to curb unemployment and create jobs.

It will be for us, the politicians, to assess these measures. This is the price Europe must pay to regain sufficient credibility to put a stop to action that runs counter to the general objectives for the steel sector, and the European iron and steel industry has enough strength to overcome this crisis, to alleviate its effects and to shorten it, and enough strength to overcome the crises which threaten other sectors of the economy.

Deleau

Europe will thus give hope to those who are suffering and who still want to look to the future.

President. — I call Mr Martinet.

Mr Martinet, rapporteur. — (F) Madam President, among the various factors which are adding to the difficulties now facing the European iron and steel industry the decline in our exports to the American market is having a not insignificant effect.

From January to September 1980, in other words in the first nine months of this year, the Community exported 2 867 m tonnes of iron and steel products to the United States, as against 3 809 m tonnes in the same period in 1979, meaning a loss of almost 1 m tonnes.

We are told that this decline is due to the poor economic situation in the United States. This is only partly true. While we have suffered this loss of 1 m tonnes, Japan's exports to the United States in the same period rose by 100 000 tonnes from 4 575 m tonnes to 4 675 m tonnes. Exports by other countries such as Canada and Brazil undoubtedly decreased, but to a lesser extent than our exports, falling from 4 300 m to 4 082 m tonnes between 1979 and 1980.

It is therefore completely wrong to say, as the Commission has done, that our share of the market has remained roughly the same. I have referred to various sources: the American Iron and Steel Institute, the employers' federation of the French iron and steel industry and the German iron and steel bureau and I have noted three sets of figures relating to the period from January to August 1980.

Firstly, imports accounted for 16.8 % of American steel consumption during this period, as against 15.2 % in the same period last year. In other words, imports accounted for a larger share of the American market.

Secondly, Japan's share rose from 5.5 to 6.9 %, that of countries other than Japan and the Community from 5 to 5.8 %, while the Community's share fell from 4.7 to 4.1 %. We are therefore the only ones to have suffered a decline in our share of the market.

Thirdly, this decline did not make itself felt until May. The situation at the beginning of the year was relatively favourable. We suffered the greatest losses during the period from May to September.

It is difficult not to see this phenomenon in the light of an event which, at the time, rightly disturbed this Parliament, the lodging by the US Steel Company on 21 March 1980 of an anti-dumping complaint against 15 European companies, followed by the suspension

by the American Administration of the trigger price system.

A two-fold pressure — I am even tempted to say two-fold blackmail — was then brought to bear by US Steel on the American Administration and by the American Administration on the European Community. This major steel company set out to achieve a relaxation of rules it considered to be a hindrance, particularly as regards pollution, and it succeeded. For the Administration it was a question of getting the Community to accept the idea of an appreciable reduction in our exports.

How did the European Parliament react at the time? As you will recall, on 18 April we adopted a motion tabled by Mr Donnez and on 10 July a resolution tabled by the members of the Socialist Group, the Group of the European People's Party, the European Democratic Group, the Liberal and Democratic Group and the Group of European Progressive Democrats. In the meantime, the matter had been referred to our various committees. What did the document of 10 July say? It refers to the agreement reached within the OECD in 1977, which called on the United States Government to request US Steel to withdraw its action and to enter into negotiations with the Commission as a matter of urgency.

The resolution of 10 July stressed the need to provide for countermeasures in case the American Government violated the provisions of GATT. This proposal was in line with the Commission's intentions, and Mr Davignon had talks with the American Administration on this subject during the summer. During these talks he referred to the risk of a trade war if the anti-dumping action brought by the United States was continued.

But the iron and steel debate has not been directly linked to the objections rightly provoked by American action in other sectors, and specifically the synthetic fibre sector. The American decision was, as you know, finally taken on 30 September 1980. On the same day Mr Askew sent a letter to Mr Davignon informing him of the withdrawal of US Steel's complaint and of the temporary introduction of a new trigger price, some 12 % higher than the old one, and of the establishment of a procedure permitting the suspension of this new trigger price if steel imports accounted for more than 15.2 % of the American market or if the American steel industry as a whole was working at less than 87 % capacity. The Department of Trade then found that there was a sudden explosion in imports of iron and steel products and, after contacting the governments of the countries in question, brought an anti-dumping and anti-subsidy action based on the notion of unfair competition.

At first glance, then, the situation which obtained in 1977, at the time when agreement was reached in the OECD, and which, I would remind you, was the prin-

Martinet

cial objective of the motion we adopted, has been restored. But it cannot be ignored that since the spring of 1980 the European industry has suffered serious damage through the suspension of the trigger price and the threat to its exports of the action brought by US Steel. Much will again depend on the prices actually charged by American companies, which are obviously not obliged to comply with the 12 % increase in the trigger price. According to information which I have and which I would ask the Commission to confirm, prices on the American market have not increased by a mere 3 to 4 %, but by 8 % where US Steel is concerned. That is a considerable difference, which is likely to be to the disadvantage of our exports, of course.

What is striking in this affair is the unilateral nature of the American decisions. Admittedly, there have been contacts and discussions with Commission representatives, whose viewpoint has been taken into account. But at the end of the day the American Administration has confined itself to informing Mr Davignon of the measures that have been taken. Although the reply from the Commissioner responsible for industrial affairs to Mr Askew contains various observations and thoughts, it still does not constitute a diplomatic document. Everything is done as if American law applied to the whole world. The United States declares its loyalty to the principle of GATT, but it uses many different forms of protectionism, as the French company Creusot-Loire has just found to its cost. On the pretext that it uses a small quantity of nickel of Cuban origin in the manufacture of its special steels, these steels have just been banned from the American market by a decision of the American Treasury Department.

Allow me, Madam President, to make a brief personal remark on this subject. If our countries regard themselves as friends and allies of the American people, we must state very clearly one day — and with the same firmness the new American Administration intends to use — that friendship and alliance do not mean resignation to hegemony. Because what is at stake is not simply trade in industrial or agricultural products, but jobs as well. The decline in our sales of steel to the United States affects between 15 000 and 20 000 jobs in Europe. Let us not forget that.

(Applause from the left)

I now come to the conclusions which your Committee on External Economic Relations proposes you should draw.

Firstly, we note with satisfaction that the objectives which were approved by the majority of this Parliament and which the Commission took into account have largely been achieved.

Secondly, we point out, however, that the European iron and steel industry has suffered unquestionable damage and that there can be no certainty that it will

in the near future regain the share of the United States market it held before US Steel brought its action.

Thirdly, we are disturbed by the interpretation the American Administration might give to certain parameters resulting in the opening of the anti-dumping procedure, and we call on the Commission to keep a very close watch on the implementation of the decisions taken by the American Administration, without ruling out the possibility of taking counteraction should there be fresh signs of protectionism.

Fourthly — although this is not to be found in the written text before you — we ask the Commission to submit to us another report on this subject in 6 to 12 months' time.

These four points are put to Parliament by the unanimous decision of the Committee on External Economic Relations.

President. — I call Mr Glinne to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Glinne. — *(F)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of my group I should like to begin by recalling our basic position.

The majority of my group favours the application of Article 58. Firstly, because there has been a veritable price war among the Community's producers since the collapse of Eurofer in July and because, if this situation continues, the iron and steel companies, whatever their legal status — public, semi-public or private — will suffer intolerable financial losses by the end of the year. Secondly, because we are opposed to cartels and therefore quite definitely support the provisions of the two Treaties of Rome and Paris which in principle prohibit agreements and similar understandings. Finally, because we think it preferable for the public authorities themselves to fix and control the production quotas rather than seeing them established in the deceptive guise of voluntary self-restraint agreements, in other words, as the outcome of the confrontation and of the power relationship among the producers.

But my group also feels, I would recall, that external controls must be improved. We therefore feel that account must be taken of all the possibilities offered by Article 74 of the Treaty, which states that 'the High Authority is empowered to take any measure which is in accordance with this Treaty . . . if it is found that countries not members of the Community or undertakings situated in such countries are engaging in dumping or other practices condemned by the Havana Charter'. The attitude, particularly of the United States, which consists in charging dumping prices, shows how essential it is to apply this article. Several governments of the Community's Member States,

Glinne

particularly those of the Benelux countries, call for its application as a matter of urgency.

Madam President, on 31 October of this year the Commission took various steps relating to the application of Article 58. We endorse this action, even if we are not entirely satisfied: the agreement reached, which allows the Commission to impose quotas on steel production in the EEC until June 1981, obviously represents no more than a compromise and it also provides for major derogations in respect of a large number of products.

For example, the system of compulsory quotas does not apply to tinplate (4 % of world production), rails (1.2 %), liquid steels (1.7 %), half of the fine and special steels (8 %) and large-diameter tubes for pipelines, or about 20 % of total Community steel production, although these products will continue to be subject to statistical control and monitoring.

As regards special steels, it has been agreed that the system of compulsory quotas should not apply to alloy steels containing 5 % or more of other substances and costing 30 % more than a corresponding normal steel. Nor will the quota system apply to the output of companies producing less than 6 000 tonnes of fine and special steels per quarter.

Will the compromise finally reached by the Nine after considerable difficulty and on a proposal from Mr Davignon produce the expected results? The most serious questions we must ask ourselves at the moment are: Will orders pick up again? Will prices revert to a more acceptable level? Will the companies, whatever their status, as I have said — public, semi-public or private — get out of the red and so be able to release funds to help solve the social problems?

Two weeks after the decision to introduce quotas we obviously feel it is still too early to assess the results. A period of several months will have to pass before we can see the effects on price and order levels. A watch must also be kept on the application of the measures introduced by the Commission, which must not hesitate to impose sanctions if infractions occur. The Socialist Group also supports the request by the ECSC Consultative Committee to be regularly informed on the application of these measures. In addition, we propose that the Commission should report to Parliament every quarter on the development of the situation in the iron and steel sector. The first such report, which should reach us on 1 January 1981, would thus concern the last three months of this year.

It is also important to emphasize the social measures being considered by the Council. While Article 58 has been applied with retroactive effect, nothing has yet been done in the social field. Whereas Article 56 of the ECSC Treaty allows the introduction of certain social measures, which I shall not enumerate — they can be found in the Treaty — without a formal decision by

the Council, the same is not true of the measures outlined in the Peters report adopted by the European Parliament: early retirement, restriction of overtime, adjustment of working conditions and hours, and the introduction of an additional shift. We urge the Council to strike a new balance in its policy on the iron and steel industry and at long last to go beyond Article 56 of the ECSC Treaty and take all the necessary social measures to reassure the workers in this sector, who are rightly concerned about their future.

In this context, it is important that the special appropriation included in the draft budget for social measures in the iron and steel industry, which was approved by the European Parliament during its budgetary part-session, should be accepted by the Council and entered in the 1981 budget as finally adopted.

Madam President, there is an urgent need to speed up the modernization of the iron and steel companies and to coordinate this modernization at Community level. This modernization, which has been made necessary by the profound changes in world iron and steel production, must be brought to an early conclusion, with scrupulous respect for the legitimate rights of all workers. I repeat: of all workers, because in some countries there have been rumours that the fate awaiting the steel workers differs according to whether they are nationals of the country or migrant workers. Modernization must be accompanied by a considerable effort to find new outlets for steel, particularly in the building sector, or as a replacement for certain plastic products, not to speak of a 'revival' of the transport sector.

The whole of the European iron and steel industry is quite obviously facing a crisis. This crisis affects tens of thousands of workers. Everything must be done to find a solution to this grave problem. The Socialist Group has put forward various ideas and proposals. It is against these ideas and proposals, which must be taken together, that my group will be judging the Commission, the Council and, not to be forgotten, the governments of the Member States. We cannot be satisfied with piecemeal measures. We want an overall solution, since we are sure that, if this overall solution is not found soon, thousands of workers will rightly turn their backs on Europe. For many reasons that would be extremely regrettable.

President. — I call Mr Ingo Friedrich to speak on behalf of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

Mr I. Friedrich. — (D) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, on 30 October 1980 the Council of Ministers unanimously decided to declare a manifest crisis in the European steel industry. This opens the way for the application of Article 58 of the ECSC Treaty, which confers on the Commission powers otherwise

Friedrich

unknown to a national minister. This decision also has a historic dimension, since for the first time in the history of the European Community a nationally controlled compulsory cartel has been created at European level.

We Christian Democrats have no objection at all to the European institutions having greater power. Quite the contrary: we are firmly convinced that many of the problems crucial to the future of Europe, such as energy supplies, safeguarding supplies of raw materials and making a worthwhile contribution to world peace, can be solved only if the Community has a greater opportunity to exert influence. But no one will take it amiss if in this specific case we react very sceptically to the idea of drastic intervention in the economic process by the State with compulsory arrangements such as this cartel. We know from experience that such measures usually cost the citizen a great deal of money, delay necessary technological change, preserve outmoded structures and ultimately eliminate jobs in a particularly brutal fashion. In the long term only the forces of the market, of competition, will ensure optimal supplies to the citizens of Europe at reasonable prices.

Despite these objections, the decision has been taken. Any subsequent carping is a waste of time. We now have to live with this decision and to make the best of it.

Let me just say a word or two to the national governments in Europe, to our nine Member States: it is simply unacceptable that all Europe's successes, unquestionable though they may be, should be described and passed off as heroic deeds of the governments in London, Rome, Paris, Bonn, Brussels, Luxembourg and so on, while all the difficult, insoluble problems are left to the Community institutions, so that 'those bureaucrats in Brussels' can be accused of not finding the solution. If this way of thinking becomes fashionable among the public, nothing else will work at European level, and many of the urgent problems we face will not even be tackled. That means certain death for Europe, and in addition, the national governments are sawing through the branch on which they themselves are sitting.

The course of events in the European steel crisis has closely followed this pattern. The crisis initially escalated as a result of the omissions of the national governments to such an extent that intervention by the European bodies became inevitable. The governments slept through the time in summer when it would still have been possible to avert the steel crisis by voluntary means and thus to avoid this cartel.

(Interruption)

They all did, Mr Wagner. You can always pass the buck like that.

Our peoples would have not future — and the Community governments should take note of this — if the national decision-makers consciously and against their better judgment repeatedly created the impression that the Community is incapable of taking any worthwhile decisions and that Europe only costs money. Do these people really believe — and I mean everyone, those in Rome just as those in Brussels — that the elimination of the steel crisis would cost less at national level? Or the agricultural policy? Everyone in a position of responsibility knows that precisely the opposite is the case. Quite apart from the fact that national attempts at a solution would result in national resentment, new protectionism, new rivalry involving incalculable risks for us all.

The citizens of Europe must realize that an economic and reasonable solution to many problems can be found only at European level. We must not therefore allow the national governments, with their egoism and their pettiness, to run down Europe and so conceal their own incompetence.

To conclude, I should once again like to emphasize that we must make the best of the decision that has now been taken. Firstly, it must be ensured that the time limit of 30 June 1981 imposed on the steel cartel by the decision is strictly observed. From 1 July 1981 there must again be free competition to ensure steel is produced where it can be produced most productively and economically, so that our European steel remains competitive on the world market and our steel consumers are charged a price that does not ruin their chances. The Commission must realize that a voluntary system can replace the present dirigistic measures only if there is no longer a possibility of prolonging the application of Article 58.

Secondly, great efforts must be made in the period up to 30 June to remove obsolete production capacities, to introduce social relief measures for the workers concerned and to create new and secure jobs.

Thirdly, the dreadful state of affairs as regards national subsidies in the steel sector must be eliminated. These subsidies can already be counted in billions. The Commission after all has an effective instrument in the code on subsidies. But it must also use this instrument and use it against anyone. The coming months, which will give steel companies some breathing space, must be used to eradicate these State subsidies.

Fourthly, on no account may additional import measures be taken to shore up the European steel industry against international competition. Protectionistic import arrangements, which we as an export-oriented Community cannot afford, must definitely be rejected.

Fifthly, other sectors of industry in Europe are deceiving themselves if the present application of Article 58

Friedrich

leads them to believe the Community could take the same dirigistic action in those sectors as it has now done in the steel sector. This will undoubtedly not be the case. The Treaties clearly do not allow such extensions to include other industries.

The march towards central controls did not begin in Europe on 30 October 1980, but they did cast their first major shadow. We must do everything to ensure that this shadow is removed as soon as possible. Jobs in Europe will not be safeguarded by protectionism and central controls, but by the most advanced technologies, the choice of optimum sites, competition and the efficiency of European engineers and scientists.

IN THE CHAIR: MR MØLLER

Vice-President

President. — I call Miss Forster to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Miss Forster. — Mr President, I intend to concentrate my remarks on the operation of Article 58. The European Democratic Group wants to ensure that this most serious step which the Community has taken will result in a stronger and more viable steel industry in Europe.

All the Member States have agreed that these measures are necessary. We do not like, Mr President, the imposition of production quotas. Nor do we like the Commission having to monitor and check the activities of private firms and publicly-owned concerns. These are steps that very few of us in this House would normally support, but because of the serious state of the industry we feel it is vital that, once we have decided to take these steps, they should be made to work.

We want the industry to be able to restructure and to become more competitive in world terms. This will mean, of course, that there will be some reductions in capacity with consequent loss of jobs. It is therefore essential that funds be made available to help early retirement and that severance pay be paid to those workers who are displaced. And we hope that the Council will reach a favourable decision on this in the Budget Council next week. They have delayed long enough in agreeing measures to help redundant workers and it is time they faced up to this responsibility and came to a conclusion.

I would now like to comment briefly on three matters. First the quotas themselves, then special steels and finally imports.

The output cut proposed for the last quarter of this year corresponds to an average cut of about 14 % below production in the last quarter of 1979. This is small when compared to the fall in Community crude steel production of over 18 % for September 1980 compared to September 1979, and the situation last month was probably worse. This small cut will enable producers to fulfil their existing commitments and for the first quarter of 1981 there will of necessity be bigger cuts.

The object of these cuts, Mr President, is to stop the slide in prices, which averaged 13 % in the first 9 months of this year and which, with an average increase in production costs of 5 %, means that most steel-making concerns are making catastrophic losses. Losses do not preserve jobs, but profits can create new ones and this is why we want the profitability of the steel industry restored. We hope that the Commission will monitor the situation and make sure that the quotas established in the new year are at a realistic level and that they are enforced equally in all the Member States. It will also be essential that there be some voluntary agreements on sales within the Community and we would support steps which would enable the Commission to ask producers for information on the amounts of steel exported.

Insofar as special steels are concerned, some of these have been excluded from the arrangements for quotas. It is therefore possible that their exclusion will provide a loophole through which some producers may be able to evade their quota limits. We therefore hope that a careful check will be kept on the production and deliveries of all special steels while Article 58 remains in force. The Commission has the power to act in this matter without recourse to the Council and to impose quotas if necessary. And we hope that they will make use of this power if the situation deteriorates any further.

Finally, we come to the question of imports. And here I would disagree with Mr Deleau in that we do not want Article 74 imposed. The use of Article 58, however, will have been in vain if imports rise and if the market is flooded with low-priced imports from outside the Community. It is therefore essential that the Commission continue to negotiate voluntary arrangements with countries such as Japan, Spain and Australia and that imports are limited to the same extent as production. This Group would not support the use of Article 74 because we believe that trade should be as free as possible and that the Community should not move towards protectionism. However, the Commission has recommended that Member States make careful checks on all steel imports, especially as far as prices are concerned, and the prices charged for re-sell of any imported steel. We hope that Member States will follow this recommendation and keep the Commission fully informed of the results.

Forster

In conclusion, Mr President, I would like to repeat that my Group does not like the necessity for all these controls, but we support them at the present time because of the crucial importance of the steel industry to Europe. I would support Mr Glinne in asking for a report from the Commission in January of next year and more importantly I would also like the Commission to look at ways of stimulating and increasing consumption within the Community, because it is consumption within the Community that will provide the future for our steel industry. However much we make efforts to increase our exports, it is the demand at home that is critical and I would like the Commission to study this question and to report to us in January. I hope that this procedure will come to an end in June and that by then we will have a much stronger and more competitive steel industry and that we will be able to return to free competition.

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

Mr Pannella. — (*F*) Mr President, my group is very disturbed about the 11 minutes it has been allocated for the two major debates today. We ask you, Mr President, either to request the major groups to give us one or two minutes more so that we have 16 or 17 minutes or to ensure the Presidency allows us this latitude. We would be very grateful if we could express our views rather more adequately in these two important debates.

President. — I shall try to interpret the rules on speaking time as liberally as possible.

I call Mr Ansart to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Ansart. — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the debate we are having today on the iron and steel industry and the authoritarian and supranational implementation of the plan for the restructuring of the iron and steel industry, known as the plan to combat the state of manifest crisis, is taking place after the Commission has taken its decision, which confirms how little consideration is given to this Assembly and to us Representatives.

Ladies and gentlemen, the situation in the iron and steel industry dramatically illustrates the situation in the European Community, which is undergoing a serious crisis and, far from proposing economic and social progress for the peoples of Europe, is calling on them to make more and more sacrifices. Today, as yesterday, the same arguments are advanced in justification of a further move to mutilate the iron and steel industry and, I would add, other industries too: the need for competitiveness, for increased productivity, the need to hunt the lame duck, as we say.

But what are the causes of this crisis and of this situation, and who is responsible?

The responsibility lies with the governments of the Member States and with the Commission, which acts just like the board of directors of one of the multinational companies that dominate the European economy and manipulate it entirely to their own ends.

The policy pursued by the European Community is not aimed at progress, but is a plan for recession and restrictions by taking the form of a policy of economies, a policy of austerity which has resulted in the re-emergence of unemployment in France and in Europe. This policy is weakening France, it is leading a growing number of Frenchmen into poverty: half of the French population live in conditions which are changing from discomfort to misery.

Two years ago draconian measures, measures of unprecedented brutality were taken in our country to put the iron and steel industry on a sounder footing, we were told, and to make it more competitive. Through the application of the decisions of the Davignon plan in Lorraine, in the North, the centre of an iron and steel industry already hit by the closure of mines as a result of the ECSC decisions, whole regions have gone to the wall: workers in their thousand, with their families, have suddenly become nomads.

In France, 60 000 steel workers were made redundant between 1974 and 1978. More than 100 000, we are told, will lose their jobs between now and 1981. I would also add that 700 000 jobs in industry have been lost in my country since 1974. Today the workers are again being asked to make sacrifices, as always, because the ironmasters benefit by the generosity of the State to an extent that always remains unknown. In France 30 000 m francs has been thrown into the chasm that is the iron and steel plan, with no control over the use to which the tax-payers' money is put: that is a considerable amount of money.

Today, with the policies of austerity and economic stagnation, there is no reason why this should stop. We are heading — and we should have the courage to say so to the workers — for massive unemployment in the Community. There will soon be over 10 million unemployed, including several million young people, millions of others abandoned for the sake of progress: unemployment has become the travelling companion of European policy. We are heading for the destruction of whole regions, and at this rate France will be no more than a second-class steel-producing nation, while West German capitalism will increase and strengthen its domination of the Community.

In the 1980s, after its production of special steels, on which the future depends, has been cut back, France will produce even less than 25 million tonnes, while the ironmasters of West Germany will be producing between 60 and 65 million tonnes. Such is the truth.

Ansart

Furthermore, we know from experience that it is not true we must accept these plans and the sacrifices they entail to have better living standards tomorrow. I have been a Member of this Assembly for 7 years. In that time I have never taken part in a debate that concerned increases in wages, increases in purchasing power or a wide-ranging social policy. I have never taken part in a debate on a proposal for the creation of large numbers of jobs, a debate in which our young people were made a definite offer of a future worthy of a great age. Chancellor Schmidt said one day — and Mr Barre and Mr Giscard d'Estaing followed suit — that the major industrial companies should make profits in accordance with the formula that 'today's profits are the investments of tomorrow and the jobs of the day after'.

The debate on industry that has just been held in my country, in the National Assembly, revealed that a very small proportion of the enormous profits made in the last three years has been re-invested in France. They have mostly been re-invested abroad, where maximum profits can be achieved, with workers who are paid a pittance and live in very backward social circumstances and whom some would perhaps like to import into our country.

The truth is that the higher the profits the multinational companies make — and experience shows this to be true — the more jobs they eliminate. How, in these circumstances, can we agree to new plans, new closures, new unemployment?

The solutions are not to be found in renewed mutilation of our industries, further destruction, further cuts in production. Nor do we advocate an autarchic policy for our country. We want to strike a new balance in the terms of trade. We therefore call for exceptional national protective measures to be taken in France in view of the extreme gravity of a crisis that has been deliberately created. Produce French, limit the proportion of European imports on to the French market, consume more steel, stimulate the internal market: for it is not austerity we need, but an increase in income for the great majority. In this way our country is likely to establish the basis for European cooperation with which many sympathize, which takes place at both industrial and commercial levels, which is far healthier and which respects the mutual interests of the various countries.

At the same time there must be a revival in consumption, a greater combined effort and a wide-ranging social policy to meet present-day requirements must be implemented. First of all, jobs can be created for hundreds of thousands in our country, workers can be trained for future jobs, particularly young people, the working week can be reduced and the retirement age brought forward, particularly in the iron and steel industry and in any occupation where the work is especially arduous, and a fifth shift can be introduced where work is continuous. To achieve this, we feel —

and experience shows that we are right — the iron and steel industry must be nationalized and placed under the control of the workers so that they may at last play a genuine role in the decision-making.

In short, the solutions are not to be found in the plan you are going to implement or in the social measures designed to make up for the damage that some never fail to advocate as a means of gaining the workers' acceptance of the destruction of our industries and our regions. These measures do not spring from a social policy that is poorly understood. They are the social measures of recession.

The solutions are to be found in a new policy of economic and social progress, of renewed consumption, of industrial development, not in a policy of European integration which benefits the strongest and is based on national sacrifices, but in a policy of cooperation with all countries, including the weakest, so that every country in the world may be raised to the level of progress.

That is why we reject the so-called manifest crisis plan, which entails new sacrifices, renewed decline — we shall be talking about this again — and which in any case will not settle the problems confronting the peoples of Europe. A strong Europe, which will have the support of the workers, will be one which bases its policy not on austerity and sacrifices but on the expansion and enlargement of the internal market.

Ladies and gentlemen, you will agree that we are some considerable distance from the promises made in the campaign preceding the election of this Assembly by universal suffrage. For millions of workers Europe will henceforth be synonymous with a political organization which treats them badly and has nothing to offer them but sacrifices, destruction and unemployment. It is a Europe that is backing into the future. Do not be surprised, then, if we reject this policy, for which no defence can be offered to the millions of workers who are its victims, if, in short, we refuse to manage a crisis which we reject.

President. — I call Mr Bangemann to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Bangemann. — (*D*) Mr President, I should like to explain the position of my group in three general remarks, before Georges Donnez and Corentin Calvez take up various individual aspects of the problem.

To begin with, I should like to emphasize that Article 58 of the ECSC Treaty provides for measures whose fundamental admissibility should not be questioned. If we have a Treaty that provides for such measures, then we cannot ask: is a measure of this kind admissible? The only question can be: should it

Bangemann

be taken? I should therefore like to say in this context that my group was very pleased to see that after extensive deliberations the Council was able to reach a unanimous decision, and I wish to congratulate all those members of the Council who started off with some doubt about this decision on giving a sign of European solidarity.

When we consider why this crisis arose and why — in the opinion of my group — it was necessary to apply Article 58, we should not close our eyes to the real causes. Only if we look into the real causes can we arrive at proposals which get to the heart of the matter.

First of all, we have a structural change in the world steel market, which is largely responsible for this crisis in the Community. We have steel production in developing and less developed countries, which we ourselves of course encouraged. I should also like to point out to all those who vary their speeches according to whether we are discussing development policy or an internal industrial policy, that we cannot assist the construction of steel mills under the development policy one week and then the next week, when we are debating the steel crisis in the Community, complain that developing countries are meeting their steel requirements from their own production and that they are exporting steel in increasing quantities to earn foreign exchange and so competing with the Community. This is something that cannot be avoided if this development policy is considered to be the right one. So this is one cause which we must view very objectively and not simply brush aside, because this trend will continue. Steel consumption in the developing and less developed countries will grow, while there will be no further increase in the industrial countries, because of economic stagnation and the well-known saturation of the market.

Technological progress may also encourage this trend. We must not close our eyes — and I should like Mr Ansart in particular to think about this — to the fact that Japan, Taiwan and South Korea have developed technologically more advanced industries which produce at lower costs simply because they have better technology. It has nothing to do with labour costs already being lower there, true though this may be: there is the added factor that greater encouragement has been given to technological progress in these countries. There are after all countries where energy costs are lower. With the same technology and the same labour costs an electric steel plant in Venezuela can produce steel for 20 % less than here, because energy costs are that much lower. In other words, we must concentrate on what we can do better than others, and that can and must primarily mean improving our technology and changing from ordinary steel to special steels. That is a field in which we are competitive and one in which we will not have to resort to protectionism to safeguard our steel indus-

tries in the future. We will have to ensure that they can operate in fair competition with other steel industries. It would therefore be quite wrong to test this problem against the question: does this accord with the principles of free market economy? For one thing, this ignores the fact that wherever the principles of free market economy have been forgotten, the steel crisis is at its worst.

If Mr Ansart believes the nationalization of steel mills is the cure-all, I would ask him to compare the position of the privately owned mills, including the small ones, with the nationalized steel mills we have everywhere. Wherever the State has left things too long, wherever it was unable or did not have the courage to restructure its plants in accordance with free-market principles, the workers are worse off. It is not therefore a question of whether the free market economy has led workers into the crisis. The question is: have not those who have simply forgotten, and in some cases wanted to forget, the principles of free market economy created a social emergency among the workers, which they are now exploiting by denouncing those who took prompt action to improve the lot of the workers?

(Some applause from the right)

That is why, in the long run, there will only be one way of improving the position of the workers in this crisis, and that is restructuring and adjustment to better, competitive production methods. To avoid any misunderstanding, I should like to say briefly that supplementary social measures should be introduced during the transitional period to protect everyone against personal hardship, a subject on which Georges Donnez and Corentin Calvez will have a great deal to say.

That is the only course we can adopt for the future. We must not hang on to obsolete structures. We must not encourage those who have so far done nothing because they believed that someone would protect them. Instead, we must encourage and support all those who are prepared to improve technology and to develop competitive production capacities by making new investments. We must also make the adjustments in good time, in other words the period up to 30 June 1981 must be used to adapt to the future. We must not take it easy and think other measures will be taken if things do not work out.

The Council must therefore draw up plans for the reduction of capacities and for restructuring at its forthcoming meetings. Without these measures it will be impossible to maintain steel production at a healthy level in the long term, and there will be no social security for the workers in this sector either.

For the Liberal and Democratic Group free market economy is not the cold egoism of a limited number of people in power, but the process on which we should

Bangemann

all agree, so that the many, namely the workers, are better off than they would be without these reasonable and sound principles of management. All those who have forgotten this — and I am now looking at a British Member who is shaking his head: after all there are enough nationalized undertakings in his country — are being antisocial, because they are confronting the worker with the risk of an insecure job and so being extremely antisocial. In addition, they are expecting the tax-payer to bear the immeasurable cost of financing measures to protect such jobs, and again it is the worker who has to pay. The only reasonable solution in a crisis of this kind is therefore a free market system accompanied by the necessary social measures. My group is prepared for this.

President. — I call Mr Davern to speak on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

Mr Davern. — Mr President, after listening here this morning to people talking in terms of thousands of millions of pounds, I would like to welcome the invocation of Article 58. It is not particularly pleasant to be obliged to fall back on this article, but it is absolutely vital that we do so. After all, this is the third time in a couple of months that this Parliament has spoken about the steel industry.

Enormous amounts of money are being talked about here this morning and thousands of tonnes are being talked about, but I would like to talk briefly about a small industry — a State-owned industry — which employs only a few hundred people but to me is more important than when we talk in millions. To many here it may seem insignificant and even not worth talking about in relation to the figures being spoken about in this House, but we are talking about the small steel industry in my own country, which is vital to the future of our industrial development. Since this is located in my own European constituency, I am determined that this House should give it some consideration and particularly that the Commission should give assurances in regard to its future.

This industry has lost a total of £6 million in the last couple of years. Compared to some of the figures discussed here this morning, that is very small, but to us it is a large figure and one we can barely sustain. There will be a further loss of £5 million in the next four or five years before we even begin to break even, and again this is to us a large sum of money. For Ireland, and for an area such as Cork, such losses are huge and are very hard to sustain.

Irish steel is at present undergoing an ambitious modernization programme, and there is no actual production in the plant at the present moment. I want the Commission to assure us that the quota figures it fixes will not be based on the production of the last 36 months. The construction work being carried out at

the new mill will not be completed until the first quarter of 1981. Our major concern stems from the fact that quotas have been established on the basis of production levels between mid-1977 and mid-1980. Production at Haulbowline Steel was reduced during that period for a number of reasons, including a rather prolonged strike and the reorganization based on the modernization programme approved by the Commission. It is difficult to see how production quotas for this steel company could logically be based on this period, especially when one considers that production in the reorganized plant due to become operative early next year will be substantially higher than former production levels. Quotas based on past performance would pose a serious threat to this small but to us highly significant and important industry.

When production starts the new mills hope to be the most cost-productive in Europe at a time when efficiency and cost-productivity are major considerations. Irish Steel's future holdings must be, could be and shall be assured in this House today by the Commission. The reorganization of the steel industry there and the high production levels have been accepted by the Commission as being in accordance with the general objectives of the steel industry. Statements by the Commission during the negotiations and bilateral contracts give the necessary reassurance that when establishing quotas account shall be taken of restructuring operations and that the system does not pose a threat to this small but highly significant industry.

Workers in Irish Steel are prepared to produce; the potential of the new plant is good; output is estimated to start at about 180 000 tonnes and go to about 250 000. These are small figures when compared with the large numbers you have been talking about this morning, but again I emphasize that this industry is vitally important to us.

Recently 213 employees in this industry were laid off. Even though a guarantee of their re-employment has been given, I would like to assure them again, by referring to an assurance given by the Commission in this House today, that nothing will be done in the quota system to prevent their re-employment.

The Commission has given the Irish Government an assurance that Community plans to cut back European steel output will not affect the position in Ireland. Mr Davignon has also assured the Irish Government that EEC plans to restore order to the industry and prevent a destructive price-war will not mean any reduction in Irish steel production. Today I want the Commission to reaffirm that employment in this, in European terms, small industry will be safeguarded and that the guarantee of re-employment to 213 important people, who are depending on this for their livelihood, will be granted. I feel that the Commissioner, having given an assurance to the Government, would be pleased to give it to this House as well as a measure of his good faith and good will towards the Irish industry.

President. — As a result of Mr Pannella's requests the European Democratic Group has given three minutes of its speaking time in this debate to the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members.

I call Mr Coppieters from the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members.

Mr Coppieters. — (NL) Mr President, I should like to begin by thanking the European Democratic Group for this kind and friendly offer and this elegant parliamentary gesture.

I should also like to say that the recognition of a state of manifest crisis in the iron and steel industry, the introduction of quotas and the essential restructuring of the steel sector must be accompanied by the setting of certain priorities. I would prefer to call them realities which will determine the futures of both undertakings and workers and also the continued existence of our Community. There are three priorities: firstly, the viability of the undertakings, secondly, the regions — otherwise regional policy will be largely useless — and thirdly, the social aspects.

Let me first say something about the viability of the steel companies. On the one hand, there must be constant research into competitiveness in the present circumstances and competitiveness when the crisis has been overcome, it is hoped, by means of restructuring measures. On the other hand, when considering any undertaking in any Member State, we must take account of the future slimming down of what we might call the traditional European steel industry and therefore of a change to other products. This must also be seen in terms of the need for new patterns of trade between North and South, for example.

The second priority concerns the regions, and I speak now specifically as a Fleming. Steel production is at present being reduced largely at the level of individual holdings and States. This is a questionable policy and may lead to anomalies. To give you an example: does charity not begin at home? When this happens within the Arbed group, there is a danger that a company like Sidmar, which was planned for a production capacity of 10 million tonnes, will be partly sacrificed, possibly in favour of less competitive plants. So it is clear that the regions in Belgium, Flanders and the Walloon area, have a role to play here. In other words, there must be conscious and reasoned solidarity at European level to prevent the measures from resulting in too much being taken away from one of the regions, which may, moreover, be in the grip of crises in other sectors, the textile industry, for example.

Thirdly, there are the social aspects. The rapporteur, Mrs Baduel Glorioso, has referred in striking terms to the tragic aspects of the steel crisis. So what do we

have to offer in this tragic situation? We have a proposal from the Council for a 1981 budget which yet again includes a token entry among the Social Fund appropriations for the changes in the iron and steel industry. I know — I also contributed — that we as a Parliament reacted during the first reading of the budget. We tried to have 112 m EUA included in Chapter 54. I hope the Council agrees to this. But we also expect the Commission and the Council to establish a cohesive steel policy, which also takes account of the shifts in emphasis in the world market and a new world economic order.

President. — I have received three motions for resolutions with request for an early vote to wind up the debate on the oral question on the situation in the iron and steel industry from Mr Deleau and others, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats (Doc. 1-587/80), the Liberal and Democratic Group (Doc. 1-588/80/rev.) and Mr Ansart and others (Doc. 1-595/80).

The vote on these requests for an early vote will be taken at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

There is a provision in the Rules of Procedure which is followed in this House, even though it may sound strange. Early tomorrow we are to vote on whether to conclude the debate on an item on which the debate has, in fact, already been concluded. I draw the attention of the members of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions to this problem.

I call Mr Petronio, a non-attached Member.

Mr Petronio. — (I) Mr President, we agree in principle with Mr Bangemann's observations concerning the great responsibility of the State industries in this critical situation of the European iron and steel industry. This is part of a vast discourse on political economy which, perhaps, will find a place in another, more general debate. We believe with Mr Bangemann that, responsibilities aside, the present aim of our debate is to ascertain the state of crisis in the iron and steel industry and also to propose — if we are allowed to do so — accompanying measures relative to the general criterion adopted by the Commission.

Leaving aside the political and economic responsibility of the various States and of the State companies, the fact remains that the present situation reveals a serious deterioration in the European iron and steel sector, which is perhaps especially perceptible in Italy. The rapid fall in demand on the national and foreign markets and the increasing pressure from a veritable flood of unregulated imports have brought about a progressive reduction in prices which, in the face of continually rising costs, has palpably weakened the financial and economic situation of the firms involved.

Petronio

It is in this context, therefore, that the declaration of manifest crisis made by the Council of the Communities on 30 October appears, together with the Commission's subsequent decision to resort for the first time in the almost three-decade-long history of the Community to Article 58 of the Treaty, which provides for regulation based on obligatory production quotas.

The quotas fixed by the Commission call for production cuts of around 20 %. It will be necessary however for the competent authorities to declare a regional crisis for the Italian steel industry, which would make it possible for our companies to have recourse to the Redundancy Fund, and request larger-scale, long-term measures to help our steel industry to regain its competitive ability in the international market.

In this context urgent measures must be taken to deal decisively with the serious economic and financial imbalances in the companies, with the defence of internal markets, with the perennial energy question and with the inefficiency in rail and port facilities. At this juncture it is appropriate to refer to the discussion on European infrastructures and to a resolution we proposed concerning the navigable Turin-Milan-Adriatic canal, proposals which were not even considered by the Council. Transport by water involves a fuel savings of one third compared to railway transport, and a savings of nearly one fifth compared to transport by road. We therefore take this opportunity to call for a thorough examination of such proposals.

For Italy, in particular, it is especially necessary to extend the reference period for the choice of the 12 months of production to include the entire critical period, that is, from 1 January 1975 to September 1980. Secondly, the utilization rate for the Taranto Centre should be aligned with the mean Community level. Thirdly, Article 58 should be applied in close coordination with Article 74, substantially reducing the amount of imports admitted. The Community trade flow should be respected, while taking into account the quotas for export and those intended for internal markets to prevent recycling within the Community.

It should also be said that, until the Commission makes adjustments in line with the measures taken, the 20 % reduction seems excessive and especially discriminatory towards those companies which have made recent investments not yet in production. Imports from third countries, especially from the Eastern bloc, are continually increasing, and exports are suffering from strong Spanish competition, especially in the steel bar for reinforced concrete. It is unacceptable that imports from the countries with whom we have agreements be reduced by 15 % while a 20 % reduction is enforced within the Community itself. These agreements have induced serious malfunctions which call for immediate correction. In the same wise it should be said that the decision of the Italian government to reduce from 39

to 12 the customs admission points for steel in order to strengthen controls presupposes the adoption of similar measures on the part of our Community partners.

President. — I call Mr Didò.

Mr Didò. — (*I*) Mr President, it has already been said that there are both circumstantial and structural causes at the heart of the crisis in the iron and steel industry.

The former are represented in the crisis in the sectors of utilization — construction, transport, electric appliances, automobiles, and so on, in the fall in the demand from the developing countries, which are overwhelmed by oil bills, and in the adoption of protectionist measures by the United States, strongly criticized by Mr Martinet this morning. The structural causes, on the other hand, stem from the entrance on the international market of new producing countries from the Third World, which are especially active in the field of raw steel. All of these factors certainly make measures for restructurization and conversion necessary, and we must therefore take note of the provisions adopted by the Commission to reduce steel production for a limited period.

We believe it to be a contradiction to adopt quotas for internal production while neglecting to take adequate measures to restrain imports, and we urge the Commission to apply Article 74 of the ECSC Treaty in order that this contradiction may be overcome.

Some speakers this morning, in particular those from the Christian-Democratic and Liberal groups, have expressed considerable anxiety because the measures adopted by the Commission to reduce production would tend to introduce policies of government intervention into the European Community, and felt an immediate need to prevent this 'monster' from manifesting itself at the Community level.

Our view is the exact opposite one; we hold that it is impossible to intervene with public programmes to reduce production in sectors in crisis while at the same time refusing to adopt measures of coordination and planning in the industrial sectors, where there are possibilities of expansion not only in production but also in employment. Social measures are not enough. These are but sops to reduce social tensions among the workers; if we want to tackle the problem of unemployment seriously, we must adopt an industrial strategy of expansion on a Community level, at least for those sectors where such expansion is possible. This is one of the points which emerge clearly from Community intervention in the steel sector, an intervention which, indeed, has never been undertaken until today.

The second observation which I would like to make, addressing myself especially to those groups who, like

Didò

the Christian Democrats and the Liberals, stressed the need for urgent social measures, is that this position is absolutely contradictory to a systematic negative vote regarding proposals to reduce working hours and reorganize work distribution. Neither can we accept initiatives which are only directed towards social assistance — unemployment compensation or other such measures — while structural measures which would at least preserve employment are consistently rejected.

Mr President, I believe it to be necessary to urge the Council once again to honour the request by the Commission and by Parliament, so that the transfers to be made within the ECSC budget may be rapidly approved and the social measures already planned implemented as soon as possible.

President. — I call Mr Pedini.

Mr Pedini. — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, my friend Mr Didò will permit me to observe that when it comes to discussing reductions in working hours for crisis situations, we are always available. But when it is a matter of affirming the general principle of work schedule reduction as a dangerous contribution to the cutback in productivity, then it is our duty to examine our dubious proposal in the context of a general debate, which we are always willing to do.

Mr President, it may well be that social measures are mere 'sops', as Mr Didò has said, but — as he himself does in the conclusion of his speech — the Christian-Democratic group calls on the Council to promote them. The ECSC Treaty is an organic text, which provides for economic intervention with numerous authorities and political initiatives, but always in coordination with measures of social intervention. We do not blame the Council for having focussed on the economic aspects of the crisis and resorted to Article 58, but we deplore the fact that, in violation of the spirit of the ECSC Treaty, no concurrent social measures were immediately taken. These social measures have only a relative value — for intervention in matters of early retirement, reduction of working hours, reduction of overtime, is always relative — but they do serve to give the worker concrete proof that we are aware of his situation.

Mr President, I come from a region — as Commissioner Davignon certainly knows — which in regard to the steel industry manages by itself, believing in its strength and not always running to the government for aid. We do urge the immediate adoption of social measures that can be taken in coordination with the ECSC Treaty, but we recommend that they not be considered as aid, because restructurization has begun and it is necessary to involve labour and make it aware of the profound changes towards which the market is taking us. It must be recognized that we are at a deli-

cate moment, when everyone is asking what direction the steel industry will take. We willingly approve Mrs Baduel's resolution — I am sorry she is not present, for I would like to congratulate her upon it — because it has put the problem of the crisis in a particular factory into the general context and thus related it to initiatives, in construction, for example, which are a part of the input necessary for the expansion of our iron and steel capabilities.

Where lies the future of the steel industry, Mr Davignon? It lies in specialized types of steel, in a more thorough conversion, in a new relationship with the developing countries with whom we are associated. In this regard it is our right and our duty to go into the matter more fully.

As far as Italy is concerned, I hope, Commissioner Davignon, that social measures will be considered in relation to the 1975 agreement, which puts us in a difficult situation by forbidding the use of the Redundancy Fund as a subsidiary means of ECSC intervention precisely for social measures.

As for the measures taken on the Commission's initiative in the framework of Article 58, we repeat that we consider them as temporary, but indispensable. They have already begun to have an effect upon the market, where a 20 % increase in costs and a 12 % drop in prices had caused a serious discrepancy. Mr Davignon will permit me to take this opportunity to express the hope that controls will be effected in a conscientious manner and applied to all firms, so that medium-sized companies are regulated and small ones, which can easily escape control, not allowed to disturb the market. Close attention should be given to the choice of inspectors, involving all the firms, as Article 4 of the regulation implies.

Permit me to make one more fundamental observation: the problem here, as some members have said, is to initiate essential programmes in the structural sector. Investors must not be penalized; adequate funding should be provided to encourage conversions like those in progress at Bagnoli and like others which are still in the planning stage.

If it is true that attention must be paid to the problem of infrastructures — as one of our colleagues has just said — and of communications, it is also necessary to establish a correct relationship between the external and internal prices of steel products, so that the price increases due to the measures taken will not favour the market competition of third countries.

Finally, I would like to express a serious anxiety, calling it to the attention of Commissioner Davignon. We have often, in accordance with Article 74 of the Treaty, taken measures against external competition, when it has become unjustified; but the Commission was right to forego the immediate adoption of concrete initiatives which are capable of cutting both

Pedini

ways. This however does not lessen our confusion and anxiety regarding current mechanism of the ECSC antidumping system. It functions in a complex, cumbersome and very bureaucratic manner, and its positive effects on the internal market are felt by Community companies only after illegitimate competition from third countries has caused considerable damage.

In conclusion, Mr President, we have noted with interest the results obtained by the application of Article 58, and we hope that the aspects which I have just touched upon will be taken into account. We are especially eager that an effort be made to rebuild confidence in the companies and in their investments. Social measures should be vigorously supported so that all may be made aware of the needs of the working class (the problem, in Italy for example, of the 15 000 workers who are using the Redundancy Fund out of the 90 000 employed in the steel industry). The crisis exists not only in the marketplace; it is a social fact which we must view with the utmost concern, and it is therefore our earnest wish that the Council would assume its responsibility in this matter.

IN THE CHAIR: MR DANKERT

Vice-President

President. — I call Mr Simmonds.

Mr Simmonds. — Mr President, I am sorry Mrs Baduel Glorioso is not present, because it is to her remarks and those remarks alone that I wish to speak this morning. I think I must be the only Member in the debate today who is not, like Oliver Twist, asking the Commission for more. As Member for the Midlands West constituency, I have lost a major part of the steel industry in my constituency, the famous Bilston Steel Works, but we have received the appropriate funds from the Community. May I disagree with what I think I heard from Mrs Baduel Glorioso when she advised redundant Consett workers to seek work in Australia and Canada? There is certainly no recruitment for steelworkers' skills in either of those countries at the moment. My advice to those workers, as it has been to workers from the Bilston Steel Works, is to exploit to the full the opportunities offered by both Community and national agencies, particularly for retraining and for developing new industries. Bilston is not designated a development area by the national government and therefore does not qualify for much of the aid that Consett is entitled to receive; but it has received large sums from the ECSC for redundancy, for early retirement and, most important, for retraining. At Bilston the clearing of the vast steelworks site is proceeding rapidly, and there are a number of plan-

ning proposals for redevelopment. I am most anxious to ensure that Community money for retraining is properly and wisely spent on skills that can be taken up by the new industries that will occupy the site. Although I am not asking the Commissioner today for more from the Community, I do give notice that I shall continue to urge my government to designate my constituency as a development area, so that in future it may benefit from the various Community funds which are at present denied to it but which are given to industry only a few miles from my constituency boundaries. Consett faces exactly the same problems as Bilston, though with a far higher percentage of unemployment, and I believe the answer to their problems and to the problems of the steel industry throughout Europe to be the same: develop, invest and retrain!

President. — I call Mr Leonardi.

Mr Leonardi. — (I) Mr President, I believe that, at this stage of the discussion, it is only necessary to confirm a few points to illustrate the position of the Italian Communist group.

As we have said before, we support the Community intervention provided for by Article 58. The situation is a very difficult one, and if a choice must be made between private action by the cartels and public intervention, such as that undertaken by the Community, we choose the latter, not because it is better by nature, but because it is more easily brought under democratic and social control. This is a basic point in our policy, internal as well as external. For this reason, we request — as have other speakers — that the Commission keep the Parliament or the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs constantly informed on the application of Article 58 and on the implementation of social programmes. This is essential to the success of the effort of public intervention.

It is entirely out of place to believe in the possibility of private intervention in circumstances like those we now face, which have resulted in a great reduction in Community production and in the loss of 120 000 jobs in the space of a few years. There can be no question of returning to a market economy in an industry like this one which is heavily capitalized, with high costs already constituting a fixed percentage of the total cost and rendering it vulnerable to heavy losses in the case of a decrease in production. Nationalization — I would like to say this to Mr Bangemann — was not an attack upon the market, but rather an alternative which arose because the market did not function. The question therefore is not to revalue a system which has already failed, but rather to improve what had to be done precisely because of this market failure.

In this situation, everyone tries to exploit his large-scale economies — which are very strong in the steel industry — and pass the damage on to others. The

Leonardi

conclusion is that, in recent times, all countries and all governments have intervened, without exception; the problem lies in the fact that the intervention was effected in different ways, but it is not that in some cases private efforts were allowed to proceed and in others there was public intervention with public funds. The preceding Community intervention based on Article 57 did not work; it was not as effective as the Commission and others had thought it would be. Today, the crisis is especially a Community one: we cannot hide behind the fact that there is also a world-wide steel crisis. The situation in Japan, in the United States, and in the developing countries is profoundly different. We agree to intervention at the Community level, because this is the right scale on which to confront the problem of conversion and restructurization of our aged steel industry.

We must concentrate on what we can do more competitively than other countries; we must understand that enormous investments will be necessary in order to convert the European steel industry, which is the oldest in the world. The industry was born here and it should also not be forgotten that, in the space of two decades, the European steel industry has passed from utilization of primarily domestic raw materials to dependence on a largely foreign supply, making conversion an inevitable necessity. Those who supply us with raw materials now want to undertake for themselves what we taught them to do.

For these reasons, therefore, we favour the application of Article 58, requesting at the same time, however, a stricter control. We also ask, as others have done, that together with Article 58, the possible application of Article 74 be borne in mind, though here also it must not be forgotten that, despite its losses on the world market, the Community as a whole is still a net exporter of steel. The intervention based on Article 74 should therefore be selective. It is certainly impossible to defend internal prices — as is now being done through the application of Article 58 — without exercising control over the entry of foreign goods in an industry like this one, where the marginal costs are far below the average costs. It is inevitable that, if we defend internal prices, we must also police imports, without forgetting however that we are still net exporters. We therefore agree to Community intervention, which should not be merely restrictive in character but should rather constitute the first step in reorganization for subsequent development.

I would like to conclude by restating the position which we have always held, now and in the preceding Parliament: a position that has always criticized the Commission for its failure to use the means provided by the ECSC Treaty. Even in the years when all was well in the European steel industry, the Commission was unable to use approximately one-third of the own resources available to it. It was unable to develop a policy of research that would make it possible for us today to convert our steel industry in the fields where

we could be more competitive. It was unable to direct investments. For these reasons we have always blamed the Commission for its inability to use the means furnished in the Treaty, and we have always voted against the ECSC budgets. I would like to emphasize this, because the Commission should be criticized for its failure to take the decisive action which could perhaps have spared us many of the difficulties we now face.

President. — I call Mr Donnez.

Mr Donnez. — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I endorse, of course, the feelings expressed in the motion for a resolution tabled by the Liberal and Democratic Group, but rather than drawing up a list of the measures to be taken to restore the iron and steel industry in Europe as a whole and in France in particular to its former glory, allow me to draw your attention to the urgency of the measures that should be taken to prevent the North of France, from where I come, from becoming once again the principal victim of the application of Article 58 of the ECSC Treaty and of the steel plan in general.

I willingly admit that, to overcome the crisis in the iron and steel industry, 'European solidarity', that hallowed phrase, is now needed more than ever before. But solidarity has never meant resignation, and a request for the suspension of the steel plan is no way to solve our European problems or those of my region.

I should therefore like to see the Community channelling its efforts in two directions.

Firstly, something must be done to eliminate the feeling of insecurity or anxiety about the future at present felt by thousands of workers in my region.

Two measures are essential in this respect.

It is essential, first of all, to give some assurance about the future to the 6 000 workers in Denain, the 2 500 of Valenciennes-Trith who were made redundant in 1979, and all the others who have lost or will lose their jobs in the iron and steel industry. The Social Protection Agreement has enabled the French iron and steel industry to cope with 23 000 redundancies. In the Valenciennes region there are 421 cases still to be settled, and this will be possible only if the Social Agreement is extended. The only realistic and consistent solution would be to extend it until 31 December 1982. That is what I consider to be the first essential step.

Then it is essential to maintain in the Valenciennes region what it was possible to maintain in 1979. No more should be expected of us than the heavy tribute, the loss of 8 500 jobs, we have already paid as a result of the restructuring of the iron and steel industry.

Donnez

Rather than contemplating the installation of an iron and steel complex at Bagnoli, the need for which I still do not understand, it would be better to instal the skin pass in Denain, the equipment already being on the spot. Perhaps I should explain that this skin pass is a cold rolling unit which is found in all modern steel processing plants and is essential if the strip mill in Denain is to survive. The expense involved is far from exorbitant. It would have the two-fold advantage of helping to modernize and to maintain the plant and therefore jobs which already exist. It therefore forms part of the measures to be taken under the restructuring programmes that are envisaged.

Secondly, it is essential that the European Community should approve the financial efforts required for the installation of substitute industries. It is essential that the restructuring of the iron and steel industry should not jeopardize economic activity in the North of France. The funds are available: what is needed is the political will to put them to work. It is intolerable that in a district such as Valenciennes — which has only 350 000 inhabitants — 8 500 jobs should be lost owing to the restructuring that has already taken place, without measures to instal substitute industries being envisaged.

The two major proposals I have just made should enable us in the coming difficult months not to overcome the crisis we are now going through, but to contribute to the implementation of a genuine Community policy, which would also have the advantage of being understood by the people concerned.

That would undoubtedly not be its least merit.

President. — I call Mr Boyes.

Mr Boyes. — Mr President, there is a crisis in Europe that is leading to massive, large-scale unemployment. The figures are quite staggering. We can talk about 7 million, probably leading to 10 million, in the EEC countries. We talk about 2 million, maybe in the next 18 months leading to 4 million, in the United Kingdom alone.

When we talk about these figures, it is very difficult for people to comprehend what they mean. When we get down to the level of a region, these figures mean the destruction of a town within the UK. That is why I was pleased with the report prepared by Mrs Baduel Glorioso, because Mrs Baduel Glorioso visited Consett, she actually spent time in that town talking to men who were affected by the closure of the Consett steelworks and talking to management. Regrettably, she was not quite as courteously treated by the management as she was by the men.

However, she did manage to prepare this report on the basis of objectivity, on the basis of visits, talks and

chats with the people. What she found, as expressed in this document, was a human tragedy. A town was in the process of being destroyed. I shall show in a moment how that process is continuing. She found in that town human beings, she found people, so from our 7 million unemployed let us look at one man, one man who led the campaign to keep that steel plant open.

Let us consider John Lee, a representative of the community of Consett, a quiet peaceable man who felt that there were channels for discussion, proper avenues for argument. He wanted to use them and he believed that if he used these channels and these proper avenues for argument, he could save his steelworks. He saw every organization that had anything to do with the steelworks — the Commission, BSC, the government, his national union leaders. He believed, quite wrongly, staggeringly wrongly, misguidedly in the end, that if he had a case, if he could show that his steelworks were profitable as he had been asked to do by previous governments, if he could show that by shutting the steelworks in his town there would be unemployment of 50 %-50 %! — then people might decide that that steelworks should not shut.

But he talked to deaf people. Every person he talked to was deaf. Nobody wanted to talk to John Lee about keeping his steelworks open. The more he talked, the more the steamroller advanced. The day for closure was continually brought forward, thus proving to that man that there was no point in having an economic case, a social case, in showing the human misery, the tragedy of unemployment in the North-East of England, because nobody wanted to know.

In addition to that, despite the staggering level of unemployment due to the present policies of our government in Britain, which is closing works after works, the last remaining works of any size in Consett has now announced closure. So we are not talking any more about John Lee. As far as many people are concerned, John Lee is now finished, written off, unemployed, one of 7 million people.

We are now talking about new names — Joe McVitie, Jack McNulty, those kind of people. The same kind of people. All they want is a job, a right to work, an opportunity to earn a living, an opportunity to come home at night and buy the things that normal people want to buy on the basis of an earned income. But they have now been told, 'you also are going on the scrap heap, no work for you either, you are joining the 50 % in the town of Consett' — a town that will live in infamy in the United Kingdom, a town that will symbolise the policies carried out by the government in our areas.

So what we want to see in Consett are jobs, and we appeal to the Commission. We hope that pressure from it will get the Council to give us money for social

Boyes

restructuring, as requested in the excellent report by Johannes Peters. Let us have some cash for jobs, let us think of other regions, South Wales for example, and other countries of Europe where there are going to be similar tragedies if we do not get the 35-hour week and worksharing measures.

Above all, I appeal today to the Commission to put all the resources available into that area, because no one can be responsible for the reaction of quiet peaceful people when 50 % are unemployed. We all have a duty and an obligation to the people in that area and I appeal this morning to the Commission to look for all sources of finance to help create jobs for those people.

President. — I call Mr Herman.

Mr Herman. — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, like many of you, I am glad that the Commission was able to persuade the Council to agree to the application of Article 58, although, like many of my colleagues, I deplore the fact that it has taken so long to get this far and that the strength of European initiative does not become apparent until we have reached the edge of the abyss.

I should now like to make three remarks in the form of three questions to the Commission. Firstly, if the Commission is successful, prices are likely to rise above the world level. There will then be a strong temptation to import steel into the Common Market.

You have told us, and this has been repeated, that there is little danger of this happening, because some of the traditional supplying countries have voluntarily entered into commitments with us. But, for one thing, in stating that you are not going to apply Article 74, you are depriving yourselves of a weapon, and this will encourage other countries, including some of those which have perhaps entered into commitments with us, but have not always respected them. Reference has already been made to Spain during this debate. There may be others.

I therefore call on the Commission to keep a particularly close watch on this aspect of the problem, imports, because there is no point in blocking our capacities if foreign producers are going to benefit as a result.

My second question, or my second remark, concerns future policy, that is to say the question of restructuring on the one hand and, on the other, the position which should be adopted on future, new investments which might affect capacities. There can be no doubt that the crisis in which we now find ourselves is the result of excessive investments which were not well planned and which were endorsed by all the social and political forces of the countries concerned. This phenomenon will undoubtedly continue. But I believe that

the Commission has the means to prevent the creation of capacities in the future. We would like to be sure that there will be no flagging in this vigilance so that we do not find ourselves in three, four or five years' time, when these first restructuring measures have been completed, once more faced with overproduction, forcing us to resort to Article 58 again.

And to conclude, my third remark. You have, Mr Commissioner, evidently put an end to this experiment, and I believe it was a useful one. But you have gone further than that. You have undertaken personally to stand down if at the end of the agreed period the situation has still not improved — which is not inconceivable in view of the present state of the economy — and if by that time we have not found another solution, since we cannot go on applying Article 58.

As I see it, announcing in as definite terms as you have done that on 30 June 1981 the system introduced by virtue of Article 58 will be withdrawn is tantamount to burning one's bridges. There can be no certainty that we shall have completely reorganized the market by that time. We hope so, we even think so, but it may not be done by that time. Thought should therefore be given to a system other than that for which Article 58 provides, the condition being that it produces the same results and gives us the same assurances. Will it take the form of a voluntary system under Article 58? We should like to have your assessment of this.

President. — I call Mr Spencer.

Mr Spencer. — Mr President, may I start by paying tribute to what I thought was a remarkably good and restrained speech by my colleague, Roland Boyes, from the other side of the Chamber? I will come back to the question of Consett, but let me point to what I believe to be a dangerous flaw in Roland's argument. While it is emotionally powerful to single out individuals or communities and use them in a political speech, politics, sadly, cannot be about individuals or about detailed parts of the Community. We in this Parliament have to consider the impact of European policies across the whole Community, and the answers for Consett lie not in some particular application of our varied efforts but in getting the policies of the Community right at large.

So let me start by restating my group's position on the social measures which, I trust, will accompany the declaration of manifest crisis to which other speakers have referred. These were proposed by the Commission a year ago; they have been debated *ad nauseam* in this Chamber and to date we have no action. We have a lot of legal quibbling about the base under the Treaties; we have a situation where governments with one hand make applications for these monies and with the other refuse to vote the money to meet their own requests.

Spencer

I can do no better than quote the President of the Commission who said in his statement which we are supposed to be discussing this morning:

The Commission is at present receiving applications for retraining and early retirement aid for tens of thousands of European workers. This involves the expenditure of several hundred million EUA which the ECSC budget cannot meet for lack of funds. This is a dereliction of our duty to the workers in the steel industry. It is gravely damaging to the image of the Community.

He went on to ask that the Ministers consider those social measures by 11 November. It is my information that they have not done so and that they have put off this decision until it becomes involved in the whole complex trade-off situation over the 1981 budget. Well, I hope that they will concentrate their minds on these social measures and that they will find a way, whatever legal quibbles are necessary, to vote the funds which their own policies make necessary.

Let me restate my group's position in detail: we want to see those funds as non-compulsory spending, but not included within Parliament's margin of manoeuvre on this budget round. We do not, I repeat not, want to see a solution, if it might be called that, in terms of national contributions outside the budget or outside the framework of the Treaties. If that kind of national deal is indulged in, not only the steel industry but the entire institutions of the Community will be in a state of manifest crisis.

Let me turn to Consett. The Consett closure must have been the most difficult and possibly the most arbitrary of the closures which were part of the BSC retrenchment movement. It was the most difficult because of the town's mono-industrial base and because of its position. Roland was right when he talked about productivity having increased. But it increased too late. We have seen in the British steel industry at large damaging arguments over restrictive practices, damagingly low productivity and, to cap it all, a damaging strike that lasted much longer than anyone anticipated. These are the historical facts which lie behind the closure of Consett and other plants. While I deeply sympathise with the position of a man caught as the leader of the men at Consett was, politics do not work in terms of three-month periods of time. Politics is a process. Economics is a process. What we are reaping now is the harvest of 10, 15, 20 years of short-sightedness in the British steel industry.

I further regret that the negotiations for a private takeover of Consett, which were under way when Mrs Baduel Glorioso was there, fell through. That, it seems to me, would have been a way of solving Consett's particular problem; but it did not happen and we have now to consider what can be done, what must be done in a town with 50 % unemployment.

I just draw Members' attention to the fact that under existing EEC and British legislation the steel closure

areas which include Consett have access to one of the best financial packages anywhere in Western Europe. The span of regional aid, although not its total figure, has been reduced by government determination to concentrate regional aid where it is most needed. And so my constituents in Derbyshire, which is to be de-assisted, are paying a price in order to help Mr Boyes' constituency in Derwentside. That package includes regional development grants. It includes tax allowances on capital expenditure to allow writing off. It includes aid under the 1972 Industry Act, cash grants for capital expenditure, loan repayment guarantees, exchange rate guarantees. It is the opportunity to establish a new industrial base in Consett, one which I hope will be established on the basis of new technology, of industries which have a life not just for the rest of this century, but into the century which follows.

I would hope, in addition, that the work of BSC Industry Ltd., who have created over 6 000 jobs in other steel closure areas, will be successful in Consett. Their work at the moment is at a very early stage indeed. I believe we should give all the backing that we can. They have already recorded some success in Corby, a not dissimilar town although its geographical position is better.

However, above all we have to appreciate the limits of what governments can do. We do not have a magic wand that can suddenly reverse the kind of social tragedy we see in Consett and elsewhere. When Mr Boyes appeals to the Commission for massive aid, I beg him to be consistent. Appeal to the Commission by all means, but do not at the same time turn round and advocate that the United Kingdom should leave the European Community and therefore cut itself off from the very source of funds for which you are appealing.

I wish in addition that Roland had actually come to the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment when we were discussing his motion on Consett, because he could have made some additional points. But he was not there because he was at the Labour Party Conference which was discussing withdrawal from the Community. So if you genuinely want to help the people in Consett, get the big policies right and it is my passionate belief that those big policies involve Britain continuing to stay in this Community.

President. — I call Mr Calvez.

Mr Calvez. — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group I appealed on 14 October for European solidarity in the interests of the producers and workers in the iron and steel industries of the Member States, because the emphasis should be placed on a fair distribution of the sacrifices to be made and therefore on the importance of the monitoring procedures decided by the Commission.

Calvez

The restructuring of this sector of industry has not been completed, and it has already cost a great deal in both economic and social terms. The Liberal and Democratic Group has called on the Council to agree to the Commission's proposal that the necessary appropriations up to 112 m EUA should be released in order to alleviate some of the social consequences of the restructuring of the iron and steel industry.

I wish to concentrate today on the social aspect and would begin by asking the Commission what it thinks of the decisions taken by the American Government to ban imports into the United States of special steels made by a French company.

We ourselves have not succumbed to the temptation of protectionism, but we find that the United States is using this economic weapon against a Community country. This is a dangerous practice for the future.

I have noted the recent communication from the Commission to the Council on measures in favour of workers in the iron and steel industry. This communication refers to the legal basis to be adopted to justify the granting to steel workers of allowances for early retirement and short-time work.

On the question of whether the ECSC contribution can form the subject of a direct subsidy from the general budget without a specific normative act, the views of the Commission and of the Committee on Budgets are diametrically opposed. When your house is on fire, you call the firebrigade without worrying about clauses in the insurance policy. The iron and steel sector is undergoing a crisis. By virtue of Article 95 of the ECSC Treaty, our Parliament can and must find a solution to this problem.

The second remark I should like to make concerns the nature and urgency of the implementation of the social measures necessitated by the employment situation in the iron and steel sector, because Europe is the hardest hit of all the geographical areas. This situation is aggravated by the fact that the European iron and steel industry has a greater surplus capacity than its Japanese and American competitors.

It is therefore a matter of urgency that, while implementing the steel plan, the Community should concentrate all its efforts on social aid measures for companies in difficulty. Provision is expressly made — I hardly need recall — for such measures in Articles 56 (2) (b) and 95 of the ECSC Treaty.

What are these measures? I should like to make a distinction between two major strategies. Firstly, it is essential, in view of the human aspects of the implementation of the restructuring plan, for the companies themselves to conceive of new forms of action and intervention, while taking account of the specific position of the workers whose jobs are threatened. In addition, this strategy has its *raison d'être* in the fact

that social security systems and the economic problems of the iron and steel centres usually differ from one country to another.

In this respect, I feel the governments of the countries concerned must be able to conclude bilateral agreements as a means of coordinating the implementation of a policy of this kind. Secondly, in the next few days — and I stress the urgent need for action — the Community must take the measures for which the ECSC Treaty provides, some of which merit very close attention.

Under Article 56 of the ECSC Treaty the Community should make full use of the intervention quotas for which the Treaties provide to ensure, first of all, the payment of wages to employees should they be laid off temporarily as a result of a change in activity. Such compensation might be paid to the companies in the form of Community allowances.

Furthermore — and this in the hope that medium-term action will be taken — the Community should bear part of the cost of training workers forced to change their jobs, because under Article 95 of the ECSC Treaty the restructuring plan requires the introduction wherever possible of measures such as early retirement and the adjustment of working hours.

To conclude, I would refer to a basic measure: a Community directive should be issued to limit overtime to such an extent that it does not affect the employment situation in the iron and steel centres. The political will of the Member States is needed as never before. Let us hope that it finds expression in the days that follow this debate.

President. — I call Mr Peters.

Mr Peters. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the common market in coal and steel was the first stage of the European Community. At the time, the Treaty was expressly concluded for the raw materials industries of Europe, to enable joint projects and objectives to be pursued. This first stage of the common market must not be destroyed by the differences among the steel companies. Nor must it be destroyed by egoistic national arguments without regard for common objectives and joint development. The Coal and Steel Treaty provides instruments which can help us to overcome the structural crisis in the steel industry.

How did this structural crisis occur? The stagnation of consumption throughout the world, the growth of new capacities in the developing countries and in the Eastern Bloc and decline in consumption particularly in Europe have resulted in overcapacities. This led to the loss of a total of 160 000 jobs in the countries of the European Community from 1974 to 1980, 30 000

Peters

of them in the Federal Republic, or 13 % of jobs in the steel industry, 40 000 in France (28 %), 3 000 in the Netherlands (12.5 %), 17 000 in Belgium (26.5 %), 7 000 in Luxembourg (over 30 %) and 67 000 in the United Kingdom (33 %). All the countries have therefore contributed to this structural crisis. The countries which have invested and modernized most have come off best, as we can see from these percentages. But then this structural crisis was joined by a serious cyclical downswing, and the voluntary cartel known as Eurofer I collapsed. The blame for this most recent crisis must quite clearly be laid at the door of the companies, because when the all-against-all battle for shares of the market and production began, some companies depressed their prices so much that the very existence even of modern companies in the Federal Republic was threatened. In view of this battle, this process of self-laceration by the laws of the marketplace in the steel industry, the Commission had no choice but to apply Article 58 of the ECSC Treaty. We thus had a manifest crisis.

I must make it quite clear that at that time the Commission chose the right course and that the application of this article was the only way of stopping the downswing. At this juncture I should like to thank Mr Davignon, because he acted very wisely in this. As you know, the Federal Republic was initially very much opposed to the application of Article 58, principally because it was afraid that the German steel industry might be further penalized as a result of its previous considerable achievements in modernizing at an early date. This has been avoided by the allocation of quotas. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany then joined the other eight governments in approving the application of Article 58. We thus have the acceptance of European responsibility and a unanimous decision based on the ECSC Treaty. I very much welcome this.

The Commission must now watch the Community's flanks. Not that I would now call for the application of Article 74. In my view, that cannot be done at present. Agreements must be reached instead. But at the same time the grey market in unofficial imports must be prevented from developing in complete freedom. It is now up to the companies, because this is only a temporary freeze, a mere stop-gap. We must now build on this, and that goes for the companies too, particularly the Germans who have said: We can and want to conclude a voluntary agreement on production restrictions. I consider voluntary agreements better than compulsory quotas. But the companies can and must now prove that they can reach such voluntary agreement. It is not now a question of simply talking big, but of really coming to comprehensive, constructive and detailed voluntary agreements by the end of June of next year, so that the European steel industry can get itself out of the crisis under Eurofer II.

Early next year the Commission must also submit a more extensive structural programme to help the European steel industry to develop into a modern, efficient and competitive industry. This cannot be achieved by maintaining obsolete plants with State subsidies and allowing modern plants to go to the wall: it can only mean ensuring the Community's steel industry has adequate capacities by modernizing.

The European Community is dependent on a strong steel industry of its own. An industrial company cannot exist without this supplier of basic materials. This must be understood and the industrial base must therefore be secured. At this point I should like to say a few words on what is happening in Dortmund. Here we have further investments, modernization and the construction of a steel plant. It is not only the workers and the works council, but also the town council, the municipal authorities, the chief burgomaster, the whole region and the whole business community who are fighting for additional investments.

The object of modernization and ensuring the continued efficiency of the European steel industry — as in Dortmund — is to maintain major steel centres rather than allowing them to be completely eliminated. And this is true not only of Germany, not only of Dortmund, but also of Consett, of France, Lorraine and other areas. Finally, it is essential that not only a more extensive structural programme, but also a social back-up programme should now be put forward. The Council will lose credibility if it approves the application of Article 58 without providing for social back-up measures and appropriate funds from the general budget. We in the European Community will lose credibility if the inevitable closures and the inevitable short-time work is not accompanied by social aid to the workers in the steel industry to enable them to find new jobs, to provide them with a decent living during this period and to enable them to receive appropriate training. I believe this will be an acid test for the Council.

President. — I call Mr Michel.

Mr Michel. — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, between interventionism and anarchy there is room for a reasonable arrangement, and in a market economy such as ours the Commissioner, in this case Mr Davignon, must be commended for his attempt to restore order in a crisis situation within and outside the Community.

The application of Article 58 as a regulatory mechanism for a fixed period obviously presupposes that the measures which have been taken will be joined by voluntary action, which will itself be very limited because it will extend from November of this year until June of next year. There should be various measures which, if taken at the economic level, are

Michel

accompanied, at the social level, by various arrangements to ensure that not always the same people suffer. If we look at the figures, we find that over 100 000 workers have lost their jobs in the iron and steel industry in the four years that have just ended and that over 100 000 workers have been forced to go on to short-time work, which is becoming a worry for quite a number of them.

Referring to what is happening not in completely general terms, but in my own region, I find that in the Walloon area one in four workers in the iron and steel industry has lost his job. And I also find that of the 792 000 jobs throughout the Community over 200 000 are at present in danger, a danger which will grow further in the coming months. We should therefore adopt a common and determined position with the trade unions, with the Economic and Social Committee and with the Consultative Committee of the European Coal and Steel Community.

Let us take as an example the situation that has occurred in the South of the Belgian Province of Luxembourg and also in the centre of the country. I find that throughout my country the workers have at present a feeling of despair, and I do not mean simply those who have retired early, not only those who are on short time, but above all the young people. The question is, therefore, what the Community and also what our governments are going to do to develop substitute activities. You see, it is not enough, even with the social measures which have been taken, to give people the means to live: they must also be given a reason to live. And that is where we have fallen down. We should therefore like to see coordinated action being taken to initiate various measures to give our young people a reason to be living again, and above all we should like to see action taken in various new directions in cooperation with the trade unions, the social organizations and those who have the capital, because, you see, in this crisis period we should remember that it is the man in the street, who does not know what he will be earning from 1 January to 31 December, who is being asked to be public-spirited.

And he is being asked to show some discipline and some common sense. But for the 'haves' there is not only flight of capital organized for them and with them, but also organized irresponsibility at national level and at Community level. If we want these things to change, we must have the courage to take the necessary steps for tomorrow, and for this reason we shall be approving not only the resolution contained in the report before us, but also referring back to the proposals made in the Peters report, and with all those who want to achieve economic and social progress, we shall be fighting to ensure that this is translated into reality, into everyday life.

President. — I call Mrs Vayssade.

Mrs Vayssade. — (*F*) Mr President, four weeks ago the French Socialists recalled what the objectives of any iron and steel policy should be: maintenance of employment and maintenance of production capacities in each country. They also said that recourse to Article 58 would be justified and effective only if certain conditions were fulfilled.

It is with this in mind that I have read and carefully studied the publication of 31 October on the measures taken by the Commission. I find that the measures advocated will not guarantee the maintenance of employment or the maintenance of production capacities. These measures give us no guarantee as regards employment. The economic measures are not accompanied by a single social measure. All we have are promises from the Council, which are not accompanied by dates or figures and which only concern early retirement and short-time work. And this same Council has completely removed any reference to appropriations for social measures in the iron and steel industry from the draft budget we considered a fortnight ago in Luxembourg. I therefore have doubts about the Council's intentions in this field.

There is nothing about the reduction of working hours, nothing about a fifth shift, nothing about the abolition of overtime, nothing about a genuine regional policy for the hardest hit regions, including my own, Lorraine. Some days after the announcement of the Community measures Sacilor informed us in Lorraine that it was making 1 600 workers redundant, that is to say 1 600 workers in addition to those whose redundancy had already been planned two years ago. This announcement about redundancies by Sacilor leaves us in doubt about the ability of the measures now being implemented at Community level to guarantee the maintenance of adequate production capacities in the Member States, especially France.

For years the anti-crisis policy has consisted in proposing cutbacks in production, which each time were to be temporary and were simply designed to allow the Member States to take some action or other. This has led to a reduction in the production capacities of all the Member States and more specifically perhaps in my own country. Above all, the policy has consisted in allowing these measures to be applied by the Eurofer cartel, in other words exclusively by the employers in the iron and steel industry. This policy has already been denounced, and denounced in this Chamber, particularly by Jean Laurain, who was a Member of the previous Parliament.

I feel it must be said again and again that this policy, which has never been accompanied by a steel industry policy, a policy aimed at increasing steel consumption in the Community, was incapable of making the European iron and steel industry work and could but

Vayssade

undermine the production capacities of certain countries. In France, whole plants and regions have felt the full force of this policy. They make a sad list — Denain, Valenciennes, Villerupt, Longwy, Homecourt and now Joeuf, Hagondange, Thionville — I believe almost all the main iron and steel towns in France have been affected or are being affected to a greater or lesser degree.

The measures proposed and taken by the decision of 31 October, which are moreover retroactive and apply from 1 October, are a continuation of this policy. The cutbacks in production and supplies that have been decided affect the products already hardest hit by the recession in my country. I am sorry, Mr Commissioner, but when I read about these measures, I feel obliged to put it in everyday language: Sorry, but we've already done our bit.

In addition, the Commission refuses to apply Article 74 and so ensure effective exploitation of the European market. This does not surprise me. The speakers who preceded me have also repeatedly referred to this.

To conclude, I should like to raise on particular point. When, two months ago, I tried to find out what would be the impact of the proposed measures in individual plants and regions and on the workers in the iron and steel industry, I came up against a wall of secrecy everywhere. Implementation will be checked by the Commission, but it has nothing to do with parliamentarians or the workers. I feel that this raises another problem. When and how will the workers really have the right to speak and at what level? When and how will this Parliament have a genuine right to check the measures taken? Only when the whole thing is over and all that remains to be done is to pay the bill?

Mr President, four weeks ago we said that Article 58 might be useful if certain conditions were fulfilled. At the time we did not feel these conditions had been fulfilled. The Commission has done nothing since to take account of our remarks, and I feel that Article 58 will above all serve to re-form the Eurofer cartel. We cannot therefore support the policy which has just been implemented.

President. — I call Mr Bonde.

Mr Bonde. — *(DK)* Mr President, distinguished colleagues, if some visitors from a distant planet had come here and overheard the debate we have had here today, they might well wonder whether we were a lot of fools here on Earth. They would observe that there was a great need for steel to make new houses, ships and bridges, and that this could unite people to abolish poverty and provide a good standard of living for all. But they would find that, when the EEC intervenes, it is not for an increase, but for a reduction in steel

output. When the EEC intervenes, it is not for a reduction, but for an increase in steel prices.

These people from another planet, standing here on earth, might well wonder. But we, who are hardened EEC-watchers, would have to explain to them that this was not just an isolated example of EEC activities. While people go hungry, we contribute money for the destruction of food. When they need milk, we devote resources to slaughtering cattle. When they are happy and healthy, we vote funds to drive them to the scrapheap. So when the EEC intervenes in the steel situation, why should it act differently?

But there are some who surprise me in this matter. They are the people from those organizations who ought to be looking after the interests of Danish industry. Every time steel prices go up by 10 %, there is an increase of more than 300 million kroner in the costs of factories that have to buy steel. This becomes even worse when competing with firms in third countries that can buy steel more cheaply than we can. It means falling exports, rising imports, and fewer jobs. But the Industrial Council, which for a while was carrying out an advertising campaign in the newspapers and on public transport, does not know — or will not explain — what EEC steel regulations mean for its own industry. They are so besotted with the EEC that they completely forget to look after their own interests. Just imagine if those involved in steel organizations were to think as much of the EEC's inflationary intervention policy as of the wage-earner's cost of living settlements.

The representatives of the Peoples Party will not vote for some of the published proposal. For we do not believe that the EEC can do any good to Roland Boyes and John Lee, and we know it can do no good for Danish workers and businessmen.

President. — I call Mr Davignon.

Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission. — *(F)* I should like to begin by reporting, as briefly as possible, on the situation and then to reply to the principal remarks that have been made during this debate.

To start, then, by reporting on the situation, in other words explaining the Council's decision. Various speakers have said that the Council reached a compromise and that Article 58 is not being applied as the Commission proposed. I am afraid I must deny that this is the case. The Commission told the Council in the clearest possible terms that it would not accept any change in its proposals — because it is the Commission which takes the decision — which threatened the effectiveness of this system and the possibility of monitoring it. That is why in the two areas in which there has been a change, tubes and special steels, we have decided on alternative formulae, alter-

Davignon

native practical methods which differ from those we originally proposed, but serve the same purpose.

Allow me to explain briefly. As regards tubes, the market for which stimulates other market sectors, we felt that it was not necessary to have a quota, to the extent that we could be sure that the products intended for tubes were in fact used in the manufacture of tubes, and we therefore took a supplementary decision — under Article 95 of the Treaty — allowing us to check with the tube manufacturers that material which escaped the restrictive quotas was used to make tubes. Checks on production, checks on use.

As regards special steels, we have applied the same method, that is of making sure that it is not possible to increase the manufacture of ordinary products and claim they are special products. And here again we have a system of dual checks and, in addition to that, the Commission has been empowered to include these various products in the quota system if the checks reveal that there is an inadmissible shift from ordinary products to special products. I feel this explanation is necessary to show that the Commission was prepared to change its position only on condition that it was given the responsibility to administer a system it considered 'manageable'.

As regards external matters, frequent reference has been made to Article 74. I should like to make things absolutely clear about Article 74. The majority, not to say almost all exports to the Community come from States with which we have agreements. These agreements provide for solidarity in such cases, in other words such exports will be treated in the same way as Community products, so that where there is a drop in consumption here, there will be an adjustment in the figures relating to exports from these countries which are subject to an agreement.

I should like to say to Mr Herman — I was surprised this was not taken up immediately — that, of course, when we conduct negotiations, we begin by wanting to apply the instruments we have. Then we can say to these States that if they do not play the game as far as bilateral arrangements are concerned, the Commission has various means at its disposal, including Article 74. That is how the situation has been clearly defined: the external aspect is now governed by a system under which the Member States have a responsibility, in that it is for them to keep statistics on imports and for the Commission to check them against the figures agreed under the arrangements with third countries. And of course the third countries have a similar interest in ensuring that these measures are correctly applied, because, if they are not, other measures may be taken. But the fact that in 1979 Spain, to which frequent reference has been made, did not respect some of the agreements concluded with us has resulted in our carrying over the excesses of 1979 to 1980. That is how we keep the market going, and I believe this is the best way of doing it, because what we need to do is

not to take action against the other European countries which do not belong to the Community, but to act with them to make the system work. Of course, the present system is more restrictive towards the Eastern Bloc countries, for example, than it is towards the countries of the free trade area.

I should also like to say that, as Mr Martinet's resolution demands, we shall keep a very close watch on our trade with the United States, and in this respect I would refer to a figure which I find important: although our exports to the United States have decreased in absolute terms, they have remained almost the same in relative terms, in terms of market shares, and that is what we are arguing about at the moment. We must be very careful about the figures we choose. As regards the actual case referred to, the banning by the United States of imports of special steel made by a French company, I can tell you that we are discussing this matter with the Americans. The case that has arisen concerns a specific delivery of special steel which the Americans claim has been made with nickel originating from Cuba and is therefore subject to the general American legislation on the boycott of that country. We are in the process of clarifying this matter. Nevertheless, we are not talking about an American measure that applies to all special steels.

Regarding the situation on the market, I feel two things can be said. Firstly, the figures on production in October have unfortunately shown the Commission's forecasts to be well-founded, in other words there was a considerable drop in production compared with the same month the previous year, which prompts me to say to Mrs Vayssade that, when we talk about decreases in production, it is not a question of knowing whether the companies have already done their bit or not. The question simply cannot be phrased in these terms. It is a matter of knowing whether the decrease in production that is in any case occurring because of the cyclical downswing is to be arbitrarily decided by the individual producer or whether it is to be organized in such a way that the burden is fairly shared.

And in the same context I should like to say to our Irish friend — I am saying a great deal to a great many people who have asked questions, but who were in a greater hurry to ask their questions than to listen to the answers; but with the patience the Commission must have when important matters are being discussed, I shall nevertheless reply so that they can have the pleasure of reading the answers in the Report of Proceedings — I should like to say to him that, as new production is concerned, we shall be able to calculate the quota of this company, which has had the Commission's authorization and which is a typical case of industrial restructuring based on industrial cooperation between an Irish and a French firm of the type we are looking for. The quota it will be allocated when they start working again will take account of this new figure, but there will, of course, be a quota. No company will escape the quota: that is the rule laid

Davignon

down in Article 58. As regards checks I can say that since the beginning of November the 45 Commission teams have been on the spot to ensure that those who respect the law are not penalized and that those who do not, do not get away with it. That is the purpose of the checks. And we intend to take particular care that the system works properly.

Mr President, that is the situation as it stands. I should now like come to some of the questions which have been raised. The first question: should we not have applied Article 58 earlier? I would say that the Commission has made every effort while the anti-crisis plan has been in force to keep Parliament and its appropriate committees informed and that throughout that period the measures advocated by the Commission, in other words the measures designed to ensure the effectiveness of an anti-crisis plan based on a voluntary system with a social aspect and a redevelopment aspect, were largely approved by this Parliament and that, with the exception of one group, which always called for the application of Article 58, everyone felt that this was the best way of handling the matter. As soon as it was found that this was no longer working, the Commission put forward its proposals, and I do not believe it can be said to have acted too slowly, since we made our proposals on 4 October and they entered into force retroactively from 1 October. So I really do not think it can be said there has been a delay or that the Council could not express its opinion promptly, since the Commission took this decision in three weeks. If the Council always made up its mind in three weeks, think how much progress the Community could make.

On the far more fundamental question of restructuring, to which Mrs Baduel Glorioso has referred in a far more general way, proceeding from a particularly hard case — the steel works in Consett — I should like to say this.

Firstly, the Commission attaches the utmost importance to the discussions which will be taking place within the Council in February on the basis of various suggestions made by the Commission. What has the Community been lacking up to now, because the Member States did not want to discuss the issue? It is not that we are lacking an overall view of the Community's total iron and steel production capacity. This has been included in the general steel production objectives since 1978. We have figures. But on competitiveness, on restructuring procedures, on products, on sites, on regional distribution, on none of these issues has there been a genuine debate between the Commission and the Member States.

Today the Member States want such discussions to ensure that present restructuring efforts are being made along the right lines in two respects. They want to know that the burden is being fairly shared, and they want to make sure that these efforts are effective so that the level of restructuring corresponds to

economic reality and thus provides the security the workers need, an aspect to which so many speakers have referred this morning. How could the workers fail to be shocked when a restructuring effort, made in very difficult circumstances, did not result in the striking of a balance in certain companies? That can happen when there is ignorance of the scope and objective nature of this restructuring effort. I therefore feel that it was fundamentally right for the Council, by approving Article 58, not to view the issue only in the short term — and Article 58 provides for the short term — but to consider what must be the longer-term goal of the restructuring of the iron and steel industry and so to ensure that the aids and subsidies authorized by virtue of the Council's decision — under Article 95 — a year ago are not used to perpetuate a situation where there is a lack of competitiveness but to make this restructuring succeed. I believe that, subject to what the debate produces — and it will not be easy — that the Council has adopted a course which is important and essential as regards the Commission's ability subsequently to state its views on new investments, several of which have been referred to today. It is absolutely essential that, in the present circumstances, the Commission should do everything necessary to perform this function of stating its opinions so that we do not have a recurrence of past situations with companies with areas of activity that might theoretically be profitable being nevertheless forced to close down, simply because there is structural overcapacity in the Community. And let no one think that this is something exceptional.

The Japanese probably made an even greater mistake than the Community with regard to the size of the future market. But they reacted sooner than we did and as a result were quicker to adopt various measures than we have been. Capacities in Japan have been closed down even though they were at a level of competitiveness and technical quality that many of our companies have not yet achieved. It is therefore very important that we make investments today that permit the creation of technically worthwhile production facilities which we discover in future are not needed because of the actual market situation or which cannot be efficient because the capacity at which they operate is so low that they produce at excessive costs.

Mrs Baduel Glorioso also stressed the abnormality of restructuring without a global policy designed to bring new life to regions particularly hard hit by restructuring. In a way, redevelopment is the long-term policy, while the social aspect is the short-term policy. It is precisely in these terms that the problem must be phrased, it seems to me. It is becoming essential to pursue a concerted policy aimed at establishing the conditions required for a revival of economic and industrial activity wherever this is possible and especially in the regions that have suffered structural hardships, like those to which reference has been made. Horizontal action and vertical action must be taken at Community level — horizontal, meaning the overall

Davignon

effort to achieve coherence in our economic policies; we shall be talking about this tomorrow and I shall not dwell on the point; vertical, meaning that where we see industries and markets developing in other countries, we must find out why this is not happening in Europe.

Referring again to the United States, from where, due to the vagaries of aviation, I arrived this morning later than I had intended, I should like to apologize to those who spoke this morning before my arrival. But from the very accurate notes I have been given I know exactly what they said. I am struck by the fact that in every area of industrial innovation activities in the United States develop without that country having taken any measures such as we have taken. It is essential that we analyse the causes of these differences so that we can remedy the situation. It is not enough to make a diagnosis: action must be taken too. The Commission has therefore again decided to present a strategy on innovation, development and investment to the European Council meeting planned for early December. Of course, the instruments the Commission has at its disposal — the Regional Fund, our borrowing capacity, the policies of the European Investment Bank — must be used to help us to achieve the objectives we shall be setting ourselves in cooperation with the Member States.

Everyone, Mr President, has spoken of the social aspect. By approving the application of Article 58, the Council has committed itself to taking decisions in November regarding regulations on the one hand and the budget on the other. The Commission will be meeting the Council at that time. I believe that it is not the time for forecasts. What is important is to know whether or not the Council will honour its commitment. Mr Calvez has alluded to the technical difficulties that remain. There are none, or they exist only for those who wish to create them. There is no reason why transfers should not be made from the EEC budget to the ECSC budget. Of course, the necessary decisions have to be taken. That is not a technical difficulty. What cannot be done is simply to allocate money to the ECSC budget without a decision of some kind, because the ECSC budget is, as it were, independent. A donation must therefore be made from the EEC budget to the ECSC budget. This can be done because the objectives of the two Treaties tally in this very respect. It is not a legal problem.

Secondly, the urgent action that must be taken does not create any problems. I have heard it said that perhaps not enough will be done in the social field. We can discuss all that. But what is essential — and we must all agree on this — is that, if the Council does not decide to make this donation to the ECSC budget, the ECSC will not be able to honour its commitments to the workers. That would be intolerable, because it would mean that while a worker who suffered hardship as a result of restructuring in 1978 or early 1979 received a contribution from the ECSC, he got

nothing in the second half of 1979 or 1980 because the ECSC budget was incapable of providing. And please do not ask us to increase the levies at a time when we are trying to restore order to the steel companies. Please do not tell us to tax the companies and call that a social policy. I believe that there is no longer any sense in deciding that these social measures must be financed exclusively from national contributions. What is needed is Community action, not a scale of national contributions. This is something for the Community budget.

The Budget Council will be meeting next week. It must decide on the procedures for the transfer to the ECSC budget and on the amount to be transferred. The Council of Ministers must decide on the features of the specific social aid to be provided under our policy. This is not the social aid referred to in Article 58. I am referring to the social aspect we have been talking about since the anti-crisis plan for the iron and steel industry has been in existence. There is now no more time to be lost, there must be no more shilly-shallying, it is now a question of yes or no.

In this context, it seems important to me for the Commission to know that Parliament, almost in its entirety, sees in the Council's decision on this issue a test of its ability to honour its commitments. On the other hand, as Mr Friedrich said this morning, we must not have a situation in which the only policies accepted by the Council at Community level are those that concern difficult or unpopular issues. That would be intolerable at political level and in terms of the idea underlying the Community. It is not for the Community to do things which the Member States do not want to do. It is for the Community to tackle all the important aspects of a problem when it is obvious that this problem can be dealt with better, more fairly and more correctly at Community level.

Just two more comments, Mr President. The first one concerns information. I was very interested to hear Mrs Vayssade say that we cannot find out what is happening because of business secrets and so on. That is not the problem. The Treaty lays down extremely precise rules on the information that may be given. We are talking about the Treaty here, and we must observe its provisions on this as any other subject. But on behalf of the Commission I will undertake to provide the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs with information on the development of the situation, overall production figures for each Member State, information on what is happening, at what level the system is being applied, what we should do to bring companies not covered by the system to their senses. These are not just empty words, since I did have the opportunity to inform the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs between the Council's first and last meetings. We shall go on doing so. I am quite prepared to agree to reporting generally on the situation in the iron and steel industry after the February

Davignon

ministerial discussions on restructuring, rather than waiting until the discussions on redevelopment.

Now to my second comment. It has been asked why the Commission is so determined that Article 58 should only concern temporary measures. There are two reasons for this. The first is that we can undertake to ensure that this system is properly implemented and monitored for a period of eight months. We cannot do so for longer than that. Some people have the habit of trying to beat the system. The only way of preventing this would be to take on a horde of country policemen in an attempt to catch the poachers who will always be quicker than we are. I believe in the temporary nature of an exceptional measure like that for which Article 58 provides. This does not mean that after June there will be no more iron and steel programme, no more anti-crisis programme. But the action consisting in transferring overall responsibility from the companies to the public sector should not continue beyond that date. If during that period, in which tempers will cool and the problems can be approached more objectively, it is not possible to convince the iron and steel companies of what is in their best interests, I do not believe there will be any virtue in extending the system.

As regards the quotation — correct, by the way — of something I said, all that needs to be done is to place it in context. The question was: since you feel that it is not necessary to continue applying Article 58, what are you going to do? My answer is: if I continue to have responsibility for this area at Community level in the future, I am convinced that, unless something unusual and extraneous occurs, there will be no reason for the continued application of Article 58 and I shall not be proposing its continued application to the Commission. I have also been asked: what if the Commission does not agree with you? The answer is quite clear, and I believe those who have had executive responsibility will agree with me: if a government does not accept your views on an essential aspect of your policy, it means that the government does not agree with you and that, therefore, you no longer agree with the government. As an individual is less important than the Commission as a whole, it is the individual who leaves in the event of disagreement. I feel that is the only answer that can be given when a question of this nature is asked, especially when you believe in what you are doing and when you believe you must be consistent with the proposals you have made.

To conclude, I should like to thank Parliament for agreeing that the Commission was right to assume the responsibilities it has under the Treaty and also that this essential sector of the economy cannot be saved solely by measures taken by the industry itself. On the contrary, it can only be saved by an overall approach to the social field and to redevelopment. And to the extent that we succeed with our activities in both these directions, we shall be able to show that Europe can respond to the problems of individuals, restore secur-

ity and provide new development and future prospects, and Europe will then have no fear of the future. That is why, whatever the difficulties the future may present, Mr Ansart, we shall approach it with our heads held high and not backwards, as you suggest, perhaps because that is the method you yourself apply too often.

President. — I call Mr Vredeling.

Mr Vredeling, Vice-President of the Commission. — (NL) Mr President, I have simply asked for the floor to underline briefly what Mr Davignon has said in a wider context about the importance of the social aspect of our proposals. I can do so very briefly. I should like to thank Parliament for the massive support we have received from all sides of the House for our proposals on the social policy. We now have something to go on in the Council, which now faces the moment of truth. By this time next week we shall know more. That is when the Council will be discussing our proposal on social aid, and I hope that Mr Spencer will be proved wrong in his rather light-hearted contention that some Member States are applying to the Commission for assistance with social measures while their delegations are doing everything they can to avoid making the payments. That would be so paradoxical that I refuse to believe a situation of this kind will arise. I will conclude by quoting someone who has held the highest office in an important Member State: 'It is essential that we create a social Europe.' That statement was made by Willy Brandt when he was still Federal Chancellor. I should also like to express the hope that Mr Brandt's successor and the governments of all nine Member States will think of this at a time when a decision has to be taken on this subject at Council level. We are talking about the credibility of our actions. There is also the question of whether the trade union movement can continue to play its role, and hitherto it has supported the process of European integration. If the Council is not conscious of this responsibility, I fear the worst for Europe. I am approaching the end of my mandate, but personally I am beginning to have my doubts about Europe.

President. — I call Mr Boyes.

Mr Boyes. — I should like — just for a change! — to thank Mr Davignon and Mr Vredeling for their replies, though they did not deal very specifically with Consett. Inevitably I am going to be asked, 'Are you optimistic or pessimistic?'. So I say to them that, though I cannot talk about sums of money, I just hope that the Commission will have noted the attitude of everyone here today to the problems of Consett and will be able to do something about it. At the end of this debate therefore — and it may be a difficult ques-

Boyes

tion for them to answer — I would ask whether we may have an assurance from Mr Davignon and Mr Vredeling that in future they will be talking particularly about Consett.

President. — I call Mr Davignon.

Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission. — (F) Mr President, I can give an answer on this. Consett is a specific problem, the impact on the region being specifically the outcome of restructuring. As regards the redevelopment effort, the part of our proposal which concerns redevelopment — since the social aspect will be covered by the normal rules — I can say that if we are presented with projects, we will do everything in our power to try to make them succeed.

President. — The debate is closed.

The motions for resolutions will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

6. *Siting of nuclear power stations in frontier regions*

President. — The next item is the report by Mrs von Alemann, on behalf of the Committee on Energy and Research, on the siting of nuclear power stations in frontier regions (Doc. 1-442/80).

I should like to inform the House that Mr Coppieters is a co-signatory of Amendments Nos 2, 8 and 9 by Mr Gendebien and that Mrs Bonino, Mr Coppieters and Mr Pannella are co-signatories of Amendments Nos 3 to 7 and 10 to 13 by Mr Gendebien. Amendments Nos 38 to 49 have been tabled by Mrs Scrivener and others in their own rights.

I call Mrs von Alemann.

Mrs von Alemann, rapporteur. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, as the rapporteur of the Committee on Energy and Research I wish to present and explain this motion for a resolution on the siting of nuclear power stations in frontier regions.

Firstly, the effects of major technologies usually extend well beyond limited, local areas. This is particularly true of nuclear facilities. Problems therefore arise when it comes to choosing a site for a plant of this kind in a frontier region, because what pollution occurs is bound to affect areas on both sides of the frontier. I shall discuss this aspect in the first part of my statement.

Another problem, which is connected not with the immediate proximity of a frontier, but with matters of

industrial competition, is how to prevent at European level the commercial interests of industries in the individual Member States from undermining safety and health standards. I shall be considering this question in the second part of my statement.

Ladies and gentlemen, the construction of major technological facilities such as nuclear power stations raises a number of problems which the builder must face. One important requirement in the case of nuclear power stations is the availability of sufficient quantities of the cooling water that passes through the system. This means that nuclear power stations are almost always built on rivers or on the coast. But rivers have often become national frontiers in the history of Europe. If we look at a map showing the distribution of population and industry in Europe, a further reason why this subject must be discussed will become apparent. It will be seen that most industrial centres are near frontiers, and I must point out that the term 'near frontiers' should be used whenever an industrial centre is closer to an intra-Community frontier than the possible effects of nuclear power stations extend. As nuclear power stations generate electricity that is principally used in industrial centres, it almost goes without saying that they are built near the industrial centres and therefore near frontiers too.

The effects on the environment can be divided into the constant, the occasional and the theoretically possible. In the case of the constant impact on the environment the non-nuclear effect is more significant, while nuclear pollution takes first place when it comes to occasional and theoretically possible effects. All these effects, whether constant, occasional or theoretically possible, whether non-nuclear — although this aspect should not be belittled — or nuclear, usually spread uniformly into the surrounding area and so across frontiers.

To solve conflicts where transfrontier pollution occurs, Articles 37 and 41 of the Treaty establishing the European Atomic Energy Community should be applied. The requirement to provide information contained in these articles does not form an adequate legal basis, since they do not provide for procedures to be applied in the case of disagreements. In addition, the Commission has practically no influence because of the very lax way in which the obligation on a Member State to provide information is enforced. While the Commission is still drawing up its opinion, nuclear power stations are often already under construction, and no country will be prepared or able to change its plans should the Commission deliver a negative opinion, because of the substantial costs of planning and design and also some of the building, for example, that have already been incurred. As a remedy to this unfortunate situation we welcome the proposal for a Community consultation procedure, which was approved by the Walz report during the last session of this Parliament.

von Alemann

On the other hand, we call for a binding conciliation procedure. There are two reasons why this procedure should be established at European level, with the Commission playing a decisive role in it. The people of one Member State of the Community will not in the long term understand why another, neighbouring country undertakes certain commitments regarding transfrontier pollution only when bilateral agreements have been concluded. The people of Europe expect European integration to produce practical results. Agreements might also be reached with third countries, with which we have the same problem, of course. In line with the idea of integration the best thing would be for everyone in the Community to have the same right to information and the same health and safety standards, no matter on which side of the frontier or in which Community country nuclear facilities are sited. The prescribed conciliation procedure must therefore be established at European level, in other words the Commission must be made responsible.

My second point leads me to the second part of my statement. The competition among our countries imposes a quite specific responsibility on us as supranational parliamentarians. Countries throughout the world try to gain a competitive edge for their industries in every conceivable way. In the case of nuclear power stations, this may result in the following situation: to provide its domestic industry with electricity more quickly and at lower costs than a neighbouring country, a government may be prepared to lower its safety and health standards or to make concessions over requirements and time-limits during authorization procedures. As this country thus gains cost advantages, its neighbours can hardly avoid following suit if they do not want to see the competitive position of their own industries permanently eroded. It might then come to — I apologize for the term — a 'concession race' among these countries in the area of safety and health protection standards, and although this would in itself be disastrous, it would assume a particularly dangerous dimension where power stations are sited near frontiers. Furthermore, this argument was advanced by Parliament's Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs in its opinion on the Walz report in 1977:

There varying provisions also result in a distortion of competition. The establishment of common procedures and common criteria would make it considerably easier to build power stations and eliminate distortions of competition.

As supranational parliamentarians we have a special responsibility in this respect, because we can show the way by overcoming and eliminating this deplorable state of affairs, which can occur anywhere in the world. In the statement I made on 13 February 1980 in this Chamber I said that we must not allow energy prices to force us into a tax concession race. I say today that we must be even less prepared to allow the countries of the Community somehow to run the risk

of engaging in a race by making concessions with respect to safety and health standards applicable to nuclear facilities. After all, we denounce such competition when we negotiate with other countries. In the negotiations with Canada the Commission was quite right to reject the right of veto on re-exports which the Canadian Government wanted. There can be no talk of re-exports when it comes to trade within the free market of the Community. But then we cannot have different standards in the various European countries.

In the motion for a resolution now before you we therefore stress the need for the Commission to have the final say in the settlement of consultation procedures in which agreement has not been reached. Paragraph 2 in particular therefore refers to the urgent need for the creation of uniform European safety standards, with the highest possible standards being adopted in Europe so that certain countries do not have to lower theirs. Only when this standardization has been achieved, will no country be affected by transfrontier pollution and the danger of a 'concession race' will be averted. Only then can it be said that the polluter pays principle applies, and only then can we European Representatives conduct a reasonable discussion with the people who are now anxious, particularly those in frontier regions, on how this problem can be solved.

President. — We shall now suspend our proceedings until 3 p.m.

The House will rise.

(The sitting was suspended at 1 p.m. and resumed at 3 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR: MR VANDEWIELE

Vice-President

President. — The sitting is resumed.

7. Votes

President. — The next item is the votes on motions for resolutions on which the debate is closed.

We shall begin with the *Hahn report (Doc. 1-345/80): European Music Year.*

(Parliament adopted the preamble)

President

On paragraph 1 I have two amendments:

— Amendment No 3/rev. by Mr C. Jackson and Mrs Kellett-Bowman, seeking to replace this paragraph by the following text:

'1. Considers that "the foundations of an ever closer union" referred to in the Treaty of Rome will be strengthened by the cultural emphasis which a "European Community Music Year", based on the musical heritage of the Member States, can give.'

— Amendment No 7 by Mr Balfe, seeking to replace this paragraph by the following text:

1. Believes that 1985 should be designated as 'European Music Year' and invites the Council of Europe to agree to this proposition;

(Parliament rejected the two amendments and adopted in turn paragraphs 1 and 2)

On paragraphs 3 and 4 I have five amendments:

— Amendment No 1 by Mr Seligman, seeking to delete these paragraphs,

— Amendment No 4/rev. by Mr C. Jackson and Mrs Kellett-Bowman, seeking to replace paragraph 3 by the following text:

'3. Designates 1985 "European Community Music Year" and calls on cultural foundations, local communities and industry to give their support to events, celebrating the musical heritage of the European Community;'

— Amendment No 8 by Mr Balfe, seeking to amend paragraph 3 to read as follows:

'3. Considers, however, that such a Music Year, which would be of interest to people in all parts of Europe, should be, sponsored *both by the European Community and the Council of Europe.*'

— Amendment No 5/rev. by Mr C. Jackson and Mrs Kellett-Bowman, seeking to replace paragraph 4 with the following text:

'4. Calls on the Committee for Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport to propose how the European Parliament itself should promote the 1985 European Community Music Year;'

— Amendment No 9 by Mr Balfe, seeking to add the following phrase at the end of paragraph 4:

'... and, in view of the long time involved in organizing musical events, hopes that the Council will give its decision by April 1981;'

(In successive votes Parliament rejected Amendments Nos 1 and 4/rev., adopted Amendment No 8 and rejected Amendments Nos 5/rev. and 9; it then adopted paragraph 4)

On paragraph 5 I have three amendments:

— Amendment No 6/rev. by Mr C. Jackson and Mrs Kellett-Bowman, seeking to delete the words

'in the event that a decision be taken to designate 1985 "European Music Year";'

— Amendment No 2 by Mr Seligman, seeking to add the following words at the end of the paragraph:

'and giving encouragement to young composers and soloists;'

— Amendment No 10 by Mr Balfe, seeking to add the following phrase at the end of the paragraph:

'... and, whilst realizing the pressure on resources, by offering some administrative and translation assistance.'

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Hahn, rapporteur. — *(D)* I ask the House to reject the Seligman amendment. The European Community does not have the means to organize the year really well.

(In successive votes Parliament rejected Amendment No 6/rev., adopted Amendment No 2 and rejected Amendment No 10; it then adopted paragraph 5 thus amended)

President. — After paragraph 5 I have Amendment No 11 by Mr Balfe, seeking to add a new paragraph to read as follows:

'5a. Resolves to instruct the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport to submit a further report on progress on this matter at the latest by the July 1981 part-session;'

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Hahn, rapporteur. — *(D)* I ask Parliament to reject this amendment also.

*(Parliament rejected the amendment and then in successive votes adopted paragraph 6 and the resolution as a whole)**

President. — I call Mr Sherlock to speak on a point of order.

Mr Sherlock. — Paragraph 32 of my programme notes on Hahn, Mr President, says that I should note that while under any other president it might have been B flat, you have managed to get through it F sharp and *allegro ma non troppo*.

(Loud laughter)

* See OJ

President. — Thank you for your declaration, but it was not a point of order.

(Laughter and applause)

President. — I put to the vote the motion for a resolution contained in the *Baduel Glorioso report (Doc. 1-463/80): Closure of the Consett steel works.*

The resolution is adopted.

I put to the vote the motion for a resolution contained in the *Martinet report (Doc. 1-565/80): EEC-USA relations in the steel sector.*

The resolution is adopted.

8. Urgent procedure

President. — I have received the following motions for resolutions with request for urgent debate, pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure:

- by Mrs Seibel-Emmerling and others, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on aids for the private storage of veal containing hormones (Doc. 1-571/80/rev.)
- by Mr Habsburg and others on the release of Rudolf Hess from Spandau prison (Doc. 1-575/80)
- by Mr Seefeld and others on the future of Eurocontrol (Doc. 1-576/80)
- by Mr Glinne and others, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the right to strike in Greece (Doc. 1-577/80)
- by Mrs Roudy and others on the abolition of the death penalty in the European Community (Doc. 1-589/80)
- by Mr de la Malène and others, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, on the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Doc. 1-591/80).

The reasons supporting these requests for urgent debate are contained in the documents themselves.

The decision on urgent procedure will be taken at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting, except in the case of Document 1-575/80 for which it will be taken at the beginning of the sitting on the following day.

9. Siting of nuclear power stations in frontier regions (continuation)

President. — The next item is the continuation of the debate on the report by Mrs von Alemann (Doc. 1-442/80)

I call Mrs Lizin to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mrs Lizin. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Socialist Group approves the content of the report that has been submitted to us by Mrs von Alemann. It is in favour of two essential policies in the nuclear field: firstly, the establishment of nuclear safety standards at Community level and secondly, and more importantly, the establishment of a Community procedure for consultations on the siting of nuclear facilities near frontiers, a procedure which she proposes should be strengthened.

Our debate today does not concern the crucial question of the nuclear option, but protective measures which must be worked out, harmonized and introduced wherever the nuclear option has been taken in the past without any kind of democratic debate beforehand. We therefore congratulate Mrs von Alemann with the conviction of one who, faced with a *fait accompli*, endeavours to limit the damage it can cause, and we agree with the course she proposes should be adopted to this end.

It is in fact hardly conceivable that power stations of the same type should be subject to different safety and control measures in a territory as small as Europe. It is hardly conceivable that the establishment of these safety measures and control methods should continue to remain an object of national egoism for some time to come, while the choice of the highest possible level of coordination is essential to ensure effectiveness and above all the independence of the experts. It is hardly conceivable that each State should concern itself only with the implications for its own territory, on the basis of its own criteria, while the choice of site in some cases has an atmospheric, hydrological or hydrographical effect over 85 % of which is carried over to the neighbouring country.

Is it not precisely for such reasons that we set out to construct Europe? To prevent the systematic domination of the weakest in a bilateral relationship and to involve them in a process of solidarity whose scope and management by a common body would assure them of impartiality? In these two respects we therefore congratulate Mrs von Alemann.

However, we must make some distinction in these congratulations, for the sake of the very effectiveness of the course it is proposed we should adopt. We believe the consultation procedure the Commission is proposing will be inadequate to the extent that it does not take its own conclusions to the logical extreme, to the extent that it does not provide for the arbitration procedure which would allow it to give its consultations concrete form and, consequently, to the extent that it does not provide for a system of sanctions for the non-observance of the outcome of such arbitration, and also to the extent that it contemplates

Lizin

consultation only on certain very specific measures and overlooks, for example, the harmonization of evacuation plans. The consultation procedure should, in our view, also be accompanied by measures which strengthen the interpretation of Articles 37 and 41 of the Euratom Treaty and make them more restrictive.

In one very specific case, the proposal to site nuclear power stations at Chooz, we have been able to see how deficient international law is. For over six months the Belgian Government had to beg for the opening of negotiations, which have always been informal. The Commission and Council, questioned on numerous occasions by many Members of this Assembly, have always claimed incompetence at this stage of the procedure because Article 37, for example, cannot be applied until well after the first decisions, the ones which in practice dictate where the investment is to be made, have been taken.

But the most flagrant aspect of the Chooz affair, the aspect which does most to highlight the need for the establishment of a Community procedure which fills this gap in the law, is the lack of balance which may emerge in a relationship involving only two States. Faced with the aims of the French electricity producers, Belgians who are today concerned about the possible consequences of the Chooz power stations are hitting their heads against a brick wall. And even if he were so inclined — which I personally doubt, because I have no tangible proof to the contrary — the Belgian Foreign Minister would not have enough pull to force his French counterpart to take part in a dialogue, let alone an arbitration procedure.

It is inconceivable that in a bilateral relationship of this kind conditions might be imposed or even the construction of a power station at an undesirable site prevented.

The Socialist Group therefore feels that the controls and decision-making must be transferred, that the highest authority must be a Community one and that impartiality must be ensured by entrusting the Commission with the management of this area within the framework of a consultation mechanism, with proper arrangements even when the conclusions are negative.

Mrs von Alemann, we have proposed that you should phrase your report in stronger terms. You may rest assured that what we find important in a field in which the opinions of the people have so often been trampled under foot by the electricity producers, whose arrogance is, in my view, equalled only by their profits, is that your report should culminate in the establishment of the most effective conditions possible. We hope that this positive gesture will also be appreciated by the members of your group — and seeing the amendments they have tabled, it is doubtful whether they have read the Euratom Treaty — and that they do not desert you despite your good intentions.

President. — I call Mrs Walz to speak on behalf of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

Mrs Walz. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to begin by thanking Mrs von Alemann for her excellent report, which will undoubtedly be largely approved by Parliament. As you yourself have said, this report follows on closely from the own-initiative report I drew up in late 1975 on the requirements for a Community policy on the siting of nuclear power stations, with account taken of their acceptability to the public, and a later report on nuclear power stations in frontier regions. These reports examined the nuclear energy policies of all the Community countries and even then voiced the demands that you are now making, demands which at that time were approved by a large majority of Parliament.

Unfortunately, the resulting Commission proposal was before the Council of Ministers for over two years, and even then all it did was decide on consultations at bilateral level, without providing for a binding procedure for the event that agreement is not reached. Mrs von Alemann's report now sets out to remedy this, without causing delays in the authorization procedure. Whether the Commission can do this, Mrs Lizin, or whether the Court of the European Communities should not perhaps be involved is another question we should look at very carefully.

Whatever one's views on nuclear energy — Mrs Lizin left this point aside — two extremely important factors should be considered. Firstly, according to the World Bank's calculations in its 1980 *World Development Report*, the expenditure of the oil-importing developing countries on oil imports will rise from 29 200 m dollars in 1978 to 57 800 m dollars in 1980, 107 000 m dollars in 1985 and 185 000 m dollars in 1990. That would mean imported oil costing more than all the development aid the industrial countries can muster.

Secondly, at the world energy conference held in Munich in September 1980 it was said that even in ideal circumstances as regards the development of energy conservation and the use of alternative energies world coal production must be tripled by the year 2000 and the use of nuclear energy increased five-fold if the world's energy requirements are to be met and a fight over distribution is to be avoided. This means that frontier regions will also have to be used as sites for power stations of all kinds, and especially nuclear power stations, because of the water courses to be found there, understandable though the opposition of the population of such regions may be.

This is why, when my own-initiative report was adopted, I called for the harmonization at Community level of, in particular, legislation governing licensing conditions. In addition, the authorization procedures

Walz

relating to the choice of sites, to construction and operation and not least to operational safety must be standardized, and the authorities must inform each other of their emergency plans. I am convinced that uniform legislation is required to provide the public with optimum protection, and it will also ensure that distortions of competition cannot occur.

It would also be a very good thing to have such negotiations with neighbouring third countries, especially the German Democratic Republic, since the safety regulations in the Eastern Bloc are completely different from ours. If there is no way of taking legal action should consultations break down, the weaker party must always give way to the stronger. They should therefore begin in good time before construction starts, so that they do not cause further delay. It will be many years before the substitute energies play a major part in our energy supplies. We have by no means overcome the shock of the oil crisis, in fact it is likely to have even more serious consequences in the future. With declining economic growth and increasing unemployment we can think ourselves lucky if we more or less make ends meet. Nuclear power stations must therefore be built by assembly-line methods, in other words standardized, so that the authorization procedures are shortened and safety is improved.

The rejection of nuclear energy by some Members of Parliament — even though it would solve our energy problems — does not, incidentally, have the support of the workers those Members believe they are representing. Both the union of European public services and individual trade unions, or the German Trade Unions Federation, advocate the increased use of nuclear energy to safeguard jobs.

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

Mr Johnson. — Mr President, I want to make it clear that I do not at the moment speak for the European Democratic Group. The European Democratic Group has not yet finally made up its mind about the von Alemann report, but it will no doubt do so this evening.

Speaking personally, I very much welcome this report. I think it is entirely right that on major installations which have a cross-frontier effect there should be provision for consultation between the states affected. I also think it right that the European Community as such should be involved in such consultation. These are two basic principles which I personally think are important. Not that the United Kingdom, as far as nuclear power is concerned, looks likely to experience many of these problems — we do not actually have nuclear installations at our frontiers, although it is possible that we could suffer some effects as a country from, say, a major processing installation in France, at

Cap La Hague or wherever. However, leaving the United Kingdom aside, when we are dealing with major industrial installations I think it is quite right that there should be these sorts of procedures, and therefore I welcome the von Alemann report.

I would remind this Parliament — because from time to time it is worth reminding Parliament of what it has voted for in the past — that in the case of the so-called Seveso directive which we looked at a month or two ago, a directive dealing with dangerous industrial activities, it was precisely Parliament which wrote into the Commission's draft directive a provision calling for cross-frontier consultation with a Community involvement where there were dangerous industrial activities having cross-frontier implications. This was an initiative taken by Parliament in the case of the so-called Seveso directive, which so far, of course, has been blocked in the Council by governments that I need not name.

The principle which was valid in the case of the Seveso directive is to my mind even more valid here, particularly when you consider that in the case of nuclear power we are not only dealing with the risks of ionizing radiation; we are also dealing with the exhaustion of very limited coolant capacity in Europe's rivers, all the more reason that there should indeed be consultation.

I myself welcome the suggestion in the von Alemann report that where there is no agreement between states the European Commission itself should act as some kind of arbiter. In my view — and I stress this is a personal view, it is not yet the view of the European Democratic Group — it is right that there should be an international arbiter and it is right, given the historic involvement of the European Commission in matters of nuclear power, that that arbiter should be the European Commission.

I conclude, Mr President, by saying that this von Alemann report relating to nuclear power, as well as the Seveso report relating to dangerous industrial activities as a whole, is, I think, but a precursor of a wider approach which must be taken. We need to look for environmental impact assessment of the wide-ranging kind suggested in the Commission's new draft directive on environmental impact assessment wherever we are dealing with cross-frontier implications. I think it would be wholly wrong to believe that the application of standardized procedures on a Community basis will necessarily slow down the development of these installations. I am not advocating slowing down development of nuclear or any other kind of facility. What I am advocating is an orderly development which is pursued in a consistent way among all the European countries.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Ippolito from the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Ippolito. — (*I*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the important report presented by Mrs Von Alemann on the siting of nuclear power stations in frontier regions goes well beyond the original argument and rightly confronts the problem of the location of nuclear stations in general and, in an even larger context, the location of all energy producing installations.

Our group (the Italian Communist and Allies) gives its full support to this report, though the document deals in only a partial and preliminary way with the whole problem of security standards for this type of plant. We would like to see this problem solved as soon as possible by complete and efficient community regulation. The question of the siting of nuclear power stations in frontier regions — a burning current issue which we believe should be handled on the Community level — is not the only one to be faced: there is also the crucial problem of nuclear security in general within the Community, whether near or far from the frontiers. This is a problem which cannot be raised apart from certain contextual factors, which I will discuss in a moment but which can be summarized as follows: the energy crisis can only be resolved through the inevitable inclusion of nuclear power in Community energy programs.

Many factors point to the conclusion that the oil crisis is worsening: though there must be an increase in the consumption of coal, there are still difficulties involved in its use and supply, and experts unanimously agree that the use of renewable resources can offer only a modest contribution beyond the year 2 000. For this reason, ladies and gentlemen, the nuclear problem can no longer, in 1981, be considered as a choice. There is no longer any room for choice, and I state this clearly, not only as a politician, but also on economic and technical grounds as an expert who has by now spent more than half his life studying this serious energy question from all sides.

If what I have said is true, we must admit, without letting ourselves be distracted by emotional factors or by problems of changes in lifestyle which cannot be solved in the medium term, that the nuclear option — though not the only one — is now inevitable, as the choices of all the industrialized nations, whether of the East or of the West, now demonstrate. We should not linger here in a rearguard action to discuss the pros and cons, but rather we should decide how we can implement a plan of construction for nuclear power stations in Europe with the tightest security humanly possible and with the fullest agreement of the populations concerned.

The von Alemann report has for us the value of a beginning. It links up with the report of our president

Mrs Hanna Walz, where in 1976 in the old Parliament, the problem of the siting of nuclear power stations in Europe was already being discussed. If the new Commission respects the letter and the spirit of the treaty which set up the EAEC and in particular Articles 37 and 41, it will possess all the instruments necessary for dealing, on a Community basis, with the vital problem of security. It will also be able to confront the problem of public opinion, which the present controversy over frontier installations has vigorously illustrated, by providing precise and objective information for the populations concerned.

It is not enough only to call on the Commission, as does the von Alemann report, to give an annual report to Parliament on the results obtained by the application of Article 37 of the EAEC Treaty and of the regulations of Community procedure. The new Commission must take a decisive step forward — with the certain agreement of the Member States — to harmonize the security standards of the separate Member States, which already differ but little. It should aim at the creation of a Community organization for control and information which, as I have mentioned on other occasions, would also seek the collaboration and approval of countries bordering on the Community itself.

President. — I call Mr Calvez to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Calvez. — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the report which Mrs von Alemann has presented to us raises a fundamental question with regard to the future of nuclear energy. In the coming decades, in order to reduce their dependence on imported energy, a fair number of countries will be forced to construct new nuclear power stations at a steady rate in their territories, including their frontier regions.

During the international conference on safety aspects of nuclear power stations, which was held in Stockholm in late October and was attended by senior officials and experts from 43 countries and by a delegation from the European Parliament, the choice of sites formed the subject of a wide exchange of information, because there are, geographically speaking, small countries which have no choice but to locate their nuclear power stations a few kilometers from their frontiers. The Community judiciously demonstrated its willingness to pursue a cohesive energy policy in Europe and stressed the importance of the use of nuclear energy.

But Europe, ladies and gentlemen, does not yet have a policy on the use of nuclear energy to generate electricity. Is it wise to put the cart before the horse and adopt a Community procedure for the siting of nuclear power stations in frontier regions? This is the question I shall try to answer, because it is the ques-

Calvez

tion that lies at the very heart of Mrs von Alemann's report. The individual Member States have the responsibility for constructing nuclear power stations, because quite obviously each country is capable of assessing the advisability and also the necessity of this or that decision, only the individual Member State is able to ensure that the necessary safety regulations are observed. And this is an area in which responsibilities should not be weakened by spreading them over several countries.

I do not have the time to dwell on this aspect of the issue. A desire for objective information prompts me to say that the problem raised by the siting of nuclear power stations in frontier regions should not be evaded because it is a real problem, and neighbouring countries may rightly be concerned about the answers they should give to the questions their people are asking and about the possible effect of a power station on the water of rivers adjoining their territory. But there is already a Community procedure, which we find in Articles 30, 37, 41 and 42 of the Euratom Treaty. The Commission must ensure this procedure is used. As you know, projects are subject to extremely strict rules, which are rigorously applied, regardless of whether or not a frontier region is concerned, and are a response to each country's concern to assure the public of the highest possible level of safety. In this respect, I would be interested to hear more about the cases referred to by the rapporteur in which safety standards have not been observed. It seems to me that the first priority should be to ensure that existing Community provisions work properly and to promote bilateral consultations.

The communications and discussions needed should take place between motivated States, within a satisfactory framework and leaving aside the extremist positions adopted by those who are blocking the discussions. And here I would make a distinction between serious ecologists and those unconditionally opposed to nuclear energy, who seek recognition as valid representatives of their cause but who refuse to play the information game according to the rules and try to gain time by prolonging the procedure. Let us call a spade a spade; ladies and gentlemen, and stop evading the issue, because there can be no basic disagreement among scientists who are aware of their responsibilities. Let us see a successful conclusion to the bilateral exchanges on the construction of nuclear power stations based on experience and on world-wide cooperation in safety matters. There is a nuclear energy agency within the OECD which has demonstrated its ability and has also looked into safety standards. Let us place our confidence in this agency before deciding on anything new. Today, with personnel well trained in the problems of administration, protection and monitoring such as we unquestionably have for flight safety — you all fly, and you are not afraid — we can say that the moratoriums and all the action taken in an attempt to delay the installation of nuclear power stations are contrary to the public interest.

Of course, it may at first glance appear tempting to give the Commission, which is an impartial body, an active role in the discussions which may take place between neighbouring countries on the siting of a power station. But, ladies and gentlemen, this entails two major risks which should not be overlooked.

The first is that delays may occur in the installation of nuclear power stations, and the second is that safety practices may be weakened. The responsibilities in this field must be very clear-cut. On the other hand, I feel the Member States should be encouraged to stay on the course some of them have already adopted: extension of the dialogue with the party or parties concerned, this alone, it seems to me, being likely to ensure that account is duly taken of the concern of the people directly affected, something which we do not want to neglect either. And to this end, I would suggest in conclusion that the Member States should take part, at Council level and as the need arises, in bilateral consultations and negotiate agreements, particularly on nuclear accidents.

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

Mr Capanna. — (I) Mr President, the course of the debate up to now indicates that the pro-nuclear speakers are not so much concerned with the question of security for nuclear power stations in frontier regions as they are with not allowing a chance to escape for making more propaganda in favour of nuclear energy, and this in a rather problematical and, in my opinion, scarcely edifying manner. On the contrary, the question of the siting of nuclear installations in frontier zones is in fact a serious one.

The countries of Europe — including and perhaps especially those which are members of the Community — all engage in a sort of gang warfare, confronting the country or countries with which they share a border with the *fait accompli* of an energy installation near the frontier. Since this is the true situation, it seems necessary for me to say that the Von Alemann report appears completely inadequate to anyone who is not fervently pro-nuclear, like Mr Ippolito. Many delegates, including myself, have presented amendments concerning the basic issues involved, in order to improve this report.

It is not enough that the European Parliament — as, for example, in point number 8 of the resolution — call for the application on the Community level of the principle of 'whoever pollutes, pays'. A standard is needed which would bind the Member States to answer directly for the damage caused, even beyond the borders, by nuclear pollution. It is certainly not enough to say, as in point number 11 of the resolution, that the population must be informed and its opinion

Capanna

acknowledged. Its views will not be heeded unless they can first be expressed in a clear, explicit, and above all binding, manner. This is to say that the population must be able to express itself widely, directly, and democratically. So that this possibility might be guaranteed, I have presented a specific amendment. The vote on this amendment will be the basis for discovering whether this Parliament and its pro-nuclear members intend to act in matters of nuclear energy with or without the consent of the population.

Progress must be made in this direction, by both Parliament and Council. Articles 37 and 41 of the Euratom Treaty should be revised and brought strictly up to date, so that the siting of nuclear power stations in frontier regions will be effected with maximum security precautions.

Before concluding, I would like to make another observation. The problem of nuclear installations near frontiers is not the only one; there is also the problem — and we would do well to begin to discuss it seriously here — of the development of uranium mines near frontiers. I will give an example which is perhaps not familiar to all members: France intends to exploit, in the open, a uranium mine officially in its own territory but very close to the Italian frontier, in the Ventimiglia area. The initial stages in the exploitation of this mine would result in pollution of the natural water supply, which all flows into Italian territory, eventually affecting 1 to 1½ million Italian citizens. This is to illustrate that we must face problems of risks and security not only where nuclear power is concerned but also in the case of the opening and exploitation of uranium mines in frontier regions.

President. — I call Mr Gendebien, who is a non-attached Member.

Mr Gendebien. — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should first like to thank Mrs von Alemann for the quality of her report.

We are now facing a test of the credibility of Europe. The installation of nuclear power stations in frontier regions remains a worrying and unsolved problem. It is a nasty thorn in the Achilles heel of the Community, for 23 years after the signing of the Treaties there is still no answer to a question which seriously disturbs the people and local authorities in many European regions.

What we must do is get out of what is virtually a legal vacuum. At the moment the electricity producers and the national governments exercise sovereign power in choosing the sites for nuclear power stations and take no account of either neighbouring countries or public opinion. Article 37 of the Euratom Treaty provides no more than the outline of common health protection and is completely derisory, inadequate and ineffectual.

Whatever this debate and the Council's decisions may produce, it must be admitted today that there is a need to go much further than Article 37 and therefore to revise it, which means modifying the Euratom Treaty. As long ago as 1976 Parliament took an initiative aimed at establishing a Community procedure for consultations on the choice of sites. The Commission acted on this opinion to some extent by itself suggesting consultations, but it did not provide for an arbitration mechanism should two governments continue to disagree. But the Council of Ministers did not act on Parliament's opinion or the Commission's proposal, and we have a duty to denounce and to condemn this unpardonable failure on the Council's part. In the meantime, the problem has become acute, particularly at political level, with the increase in the number of nuclear projects very close to Member States' frontiers. Chooz, Fessenheim and Cattenom are but three examples. Parliament has therefore taken up the issue once again. Two motions have recently been tabled, one on behalf of the EPP, which confined itself to calling for a Community consultation procedure, the other tabled by myself on behalf of my party, the Rassemblement Wallon, which called for a complete ban on nuclear power stations in frontier regions and specifically at Chooz. The result is Mrs von Alemann's report, which has its good and its bad points, but is in any case inadequate.

To deal with the good points first: I endorse the call for the establishment of a Community consultation and arbitration procedure, the need for common safety standards at the highest possible level, the polluter pays principle and the need for the public to be consulted. But the report falls down in some respects, or at least does not go far enough, specifically in the wording of paragraph 2 of the resolution, which seems very ambiguous to me. This paragraph would permit the siting of nuclear power stations in frontier regions on the assumption, as yet unverified, that there is a Community consultation procedure and on the assumption, similarly unverified, that there are strict and uniform safety standards.

One of my amendments proposes a clear solution. In view of the serious effects they may have on the environment and the possibility of good neighbourly relations between countries and regions being upset, nuclear power stations should be prohibited in frontier regions and notably in an area up to 50 kilometers from the frontier of a neighbouring country. The other amendments are subsidiary to this and aim at strengthening Mrs von Alemann's resolution should the construction of power stations in frontier regions nevertheless be authorized. I believe it makes good sense to demand, firstly, the closure of power stations which emit radioactive pollution or pollution in excess of the agreed standards, secondly, proper consultation of the people in each town or village concerned, on either side of the frontier and therefore in at least two countries, and, thirdly, impact studies in every region affected under the aegis of the Commission.

Gendebien

Finally, and I am convinced that Parliament will make a point of voting in favour of the last amendment, I propose that the Commission and Council should draw up and implement joint plans for the protection and evacuation of people in frontier regions who might fall victim to a nuclear accident. Before concluding, I should like to say that in every respect we stand by the people of Chooz and the surrounding area on both sides of the Franco-Belgian frontier. After the pretence of consultation organized by the French authorities in Chooz with the blessing and complicity of the Belgian Government, the battle of Chooz is entering a phase that is for the moment less spectacular but politically of cardinal importance. The question is whether or not the very many amendments which have been tabled to this report by myself and others will be adopted by the elected members of the major parties. Will these parties, whose local representatives oppose the nuclear power stations, adopt the same attitude here? Will these parties, who, with the exception of a few isolated individuals, are notoriously pro-nuclear, water down even further a von Alemann report which is already characterized by moderation and partial ambiguity? That is what I fear, particularly when I see the amendments tabled in opposition to the rapporteur, Mrs von Alemann, by the Liberal and Democratic Group, which in fact has disowned the rapporteur.

In fact, Parliament must bring pressure to bear on the Commission and Council. The Commission must press ahead in demanding that the Council adopt with the utmost urgency a consultation and arbitration procedure and uncompromising safety standards. To conclude, I will say that the political question underlying this debate is in fact whether or not Parliament and the Commission will be capable of demonstrating firmness and independence towards the national governments and towards the electricity producers. The votes on the report and the amendments will provide the answer.

President. — I call Mr Turcat to speak on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

Mr Turcat. — (*F*) Mr President, the problem of nuclear power stations situated in frontier regions is obscured, as with everything else 'nuclear', by violent emotions and the kind of more or less rational fears that we have just been hearing about.

No one would dispute that it is every nation's right to build a nuclear power station on its own territory, and if one Member State is able to achieve greater independence in energy this, far from working against the interests of the others, does in fact strengthen the Community as a whole. However, when we come to nuclear power stations situated in frontier regions and in the vicinity of inhabitants of different nationality and with different laws, then we have to consider very

carefully, and also draw a distinction between, the problems of pollution and the problems of risk.

What, in this respect, are the duties of the states and of the (generally speaking, state) undertakings engaged in the design and construction of a nuclear power station?

Firstly, in relation to the Community and, in fact, to the Commission, there is the duty to provide general but precise information. This is covered by Articles 37, 41, 42 and 43 of the Treaty.

Then, in relation to neighbouring states, it is clearly the duty of every state to satisfy itself that its citizens would not be exposed to an unreasonably high level of risk. It is known well enough, or maybe not well enough, how little risk there is of a major accident with these power stations, but safeguards against external factors, such as sabotage or earthquakes, must be carefully drawn up and agreed.

Next, as regards radiation — whether continuous or occasional, to use the terms adopted by the rapporteur — this problem should be taken care of by recourse to the Community standards. That is the intention behind Article 30, and the Commission does have the authority to intervene under Article 38, if you would care to refer to it. Clearly, these essential points should form the basis of bilateral agreements between the Member States concerned.

Assuming these special risks have been covered and the local inhabitants duly safeguarded, there is no reason, it seems to me, to treat the nuclear industry differently from other industries, where the levels of pollution, environmental impact, discharge of waste heat and so on are in any case generally higher. The duty to inform and to follow established consultation procedures applies not only in relation to states but also, and above all, in relation to local authorities and populations. And here I should like to press the case of the local authorities because they are not allowed, in my country at least, a proper role in the procedures, officially at any rate. It is in fact individuals who are questioned in the course of the preliminary public inquiries. In practice, however, these procedures go beyond the strictly legal terms of reference of a public inquiry and local authorities are in fact in a position to present a case and should always be allowed to do so.

In these circumstances the Community should not, in our view, make the procedures unnecessarily cumbersome, or seek to put a brake on development or to organize a weakness. And the problem is quite different from the one mentioned this morning in connection with the steel industry, where the problem is one of surplus capacity and of controlling competition. We are not even talking here of the sort of competition mentioned by the rapporteur, of a lowering of safety standards, for which there really is no evidence at all.

Turcat

What we are proposing, therefore, is as follows.

Firstly, if the Commission, on the basis of the data it receives, delivers an unfavourable opinion on the siting of an industrial complex it of course can and must say so. It is even desirable to extend the time limit laid down in Article 42 and the Treaty allows this to be done if the Council so decides. It also allows the opinion to be published under certain conditions — and why should it not be published?

Secondly, as regards protecting the environment and the population against pollution of the air and rivers, it is up to the parties concerned to agree among themselves. And it is difficult to see on what legal or common-sense grounds disinterested third parties should be allowed to intervene in any shape or form and how they could do so without the risk that responsibility in these matters will be fragmented and obscured. The parties concerned are in this instance the states, the local authorities and inhabitants, and no one else.

Thirdly, we come to standards. By all means let us lay down standards, but not a hotchpotch of standards drawn up without consideration as to their relevance and not invested even with any gloss of uniformity in the process. No, what we have to do is make a comparison of national standards as our point of departure and, recognizing that safety requirements are the same everywhere, proceed calmly and scientifically to draw up Community standards that go beyond just radiation standards. Otherwise, and also if these standards and consultative procedures were to prove to be of no real benefit to those concerned or, worse still, to act as a brake on development in the energy sector, one would be forced to ask oneself who stands to benefit from our continuing dependence.

That is the position of the European Progressive Democrats and the explanation for our intention to vote against the resolution.

President. — I call Mr Calvez.

Mr Calvez. — (*F*) Mr President, I simply want to point out to Mr Gendebien, who probably was not in the House this morning, that the President did say that the amendments had not been tabled on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group but on behalf of the individuals concerned. And I also wanted to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the rapporteur because, I must say, the rapporteur's task is not always an easy one.

President. — I call Mr Abens.

Mr Abens. — (*F*) Mr President, I have no wish to go over ground already so admirably covered by previous

speakers, but I must express my profound disagreement with the remarks made earlier by Mr Calvez.

I feel it my duty once again to draw the attention of European public opinion on the one hand to the importance that the motion before us holds for my country, the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, and on the other to the urgency of the matter under consideration by the Council.

Mr President, for many months now we have been saying that this matter is before the Council. The Commission referred this problem to the Council for the first time back in 1976. In 1979 it put a new proposal to the Council. Here we are, almost into 1981, four and a half years on, and still the Council is unable to come to a decision.

Mr President, the Council must now give consideration to this proposal as a matter of extreme urgency, and I say this because I am totally opposed to the politics of the *fait accompli*.

The fact of the matter is that France is presently constructing a vast nuclear complex at Cattenom, close to our southern border, and it is doing so without there being any agreement between the two countries.

This, Mr Calvez, is unacceptable and I might even say immoral.

Having said that, how does the problem of the siting of nuclear power stations in frontier regions affect the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg? I shall answer this question by reference to the power station at Cattenom. What we have here is a power station with a very high capacity:

5 200 MW, attended by correspondingly high risks. This power station is being constructed just 10 kilometers from the Luxembourg border and, incidentally, the same distance from the German border. Luxembourg's main conurbations, that is to say the heavily industrialized mining area and the capital city, Luxembourg, lie within less than 25 kilometers of the nuclear site. This means that two-thirds of the population of Luxembourg and four-fifths of the Luxembourg economy lie in an area that is particularly at risk in the event of any serious incident. In the event of an accident, one would have to think in terms of evacuating the population.

Now, such an eventuality poses problems for my country that are practically insoluble. In fact, should it come to a mass evacuation we could not hope to accomplish such an operation without the goodwill of neighbouring countries prepared to receive and provide shelter to our evacuees for perhaps many months. Quite understandably, therefore, there is very great anxiety among the population of the Grand Duchy resulting in a vast upsurge of public opinion hostile to

Abens

the construction of this power station. As a concrete expression of this, an anti-Cattenom action committee has been set up embracing members of all the political parties and prominent personalities from all walks of life.

A small country like mine, Mr President, is powerless to make any effective stand against this kind of behaviour by a large neighbour. It does not have the means to retaliate politically or economically that it must have to make itself heard. It has to rely on just two things to force others to listen to its opinions and to respect its sovereignty over its own territory and its population, namely, international law and European public opinion. I have to say that international law is not being observed because the consultative procedure laid down in the Euratom Treaty has not been implemented so far. The image of France that is coming across in this case is very far removed from the public relations image that is being thrust before public opinion. Mr President, I call on France, a country for which many of my fellow countrymen have a deep sympathy, to beware of becoming, through this business of the nuclear power stations, an object for antipathy — to put it mildly.

I conclude by stressing once again the urgency of bringing this regulation into operation, and I hope that the French delegation within the Council will give its agreement to this Commission proposal and thereby resolve a long-standing problem.

President. — I call Mr Sassano.

Mr Sassano — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the problem of power plants located close to the frontiers of the Member States of the Community can and should be solved with an overall examination.

The inductive method, that is to say, a study beginning from particular cases, is certainly not suited to deal with the difficulty attendant upon the siting of such plants. It is necessary however that the Commission propose as soon as possible inflexible standards for the planning, construction, and use of power stations, especially nuclear ones. The Community can gain the full confidence of the people of Europe only if it can count on precise directives, respected by all the Member States and assuring at the same time the greatest possible efficiency.

First it should be made clear what is meant by frontier regions. I think that they should be designated by the Commission on the basis of the distance that the effects of such power stations can be felt during normal operation. In cases of serious accident, they should be evaluated according to needs of security, health, and environmental protection.

In the matter of power installations, the Commission and the Council must act in such a way that emergency plans pertaining to particular eventualities are elaborated, tested, and finally put into use with the participation of the Member States concerned, the costs to be borne by the country to which the installation belongs.

Once Community standards are adopted, it will be less difficult to negotiate agreements with the countries bordering on the Community to avoid future complications.

Considering that power stations are assuming and will assume, because of their size and numbers, a continuously increasing importance in the Community, it is evident that policies regarding their siting are absolutely fundamental. Principles should be established which are to be respected in all Community territory, irrespective of the distance or proximity to national frontiers.

If we are convinced, as most of us are, that it is absolutely necessary to build nuclear power stations if we wish to avoid a recession of awesome proportions, we must respect precise Community standards. In these standards there should certainly be provisions for choosing the sites of the installations on a reasonable basis.

Once sites have been selected, regardless of their distance from the frontiers, a large part of the problem we are now examining will be solved. Unfortunately, the very fact that we are discussing whether or not it is possible to locate power stations near national frontiers tells against our decision to build such stations, although we are convinced that they offer maximum security.

Once again incomprehensible and egoistical national interests intervene, and even within the Member States themselves, similar and unreasonable contradictions can arise between the different regions and persist with serious consequences.

I am firmly convinced that if the nuclear energy program were run by the Community directly, this problem and others will certainly arise would not be what they are. The Community could then have the same opportunities as the USA and the USSR in solving this very difficult problem.

President. — I call Mr Damette.

Mr Damette. — (F) Mr President, speaking as a French Communist, it strikes me that this Assembly suffers from an inherent defect that causes it to see in the most serious topics a legitimate occasion for political manoeuvring. Now, for example, nuclear energy is an important subject and safety a serious problem.

Damette

But is that what these texts before us are really all about? Not a bit of it. This kind of document is a perfect illustration of what I am going to call 'the little European game'. This little game has one very simple rule: You take a problem relating to various states and you draw a supranational inference from it, in other words you try and reconcile it with the Treaty, which seems to be this Parliament's overriding obsession. Here we have two themes regarded as having a supranational character: nuclear safety and the frontier.

Firstly, the frontier. We are supposed to believe that bilateral relations are insufficient and that a higher authority needs to be called in. That does not square with the facts. Experience tells us that bilateral relations are perfectly adequate in meeting current problems, and in particular the problem of safety in power stations. What then is the real objective? It is to challenge the political authority of the Member States — and France is a particular case in point — over the frontier regions on the alleged pretext of pollution problems.

The text is highly revealing. In connection with the Euratom Treaty, it refers to 'outline common health and safety provisions'. There's a legal innovation for you! That would mean that the Treaties are to be regarded not so much as reference texts but as skeletons to be fleshed out in due course, I presume. The Treaties are being used simply as springboards to supranationality.

The idea of a Community mechanism for arbitration between the states is of course a logical sequel to this. I am not surprised, moreover, to find that an amendment tabled by the Socialist Group completely unmasks the manoeuvre and goes so far, by the changes it proposes to paragraph 5 of the resolution, as to call for powers 'to prevent any given country executing a project on its own territory'. It is easy to see, in fact, how the frontier is being used as a pretext for promoting the idea of supranational control.

The same applies, but even more so, in the matter of nuclear safety. The entire text is based on the premise that the wider the territorial application of the safety standards, the better they are bound to be. That is utter rubbish!

The quality of safety standards depends above all on the structural conditions under which they are drawn up and applied. And everything points to the fact that the best guarantee is offered by a structure based on public utilities. Thus, in France, the French Electricity Board and the Atomic Energy Commission are the best guarantors of nuclear safety for the French.

The real danger lies in opening up the field of nuclear power generation to the private sector and to the law of profit. I note, incidentally, that this question has not been raised until now. To say, as the text does, that a

Community procedure is likely to increase the confidence of frontier populations in electricity-generating stations is a bad joke. The French place their confidence in the guarantee offered by a public utility and not in any guarantee of the Commission in Brussels.

But I think there is something else to this debate. Why this obsessive desire to impose uniform standards? Everyone knows full well that to impose standards in this field is in fact to prepare the way for imposing a specific system. And if that is the case, one could assume that the question of safety is no more than an excuse to prepare the ground for the integration of energy policies to the advantage of the multinationals. For, in the last resort, what really matters is who is going to control, who is going to turn the development of nuclear energy to account? This is yet another question that no one seems to have troubled to ask. This supranationality that they keep trying to impose on us has itself a very precise content and it is tied up with the multinationals working in the sector, and primarily the American ones.

Let us take a closer look at this. This whole affair centres around the construction of a nuclear power station at Chooz. Only they have forgotten to tell us that there is already, and has been for several years now, a Franco-Belgian nuclear power station at Chooz. And who put it there? Well, Euratom of course! Euratom's intervention in Chooz is highly significant because this power station has served to provide an entry into France for the Westinghouse system. It was responsible for rejecting the reactor system of the French Atomic Energy Commission. The net result has been the restructuring of the sector to the advantage of Baron Empain. We all know that the European nuclear industry is simply the European office of the American multinationals. That is certainly no kind of guarantee, and certainly not of safety.

This being so, I need hardly tell you that we not only reject these texts but, more to the point, we condemn these hypocritical manoeuvrings that seek to exploit the considerations of safety for all kinds of other ends. I tell you quite frankly that behind these texts I can see the hand of Westinghouse, Baron Empain and a few others. No, thank you! That is not what we want at all. What we want, in France at any rate, is state control of the nuclear industry from extraction of the ore, through construction, to operation of the power station. In our view that is the only guarantee of safety, in every sense of the word.

In conclusion, I wish to condemn that which is perhaps fundamental. We keep being told about the nuclear hazard posed by power stations sited in border areas, but I can see another equally serious danger threatening frontier regions such as the Alsace and Moselle in the shape of the American nuclear forces stationed for example at Kaiserslautern. I am astonished that those who champion safety should, as if by chance, have forgotten this problem. Would they have

Damette

us believe, in fact, that nuclear reactors are more dangerous than bombs? Are they trying to divert the fear of nuclear energy to electricity generating stations while all the time NATO is stockpiling countless megatons in Europe?

President. — I call Mr Coppieters.

Mr Coppieters. — (NL) Mr President, I am sorry to have to say that the report by Mrs von Alemann is a weak report. The references it makes to the present state of the Community procedure, what Mr Ippolito has called progress, mark a step backwards compared with earlier reports. The provisions of the Euratom Treaty, the Council's regulation of 18 May 1972, Mrs Walz's 1976 own-initiative report, the Commission's proposal for a resolution of December 1976, proposals still before the Council, the new own-initiative report of August 1977 on these proposals, a very weak Council resolution of November 1978 and — and this is where my story really begins — a new explanatory memorandum from the Commission in May 1979 of much reduced scope are all dead letters: people living in frontier regions merely need to be reassured.

This is a typical case in which the European Parliament is not given an opportunity to play its part. In its explanatory memorandum the Commission has changed its viewpoint, and the European Parliament has not had an opportunity to express its views on this change. That is how things stand at present, Mrs von Alemann, and so we are taking a step backwards rather than forwards. It would have been a very good thing if we Members of Parliament had been able to take up this matter again in the form of a new opinion, because we have not forgotten what is happening and we have not forgotten the people who are directly effected. I shall be kind to Mr Calvez: I consider the opponents of nuclear power stations to be just as intelligent as the supporters. And then I think of Chooz, Doel, Kalkar, Borssele and Malville and of the incident which was avoided at the last minute in La Hague on 15 April of this year, the effects of which, if it had occurred, would have been felt on the other side of the Channel in Southern England, just as an accident in Malville would have implications for Germany and Switzerland. That is the truth of the matter, Mr Calvez.

The conclusions I draw from this are: firstly, that the von Alemann report does not go as far as the earlier reports. Secondly, in view of the Commission's new memorandum the European Parliament ought to have updated its opinion. Thirdly, Articles 41 and 42 of the Euratom Treaty and the 1972 and 1976 regulations should form the basis for solutions to the problems if the will exists. You have the opportunity, ladies and gentlemen, to express this will in a number of amendments which have already been announced by Mr Gendebien and Mr Capanna and which state the guar-

antees in rather clearer terms than this vague report does.

To the numerous supporters of nuclear energy in this Assembly I should like to say: if you are so sure of your cause, why do you not put your power stations somewhat closer to your capitals rather than by our frontiers?

President. — I call Mrs Dekker.

Mrs Dekker. — (NL) Mr President, the legislation in the European Community that extends beyond national frontiers is unfortunately completely different from national legislation. It is far less advanced. Responsibilities which are observed in one country — and I am now addressing Mr Calvez — do not apply to the other side of its national frontiers. The selection of frontier areas for the construction of facilities such as nuclear power stations, which is what we are discussing now, with all the undoubtedly potential and extremely far-reaching consequences this has for the frontier region and the people living on the other side of the frontier is something over which those people have no influence worthy of note, something that they can in fact do little about. But the same is true of the enormous amount of pollution that one country can export to another. I am referring to the pollution of the Rhine, which is something about which those who unwillingly suffer the consequences can do very little. They usually have to put up with the harmful effects. Even the special international agreements that are needed to do anything at all about this unacceptable situation are scarcely observed, despite the very solemn undertakings of the governments.

Some people call for the introduction of a European passport as a way of giving the people visible and tangible proof of Community cooperation. I would call above all for further progress in the development of common policies and legislation, and not only is the Community a very suitable framework for this, it is also something it is expected to do.

The siting of nuclear power stations close to frontiers with other countries — I do not myself come from a country that borders directly on France and will perhaps not therefore be accused of a direct attack on that country, but we are, of course, concerned with all countries that are affected — is one of the areas in greatest need of a transfrontier arrangement, especially as the consequences are of such immediate interest to the citizens of these countries.

The motion for a resolution provides some kind of impulse, but I consider it to be too non-committal, especially when we consider that it is not the first time this subject has been discussed, as Mr Coppieters has already said so clearly. The Commission has been submitting proposals to the Council since 1976, the

Dekker

former Parliament stated its views clearly, in some respects far more clearly than the von Alemann report has done, but unfortunately all that the Council has so far proposed is a very non-committal arrangement for the exchange of information.

What the Commission's proposals lack above all is the essential element of a binding arbitration mechanism. I therefore find it somewhat surprising that the report applauds the Commission's proposals in such strong terms. After all, it itself states that an arbitration mechanism is essential.

Nor does the report come anywhere near to committing itself on the Community safety standards which should be established, even though paragraph 2 refers to such standards as the essential basis for the introduction of a consultation procedure.

In the case of the next paragraph, which concerns compliance with Articles 37 and 41 of the Euratom Treaty, I wonder why it is not suggested that the proposed consultation procedure should be introduced under these articles. We could then use an existing framework and not have to set up a separate arrangement for this specific area. I would also like to have seen more said about the consultation of the public on both sides of a frontier. In the Dutch-German frontier region the local Dutch population have already taken part in the German consultations on the planned siting of nuclear power stations in Germany. An interesting example in this context.

But on no account must the absence of opportunities for the public to state their case in one country result in the loss of rights the population of another country have already achieved.

Mr President, I feel that the resolution is far too implicit or, to put it another way, leaves everything fairly open. One of the important omissions is a statement on the need for an operational transfrontier emergency plan. Other speakers, Mrs Walz, for example, have already referred to this. The amendments which seek to strengthen the resolution along these lines will therefore undoubtedly have my support. To conclude, Mr President, this arrangement must be seen as a first step, in which we have concentrated on nuclear power stations in view of the urgency of the situation. This first step must, of course, be supplemented by appropriate directives on all other activities and facilities which have transfrontier implications. Parliament must not therefore leave it at this unequivocal recommendation: it must stop accepting a situation in which the Council does not draw any conclusions from Parliament's opinions, and it must ensure that further action is taken in this field.

President. — I call Mrs Bonino.

Mrs Bonino. — (*I*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I believe that I am a part — and I say it with pride — of the 'frivolous' anti-nuclear group, as Mr Calvez referred to us a moment ago. Though I am not a part of the group of serious ecologists, I am certainly on the roster of that 'frivolous' anti-nuclear group which alerted public opinion from the first, declaring for example: 'Understand that the choice of 'conventional' uranium is a choice that leads us straight to plutonium; once it has been made, there can be no going back.' Today this has been confirmed by a noted expert — as he has asserted himself to be — that is, by Mr Ippolito. I believe, Mr Ippolito, that we were right on this issue. It is true: the choice of 'conventional' uranium does lead to breeder reactors and to plutonium. This is obvious despite the assertions of all those — including Mr Ippolito — who want to convince us of the opposite. It is this road which is opening before us.

I am part of the group which first called for public debates on the nuclear question when, at least in our country, the nuclear choice was made by the government without any consultation of the citizens or of the populations concerned. And if there is now a running national debate, it is due to anti-nuclear movements and certainly not to independent information from nuclear supporters. And I believe this to be an important point, for when the report speaks of 'correct information for the people' it is necessary to ask who will furnish this information, and if it will appear independently or as a result of pressure from antinuclear groups.

Mr Ippolito was saying, 'this is an inescapable choice'. Mr Ippolito, on this question at least, scientific opinion remains divided. I believe that scientists' as conscientious and as expert as you are — from Pollard to Lowins — assert the exact opposite, whether in terms of security or in terms of efficiency. I say, therefore, that we must leave the choice to the people. But you have so little concern for democracy that, despite the calm and the certainty you show and despite all the monetary and other resources available to you, you were either incapable or afraid — for in reality you are terrified — of collecting the signatures to call for a referendum, as the anti-nuclear forces in Italy did.

We certainly have few means of recommending our opinions, while you have at your fingertips, as it were, science, information, money, and financing. I believe that a debate in these circumstances is a courageous step for us to take, even if we begin at a disadvantage, for when scientific opinion is divided and we are faced with a political choice, I believe the decision should be left to the people. Concerning your resolution, Mrs von Alemann, I believe that events have demonstrated — as we have already discussed in Committee — that every nuclear power installation has caused tension in the local population, and this certainly not because of anti-nuclear movements but obviously because the people do not feel sufficiently protected. In fact, the

Bonino

construction of nuclear power stations in frontier regions is in reality an imposition of the nuclear choice on industrialized nations which have not yet accepted it, for the consequences of such frontier installations are felt, for example, in Belgium, or Denmark, or Switzerland, where no such choice has been made.

I believe this to be an important point because in Chapter 2 we are told that in the meantime nuclear installations will be built on the frontiers and then later, at some time unspecified, Community standards for security will be 'urgently' formulated. It would be wise in any case to avoid creating tensions and conflicts with unforeseeable consequences at least until these standards, which we have long been awaiting, are elaborated. Speaking from this viewpoint and for these reasons we as a group request a roll-call vote on some fundamental amendments and on the final resolution itself. I therefore appeal to the socialists, many of whose declarations and speeches I have appreciated, not to forget that, if declarations are important, the vote is even more so. Often defeats are due to absenteeism, and I hope that this will not recur, for I believe that in the face of such a serious problem each person's conscience should be active. I hope, therefore, that we all will vote, for individual responsibility is not limited to local debates: it is not enough to express anxiety or to say one is opposed to the nuclear choice only to act in favor of it on all other occasions.

President. — I call Mr Oehler.

Mr Oehler. — (*F*) Mr President, there are, in my opinion, two aspects to the problem of the siting of nuclear installations in border areas.

Firstly, we see how the frontier regions are turning into zones of high nuclear concentration. As the rapporteur points out, 33 of the units in operation, under construction or projected lie within 40 kilometres of national borders, 15 of these units being less than 10 kilometres from the border. We have often been told that the reason for this concentration of nuclear installations along national borders is that they have a high coolant requirement and therefore tend to be sited on large rivers, which often constitute borders between states.

But, Mr President, this argument no longer stands up in this day and age. It is technically feasible nowadays to site nuclear power stations elsewhere. There is no longer any justification for siting nuclear installations in border areas, except that the risks are to some extent shared with the neighbouring state.

Secondly — and this is still valid — even without uncontrolled proliferation of nuclear reactors, there is a duty to protect the population and take into account the demands of regional balance, particularly as regards protection of the environment.

As regards protecting the population, at last October's International Atomic Energy Agency Conference on the safety of nuclear power stations a great many experts spoke out in favour of nuclear installations being sited in areas of low population density. Now, where the European Community is concerned, there is no getting away from the fact that the proliferation of nuclear installations along borders is taking place in areas of high population density. Frequently, those living across the border from the installation are not even told about any plans protecting the population. And we have a concrete example of this in relation to the power station at Fessenheim, which has now been in operation for three years: The population on the other side of the border was only informed about the ORSEC plan just a few months ago. On the occasion of this crucial debate in Parliament on the siting of nuclear power stations in border areas it is I feel vital for us to come to grips with the real problems and not be side-tracked by spurious arguments. By spurious arguments I mean, for example, the theory that the difficulties associated with the construction of power stations in border areas could be resolved simply by empowering the Commission to arbitrate in such matters. Or again the premise that common standards for the construction of power stations would overcome the pollution problems associated with nuclear electricity generation. Contrary to what Mrs von Alemann suggests in her report on the siting of power stations in border areas (in particular Articles 5 and 6 of the Euratom Treaty) there is no legal basis for any intervention by the Commission in national decision-making on the siting of these facilities.

The right to make decisions in areas that fall within its responsibility and within its sovereignty must remain in the hands of each individual Member State of the EEC. That is the only real basis for cooperation between states on nuclear matters to comply with the terms of the Euratom Treaty.

On the other hand, accepting that the selection of suitable nuclear sites and the operation of border power stations do pose some very definite problems, I believe it is vital and urgent for us to introduce the necessary procedures for consulting the public in order to win public opinion in the Member States of the Community over to the use of nuclear reactors for power generation. In this we should follow the example set by Sweden and Austria.

I come now to my two amendments and the motives underlying them. We have to decide whether, in the interests of protecting the Member States' sovereignty in the energy sector, we should perpetuate the existing over-centralization of decision-making processes, or whether we should rather promote the legitimate aspirations of local and regional authorities to participate in decisions that directly affect the safety and way of life of the people in these communities. Let me say that in no way are my amendments an attempt to deprive the national authorities of the right to formu-

Oehler

late their own nuclear energy programmes. On the contrary, their aim is simply to allow local and regional communities a real say in siting decisions. The European Parliament's support for this form of cooperation and consultation would without a doubt be properly appreciated by the populations concerned.

President. — I call Mr Skovmand.

Mr Skovmand. — (DK) Mr President, the question we are dealing with is an important one, but I do not think that the chosen procedures are the right ones. Is it reasonable to carry out such a debate only within the European Parliament? Should it not take place in a wider forum, in which all European countries are represented? One of Denmark's major problems in this respect is the Swedish power station at Barsebäck, which lies far too close to Copenhagen. The next largest are the power stations of the DDR, which in certain cases could threaten our southern regions. But will Sweden and the DDR take any notice of or participate in a system that has been previously established by the European Parliament, as indicated in Point 9 of the Resolution? I doubt it.

There are also problems in establishing fixed safety standards for nuclear power stations. The requirements which would be set in such standards could easily prove to be far too low. Standards today are much higher than they were only two or three years ago, and there is every probability that this trend will continue.

Finally, considerations of cost and pollution, and the cost of pollution, are too inexact. Nuclear power stations cost a great deal, even when they don't have accidents and cause pollution. But if a nuclear station were to be placed too near a large town in a neighbouring country, it would be necessary to spend large amounts on arrangements for protecting and if necessary evacuating the population of the town. But this has not been considered. For these reasons, the People's Party does not intend to vote for the resolution.

President. — I call Mrs Weber.

Mrs Weber. — (D) Mr President, I find myself addressing few gentlemen and even fewer ladies. We have reached the end of this debate, but I believe there are still a few points which have not been raised, and I hope to cover them.

In the debate on the planning of sites it really ought not to matter too much whether a facility is sited well inland or on a country's frontier. Four objectives should be pursued: firstly, safety and the protection of the public against disasters, secondly, supplies, thirdly, compatibility with the environment, these three objec-

tives being equally important. The fourth, and for myself and also for my party particularly important, objective is public approval. If we do not have public approval, we cannot seriously claim we are establishing policies for the people in our countries.

I believe that these objectives are particularly difficult to achieve and are all the more important when the facilities concerned are located in frontier regions. And in this Community we find again and again that in frontier regions in particular at least two and usually three of these objectives are not observed. There are practical examples of this.

If public approval is not obtained, all our countries will face increasing tendency for protest action resulting in no solution of any kind being found to our energy problems. I wonder what the advocates of nuclear energy will get out of this. This argument should perhaps be taken more seriously than in the past.

If environmental compatibility is not ensured, the result will probably be the disturbance of international relations. I should also like to give practical examples of this and ask Mr Calvez, who represents the position of his Government here, whether he can answer the question which have unfortunately not been answered in bilateral discussions, although the French, or rather Mr Calvez's party, repeatedly point out that bilateral discussions will produce the great solutions. They are practical questions, to which our Federal Office for the Environment and our Federal Internal Affairs Ministry have so far received no answer.

On Cattenom, for example, one question would be: who guarantees that part or all of the nuclear power station will be shut down if it is overloaded? Where is it planned to put the storage tanks for the 77 million m³ or so of water we need? Why are neither the German nor the Luxembourg authorities allowed to see existing French climatological studies? And finally, why is the third heat load plan of this international Commission so much poorer than its predecessors? This leads naturally on to the rejection of transfrontier cooperation on the Seveso directive and the application of the provisions already contained in the Euratom Treaty.

What point is there in our or your having your President proclaim the great European idea during talks at European level and in our electing a President of this Parliament from your party, who acts along European lines, when in practice we find you tabling amendments in support of so moderate a procedure as that proposed by Mrs von Alemann? You want us to delete 10 out of 13 paragraphs and to water down the other two? That would mean doing less than what the Euratom Treaty provides for. I thought we were here to add to the Treaties where they are found to be lacking. This is certainly necessary in the case of policy on energy and the environment. What we must most definitely avoid is falling back behind what was

Weber

considered to form the basis of our common destiny as long ago as 1957.

President. — I call Mr Davignon.

Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission. — (F) The Commission welcomes the fact that Parliament has reopened the debate on this question, without which we should not have had the benefit of Mrs von Alemann's report, which identifies precisely, objectively and clearly the dimension of the problem, the anomalies with which we are faced and the action that remains to be taken. I should like, on behalf of the Commission, to thank her for giving us this opportunity to put the problems to you.

Perhaps I should add, Mr President, that not everyone who has spoken in this debate has approached the problem with the same clarity, precision and objectivity.

Mr President, the Commission is ready at any time to open a debate on the usefulness of nuclear energy. May I say, however, that it would hardly be impressed by some of the arguments advanced, the theoretical thrust of which is to bring about an improvement in a situation in order to be able, in effect, to destroy the very *raison d'être* of these controls, because there would be nothing left of the nuclear industry, whether close to borders or not! Mr President, the next item on the agenda concerns the economic situation of the European Community in the context of the conflict between Iran and Iraq. We are going to look at our weaknesses and the price we are going to have to pay in the event of another rise in the cost of oil.

We cannot in the immediate future lessen our economic dependence by turning our backs on nuclear energy. Let those that wish to do so understand and let them spell out the facts about the economic consequences of turning our backs on the alternative energy source which is at our disposal.

Having said that, Mr President, quite clearly — and this is the Commission's view — the kind of development we are looking for will be stifled as long as there is uncertainty, ignorance of the rules and, generally speaking, a negative attitude to the pursuit of a *reasonable* nuclear policy.

Of course, nuclear installations on borders pose an additional problem arising out of difficulties that are partly psychological and partly factual. All those who have said that the siting of a nuclear reactor near a border creates tension have a certain amount of right on their side. The question is whether we want to overcome this tension or to use it to ban nuclear installations? That is a different set of options.

The option the Commission has decided to pursue is as follows: How can we create the conditions that will allow safety considerations and economic justification to be examined sensibly on the basis of sound information duly made available to all concerned? That is an area where the Community has a role to play, because the Community — and, more specifically, the Commission — is not involved with building nuclear power stations and therefore has no government policy on the matter and no vested interest, and because it can therefore contribute the necessary objectivity on which to base a valid assessment of the situation. What the Community does is to create, especially in connection with loans, the financial conditions that can help to secure the alternative energy sources we need. But the choice is made by the users and not by the Community or by the Commission, let there be no doubt about that. And I cannot resist the temptation of saying at this point — even though Mr Damette is not in the House — that for the first time in a long while a spokesman for the French Communist Party has succeeded in surprising me. In fact, if I understood him correctly, he deplored the fact that we were not discussing in this Assembly the deployment of tactical nuclear weapons in the Community. I have always been led to believe that the French Communist Party was against defence questions being discussed in this Parliament. I duly take note that it has had a change of heart.

The second point I should like make is that there is a need to be clear about what the articles of the Treaty actually mean. The Commission is not afraid to use the Treaty, but one must beware of reading into the Treaty what is not there and one cannot make proper use of the Treaty by distorting its provisions. Under Article 37 the Member States have a duty to provide the Commission with such general data relating to any plan for the disposal of radioactive waste in any form liable to result in the radioactive contamination of the water, soil or airspace of another Member State. This has to be done six months before the reactor is commissioned, that is to say before this radioactive waste causes any actual contamination. That is the long and the short of Article 37. Like it or not, that is what it says! Under the present circumstances it cannot really be said, therefore, that this or that Member State has ignored or failed to comply with its obligations under Article 37 or its obligations under Article 41 in relation to investments. But I readily concede to Mr Abens that this does not entirely resolve our problem. What one cannot say, however, is that they are breaking the Treaty. That is the point I wanted to make so that there can be no misunderstanding on this matter. Either we know what we are arguing about or we do not argue at all. And it is precisely because the provisions of the Treaty are worded in this way it has apparently been necessary to resort to procedures that allow matters of substance to be discussed in a spirit of reason and in the hope that all parties can find some common ground. That is what we are trying to achieve in these consultation

Davignon

procedures when there are several parties involved but in the course of which the Community has from the outset no legal power to intervene. That is as much our problem as knowing how exactly to achieve this objective in practical terms.

In this connection, the excellent report by Mrs Walz led the Commission to draw up some proposals, and I must say that I was a little surprised to hear Mr Coppieters accuse us of amending our proposal without consulting Parliament again. I have made a quick check and the only changes I can find record of are such as would have delighted Mr Coppieters, since we have now included — something that did not previously figure in the explanatory memorandum — the number of transfrontier nuclear installations showing the scale of the problem and, secondly, after the events at Three Mile Island we did stress the importance of having a clear idea of the kind of measures that needed to be taken, since the difficulties encountered so far in this area have been surmountable — thank heavens! And so the idea of consulting Parliament when we are working along the lines laid down by it seems to me to be pushing formalism too far. Of course, if I have misunderstood Mr Coppieters I have no doubt that he will put me right on another occasion . . .

Mr Coppieters. — (*F*) What I actually said was that the Commission was right, but that Parliament had not yet expressed an opinion!

Mr Davignon. — (*F*) I have always had a very high regard for any Member of the European Parliament who credited the Commission with being in the right. Thank you, Mr Coppieters.

Now, we find ourselves in the position of having to see what we can do in practical terms. And in this connection there is a proposal in Mrs von Alemann's report which the Commission approves, given the provisions as they stand at the moment. I do not in fact place much faith in what is currently under discussion within the Council, that is to say a decision the effect of which would be to recommend bilateral talks in which the Commission could at a given moment intervene as mediator or arbitrator if the two states are unable to agree among themselves.

Mr President, the role of the Commission as defined by the Treaties is not one of conciliation or mediation. Its role is fairly plainly spelt out: It is to assume its responsibilities as a policy-making body and express its views on a certain range of matters. To reduce it to that of a benevolent kind of mediator does not seem to me to correspond to the role it ought to perform, to the extent that it is expected not only to reconcile two differing positions but also to provide certain kinds of

basic information which will ensure that a nuclear power station can be built under acceptable conditions. And therefore I think it would be dangerous to set our sights lower than does Mrs von Alemann because that would be to deny ourselves the objectivity necessary to deal adequately with the problem. I have to add right away that the Council's position at this time is exactly as I have described it: to go less far, to suggest bilateral discussions and to give the Commission a residual role. I have told you why I do not look with any favour on this solution.

And now, for the sake of good order, I should like briefly to comment on one or two of the amendments since the debate has largely centred around them and I should not wish there to be any misunderstanding about what the Commission's position is. I shall deal with the most essential ones.

May I first say to Mrs von Alemann that we are entirely happy with her new version of paragraph 2. It accurately reflects our present position and it is vital for us to make every effort to draw up Community safety standards. That is very important indeed. That should be our starting point. It will facilitate constructive consultations at Community level because, by comparing different safety measures parameter by parameter, we shall be able to determine whether or not, using different methodologies, we arrive at the same result. This is all the more important as our analysis of the different legal provisions in the various Member States leads us to suppose that they are comparable as regards the result and not very different from the point of view of the safety standards they set.

I would like to say to Mr Gendebien that as regards his Amendment No 5, to paragraph 2, in which he calls for a ban on the construction of nuclear power stations within 50 km of any border with another Member State or with a third country, I have the feeling that he has carried out his exercise on a map, as I did, for example the map of a country known to us both and he well knows the results — I am against the amendment.

In her Amendment No 26, Mrs Lizin suggests — as several others have done — that in implementing Article 37 it should be possible to find a way of introducing more sensible time limits which would allow more time to form an opinion. We are for this amendment.

We are entirely behind Mr Gendebien's Amendment No 8, in which he deplores the Council's failure to define its position.

Mr Galland's Amendment No 41 raises an extremely important problem which concerns, in a Community like ours, the situation it is in, that is to say where certain countries, through a certain number of economic options they have taken to diminish their

Davignon

dependence, to improve their balance of payments position, to strengthen their currency and economy, have decided to invest in alternative energy sources. Should they be deprived of this option, until such time as Economic Union has become a reality, simply because other states have decided not to take the same attitude and are prepared as a result to put up with the economic handicaps? Can they, moreover, create problems for the others? This is an absolutely fundamental political problem and, to us at any rate, this seems to justify setting up a consultative procedure. It should not be possible, however, for those who decide, for example, to take the radical option — as is their right — of never resorting to the nuclear alternative, to prevent other states who have access to the water they need and where the geography is such as to enable them to build a nuclear power station from doing so, provided, of course, that the safety conditions we spoke of earlier are met.

I believe that in a democracy what matters is that everyone should have their rights, but it is unacceptable that some should have more rights than others, to the extent that one believes that from the outset one option is automatically to be regarded as being preferable to the other. I am not saying that the nuclear option is necessarily better than the other; what I am saying is that the non-nuclear option ought not necessarily deprive other states of the choice they have made.

Secondly, may I say with reference to Mrs Lizin's Article 37 that one needs nevertheless to beware of undervaluing what the Treaty has to offer just because the conditions laid down by it are not being met. If the standards laid down by the Treaty are not being met, the Commission is empowered under Article 38 to take the requisite steps to re-examine the decision taken at national level.

I should now like to comment on Amendment No 9 of Mr Gendebien's in which he — and indeed the same point was made by Mr Damette and Mrs Bonino in their speeches, but I address my reply to Mr Gendebien, without wishing to single him out in any way, because Mr Damette and Mrs Bonino were more interested in putting to me their case than listening to my reply — I want to say to him, therefore, with reference to this Amendment No 6, that the Commission needs no prompting to take a firm stand with the governments of the Member States or with the electricity-generating companies. We serve no one, we serve only the interests of the Treaty and the objectives we are seeking to promote. And a paragraph such as this might foster the belief that we could be swayed by the electricity producers. I am still waiting to see on what basis such a statement could be made. As for the disputes we always seem to have with the states, one might be dissatisfied with the outcome, but certainly not displeased with the fact that we are constantly striving, as in this instance in support of Mrs von Alemann's report, to achieve practical results.

And in this context I, in my turn, should like to put a question to those who call on the Commission to act in compliance with their wishes. I am interested to know now what Parliament's attitude will be — bearing in mind that this report is addressed more to the Council than to the Commission — when the Council acknowledges that it is in possession of the report but will not show undue haste in acting on it. And I wonder if, when the time comes, we shall again see a number of resolutions couched in the same terms and under the same circumstances calling for vital action.

Mrs Lizin's Amendment No 28, suggesting the addition of Article 41 seems to us to be an improvement. Mr Gendebien's Amendment No 12, suggesting an impact study covering the border areas to provide us with the fullest possible data, is also good. We should very much like to go along with Mr Sassano, who wants acceptable sites for nuclear installations indicated on a map of Europe. This looks to us like an exercise that is liable to follow the familiar pattern, that is to say that each state will be agreeable to such a procedure for a neighbouring state. Accordingly, I do not believe that this road would lead us very far. On the other hand, I am in agreement with Mr Coppiepers, Mr Capanna and Mrs Bonino, whose Amendment No 31 seeks to define more clearly the responsibility of the Member State or the local authorities as regards payment of compensation in the event of a pollution problem arising in spite of the measures adopted.

Mr President, forgive me for having been somewhat technical and going into detail on some matters but I believe that it is the Commission's role to inform Parliament of its position on the amendments put down in relation to a matter with which it has been entrusted by Parliament. And I shall conclude by saying that for us this matter is an important one. It is not simply a debate on the pros and cons of nuclear energy. Those who seek to open a debate on this question seem to us, on this occasion, to be wrong. The problem is to know, seeing that we are a Community, what conclusions to draw in relation to activities which should be made to conform to certain standards and the implications of which — to talk in rational terms and not in the apocalyptic language used by some of the speakers — other states ought to be aware of. The more information available, the lesser the anxiety and anguish. In this respect, the articles of the Treaty as originally drawn up are incomplete. The substantive and procedural recommendations contained in Mrs von Alemann's report, amended if necessary but bearing in mind the comments we have made, is in our view therefore a renewed joint effort on the part of Parliament and the Commission to settle this question. That is what gives me real cause for satisfaction.

IN THE CHAIR: MR KATZER

Vice-President

President. — I call Mrs von Alemann.

Mrs von Alemann, rapporteur. — (D) Mr President, I have basically three remarks to make. Firstly, it is natural for there to be friction between policies at frontiers, particularly in a Community which has really only been in existence for 30 years. It is therefore important that we should discuss openly and be quite frank about how we can minimize these frictional losses. So I am pleased that this has clearly not been for the most part, as was also the case in committee, a debate for or against nuclear energy, but a debate concerned with practical aspects of the Community as it is today and that it cannot now come to a vote for or against nuclear energy. I have tried to reflect the committee's will in my report.

Secondly, I should like to say that the report also attempts to say — and I am therefore rather sorry about what Mr Coppieters said — that we should at present do what can be done. The Commissioner has just reiterated how difficult the negotiations with the Council are at present and no doubt will continue to be in the future, and so I also realize that the question of the siting of nuclear power stations, which was discussed in the Walz report, is not dealt with so expressly in the new report and that we have simply taken account of the facts, of which we are, of course, all aware, particularly those of us who were once members of a provincial or federal parliament. I nevertheless believe that, if a majority votes in favour of this report, it may give the Council an impression of how we Members of this European Parliament want to help to remove the frontiers and reduce the frictional losses.

Thirdly, and lastly, I should like to make the following quite clear: the subject is too serious to be discussed in personal terms. We should not be having a debate for or against a country. It is not a question of a country feeling that it is being attacked here or of a political party in one country or other believing it must defend national interests to the extent that it rejects everything in a report which was adopted by the majority of a committee. The subject should really be seen as an example of those areas in which the Community still has ground to make up and in which all of us can help to eliminate these frictional losses and to improve European cooperation between neighbours.

President. — I call Mr Coppieters to speak on a point of order.

Mr Coppieters. — (NL) Mr President, taking advantage of the fact that Mr Davignon mentioned my name in his statement, I should just like to clarify one point. It concerns the explanatory memorandum of May 1979. What I said was that it is a rather weaker version of an earlier viewpoint, and that we did not have an opportunity to discuss the Commission's new position, which really should have been the case. It was therefore the other way around, Mr Davignon.

President. — I call Mr Gendebien.

Mr Gendebien. — (F) Mr President, I would like to ask the Commissioner what he thinks of my Amendment No 13, which concerns the need to draw up common plans for the protection and evacuation of inhabitants of frontier regions, particularly those areas where nuclear reactors are already sited. I feel this is one important point on which the report has nothing to say. I should be pleased to hear the Commission's view on this matter.

President. — I call Mr Davignon.

Mr Davignon. — (F) My position on this is as follows. What we are hoping from Mrs von Alemann's report is the creation of the general conditions that apply to any procedure relating to transfrontier aspects. I think that in that particular context I am in agreement with Mr Gendebien. On the other hand, I am not in agreement with the way he has worded his amendment, which gives the impression that evacuation needs to be organized as soon as a nuclear power station is built. Perhaps I am interpreting his text rather literally, in which case he might wish to change it. What I believe is true is that in the context of consultation, since there are safety standards, it is necessary to know how they will be applied and how to cope with any difficulty that might arise. That is a matter for consultation between local and regional authorities in the border areas, which seems perfectly reasonable to me. But I believe that it needs to be given a strictly neutral interpretation, free of any bias in favour of one aspect as against another.

President. — The debate is closed.

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

10. *Deadline for tabling amendments — Agenda*

President. — The deadline for tabling amendments to the report by Mr Kirk on fisheries, which is included on the agenda for Thursday's sitting under Item No

President

236, has been extended until 1 p.m. tomorrow, Wednesday, as the report was only today adopted in committee.

Another report by Mr Kirk (Item No 237) was not adopted in committee and has therefore been withdrawn from the agenda for Thursday.

11. *Community oil supplies from the Middle East*

President. — The next item is the oral question with debate (Doc. 1-592/80) by Mr Müller-Hermann and Mr Vergeer, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group), Mr Seligman, on behalf of the European Democratic Group, Mr Linkohr, on behalf of the Socialist Group, Mr Galland, Mr Calvez, Mr Ippolito and Mr Veronesi to the Commission:

Subject: Community's oil supplies from the Middle East

1. What is the assessment of the Commission of recent developments in the Middle East for the Community's energy policy?
2. Will the Commission report the steps taken to ensure the continuity of the Community's oil supplies?
3. In the light of the serious situation in the Middle East, does the Commission now accept the need for a dynamic Community energy policy, to be expressed by early decision on the Parliament's resolutions for actions in the energy sector?

I call Mr Müller-Hermann.

Mr Müller-Hermann. — (D) Mr President, the question we are now discussing has the backing of a very large majority of this Parliament. We shall have to discuss it again — I hope at the December part-session in the presence of the Council — because it expresses all Parliament's concern about the unfortunate lack of progress we have so far made towards a common energy policy.

Today we address the Commission, which we can really only accuse of not doing enough to gain acceptance for its views in the Council. But our question is really addressed to the Council itself, which — and I must put it in these uncompromising terms — must be accused of irresponsible inactivity. The question has been sparked off by the recent developments which have followed the obvious instability in the Middle East, that is to say the conflict between Iran and Iraq, which six months ago we might not have thought possible and which has resulted in the loss of two important oil-producing countries as sources of supply for the industrial countries.

In fact, we owe it to Saudi Arabia, the Emirates and Kuwait that the resulting gap has now been filled as a result of their decision not to reduce oil production by

10 % as originally planned. They are undoubtedly doing this to help the world, but it is in fact, and we must remember this, not in their own interests, which consist in leaving as much oil as possible in the ground for as long as possible. I feel it is important for the House to note this, because we are apt to be all too quick to blame the oil-producing countries when we are talking about energy supply difficulties or about the dangers of inflation.

Ladies and gentlemen, in their efforts to calm the public the national governments and the Council will tell us that our oil tanks are filled to the brim, giving us enough oil for 120 to 130 days, known as the strategic reserve, which we need and do not want to touch. The Council and the governments are not drawing the necessary conclusions from continued political and economic uncertainty in the Middle East, and we are not making the desired and necessary progress with our policy of reducing our excessive dependence on oil. This reference to the full oil tanks in fact results in everyone believing that things are not so bad, we will get by. But that is not a responsible policy in the long term.

I should also like to point out that the United States — under its new Presidency — will undoubtedly make considerable efforts to exploit its own energy resources at home and in countries nearby and so reduce its dependence on Middle East oil to such an extent that it will certainly not be dependent on imports from the Middle East in 1990, or in about 10 years, as it is today. But we will undoubtedly continue to be largely dependent on supplies from the Middle East. Nor shall we be able to count on the Americans, as we have done in the past, to ensure the safety of the transport routes and peace and stability in this area. That is, in my view, a further reason why we should expect the Commission and Council to make the greatest possible effort to release the Community from this excessive dependence on Middle East oil. We call for an early decision because all of us who know this subject are aware that it is at least 8 to 10 years before political decisions taken today have the desired effect on energy supplies. Decisions not taken today and repeatedly put off can only mean our facing even greater difficulties in the future.

We unfortunately find that, even though we are now doing more than in the past, the Council will be far from capable of achieving the objectives set by the Community. This is undoubtedly true, for example, of the efforts being made to conserve energy. What we have achieved is in effect the consequence of the recession, not an attempt at more effective savings in the private sector, in transport and in industry.

As regards research and development, where there is an urgent need for work to be done, we all saw what the Council's attitude is during the recent debates on the budget; rigorous cutbacks on completely unjusti-

Müller-Hermann

fied grounds, a particularly clear illustration of the contradiction between words and deeds.

Coal production in the Community is increasing only very slowly, if at all. And, to quote one of Mr Brunner's last remarks, only 8 gigawatt coal-fired power stations and 16 gigawatt oil-fired power stations are being built at present. As we all know — even the President of the Council, Mr Thorn, mentioned this during his inaugural speech — the Governments announced a major programme in Venice aimed at the increased utilization of imported coal in the Community. There is nothing wrong with this, but we must realize that for a programme of this kind the requirements in terms of cargo space, port capacities, storage capacities and transport and processing facilities are enormous — but here we have so far seen nothing but false starts. I would also point out that, if the coal programme was incorporated into a coal processing programme, it would offer tremendous opportunities for making progress with regional matters in the Community, for example through the construction of port facilities with appropriate processing equipment in Italy or Ireland.

I must also refer to the export of nuclear power, on which, as we have just seen again, there are undoubtedly differences of opinion in this House. But Mr Brunner has just stated that only 70 gigawatts will be available in the Community by 1985 instead of the 160 gigawatts originally planned. The only country pursuing a consistent policy in this field — and it has my congratulations — is France. Which ever way we look at it, the only real alternative for the next 20 years, apart from coal — where there are also major problems — will be nuclear power.

I should like to draw your attention to a final point, and perhaps Mr Davignon will say something about this. For a long time now we have been pointing out to the Council and Commission that enormous capital procurement problems are associated with the solution of the energy problems. Has the Community or have the national governments any practical directions or proposals to make on this?

Instead, things are left to take their own course. In the same context, I feel the European Community must also tackle the problem known for brevity's sake as the 'recycling of the oil millions'. This year — and the picture will be similar in the years to come — we will find we have surpluses of 130 000 m dollars in our trade with the oil-producing countries, but enormous current account deficits with the industrial countries — and even larger deficits with the Third World, although we all know that the developing countries are already up to their necks in debt. We must therefore find and develop long-term means of obtaining energy supplies, in addition to the existing means, so that the capital that is accumulating in the 'wrong' place is channelled to the regions, where there is an

urgent need, particularly so that energy supplies can be safeguarded for the future.

We cannot simply say that this is all being done by the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund or the international banking system. The European Community, as one of the economically strongest regions of the world, also has a responsibility, and I must stress this.

In the short time available to me I have had to confine myself to the fundamental issues and, as I have said before, we will be discussing the whole subject again. Mr President, I would ask you to ensure that this discussion takes place in the presence of the President of the Council, because it is not primarily the Commission, but the Council which is to blame for the absence of a European energy policy. The Council must account for itself, because, where the long-term security of our Community is concerned, it is in the dock. All we can do today is ask the Commission what it can do to persuade the Council at long last to take the decisions that are urgently needed.

President. — I call Mr Davignon.

Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission. — (F) At this point I should like to be relatively brief, for two reasons.

The first is that we have drawn up a document summarizing the various problems arising in connection with the Community's energy policy. It covers very many of the questions raised by Mr Müller-Hermann and will be in the hands of the Committee on Energy before the end of the week. It seems to me that the timing of this report is very fortunate, given the situation in which we find ourselves at the moment.

We are in fact very conscious of the fact that not enough is done in the energy field, that Community action here is essential, but that some of the Council's budget decisions have been — to put it very mildly — surprising.

I should like now to turn more specifically to the situation in which the Community finds itself in the light of the prolongation of the conflict between Iran and Iraq. I feel it essential to take a balanced view of the situation, for it would be just as wrong to regard it as verging on the catastrophic as it would to adopt a totally complacent attitude.

In either case we should have to suffer the consequences of an over-simplified approach. If we say that the situation is inherently so serious as to make the Community and its nine Member States incapable of overcoming these problems we shall be digging our own grave. For the economic operators — the com

Davignon

panies, the States, the consumers — will think that the situation will become so desperate as to warrant protective measures being taken at any price. And when I say 'at any price', that is precisely what I mean. The implication would be that oil should be obtained wherever it is available, regardless of the price at which we ought to be buying it. The result would be the same as we experienced during the Iran crisis of 1979. Firstly, the upsurge in activity on the free markets would lead the oil-producing countries to divert a large proportion of their supplies away from the normal trading channels towards the free markets; secondly, the oil-producing countries would consider it their right to obtain for the 95 % of production that does not find its way onto the free market the same prices as prevail on that market.

Just as we are wrestling with an economic situation produced by the second oil crisis, we have to face the threat of a third oil crisis at a time when the economic picture is particularly bleak.

Let me add that I am not quite sure how we shall find the resources necessary to implement the reconversion policies for the steel industry which we were discussing earlier on: an investment policy, an innovation policy and a policy of change and a transfer of production to the energy sector. On the other hand, it would be wrong to be too complacent and to think that, just because our stocks are rather high at the moment, the present situation does not yet give grounds for serious concern, so that we can allow events to take their course. I believe that if we adopt too lax an approach developments could well teach us just how mistaken such an approach was. Despite all the efforts made no one can say today how long the conflict between Iraq and Iran will last. It is difficult to estimate with any precision the extent of the damage to the oil installations or to say when, once the fighting has been brought to an end, the oil will begin to flow again. The vital thing seems to me to be therefore coordination between the Community countries coupled with a determination to keep the situation under control. It therefore appears to me particularly important that Parliament should have decided today to put an oral question on this subject, since the Council is meeting on 27 November, that is in just over one week, after which the European Council will be meeting and will certainly want to analyse developments in the energy sector, and this will be followed, around 8 December, by the meeting of all the Western countries affected by these oil problems, in other words the need to cooperate with the United States and Japan. Why? Because the United States must also pursue a sensible policy on imports, and an extremely dynamic policy on the use they make of their own resources. It is also imperative that we have the same cooperation with Japan, which must shoulder its own share of the responsibility for the sound functioning of the international economic system and, with that objective in view, take the measures necessary to deal with the situation, just as we ourselves are doing.

It is often a little pointless to quote figures, but I should nevertheless like to mention a few. We have a situation in which the loss of Iranian or Iraqi exports represents around 12 % on average of the Community's supplies at a time when our economic situation was more healthy than it is at present. What we have to compensate, therefore, is not that figure but a lower one. Since our economic activity has declined for the moment, our need for energy has also diminished. Furthermore, the situation today is very different from what it was at the time of the Iranian crisis, since stocks are at a level well above the obligatory 90 days. They are in fact situated at between 110 and 120 days, which means that we have a substantial buffer which will help us to overcome the difficulties ahead. We are therefore far from powerless.

What is the situation on the markets? I believe we find two things. Firstly, we find a tendency on the free market to a constant but slow rise in prices, which ought not to alarm us unduly but which is a development to which we must devote very careful attention. Secondly, we find that the price on the State oil market is relatively stable, with none of the upheavals associated with the Iranian crisis. We must therefore be certain that when the Council meets on 27 November it will translate into fact this starting position, the key factor of which is a firm determination to keep the situation under control. We cannot, without endangering our economic future, allow a perfectly manageable situation to get out of hand because of a lack of coordination between the Member States and between the Community and our other partners, or because we do too little too late.

That is why the Commission has submitted procedures and objectives to the Council for consideration on 27 November and that is why I believe that we shall arrive at some satisfactory solutions at that meeting. The preparatory work reflects a sound grasp of the situation I have just described, which gives no cause for alarm but certainly cause for concerted action. And I have faith in the weight which Parliament will bring to bear in a matter that concerns all our citizens. I believe that lack of action at European level in an area where it is perfectly feasible would spell a mortal blow to our economy. Such a situation would obviously be intolerable both to Parliament and the Commission. But I think that the Council will act along the lines I have just sketched out and that, when we get onto the more general discussion on all the aspects of the energy problems, we shall be able to work out the procedural measures and policies to be adopted by the Council so as to enable the Community to keep the situation under control, something which, as I have pointed out repeatedly, is absolutely essential.

President — I call Mr Linkohr to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Linkohr — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the background to the debate now taking place in this Chamber, with so very few Members present, is a serious one. It is so serious that I feel I must contradict Mr Davignon for saying that we have instruments for mastering the situation. I contradict him on this, because the situation is rather different. I believe that it is not only in Europe that our energy policy has become unpredictable. None of the leading experts in the world, no one in this House could have predicted the present conflict in the Middle East. None of us knows what turn this conflict will take over the next few days and months or whether the super powers will intervene, for example. We have here a classic case of nervousness resulting in war. We should bear this in mind.

In addition, I find no comfort at all in the stocks we have to ensure our supplies for 120 or 130 days. We are dealing here with the situation in the Middle East as a whole, an area on which we are really dependent. France, for example, derives 25 % of its oil from Iraq, Italy 17 %. We know that about two-thirds of our oil passes through the Strait of Hormuz, which is now threatened by the war. This is a cause for concern.

It is not only a question of the danger of war and concern for oil supplies, but also of our balance of trade, which is becoming increasingly negative. And there is a great temptation to restore this balance of trade by exporting arms. We also find that that is a field in which some countries of the Community are quite efficient. We should be restricting oil consumption in the Community rather than paying for more oil by supplying weapons.

It should also be remembered that prices are on the move. It may very well be that we manage to get the quantity problem under control, but the same cannot be said of prices. This is illustrated by an example from the recent past: when the Shah was toppled in Iran, oil supplies fell by a mere 3 %, but prices rose by 100 %. The profits went into the pockets of those who are usually referred to as multinational companies and who are today preparing to become tomorrow's major energy companies.

There is also the difference in the assessment of this situation by the United States and Europe, or more specifically by the Member States of the Community. Everyone is undoubtedly pursuing a policy of *sauve qui peut*. There is no Community policy in this respect. I feel this is the crux of the problem in this Community. What we have in fact are national camps, with each nation attempting to react to these problems on its own. But what is lacking is a Community policy really worthy of the name. If it comes to a crisis, the Community may be involved, because the crisis-management system we have in the Community is purely and simply the sum of nine national crisis-management policies, which are not even coordinated.

This morning I read in the newspaper that the French Government had advised the companies not to take oil out of the allegedly full tanks, but to buy on the spot market. Of course, the spot market prices will then shoot up, which is hardly surprising. If other governments are already using their stocks. I ask myself what is meant by a common policy. This crisis must give rise to a common energy policy with oil conservation as its principal objective. There can be little arguing about that, because it has been said often enough in this House. We must succeed in this principally because we have lived far too long on this cheap oil owing to the military superiority of the industrial nations over the developing countries and our consequent ability to exploit them. We have therefore behaved like thieves who, having stolen once, believe they can do so again every year without being caught. Everyone is caught eventually, and I hope it does not happen to us too soon.

(Applause)

President — I call Mr Herman to speak on behalf of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

Mr Herman — (F) Mr President, if the press reports are correct, the Commission is to forward to the Council at the end of the month a series of proposals concerning six points which have been communicated to us.

The first consists in getting the governments to discourage the oil companies from buying at excessively high prices. That is undoubtedly a good intention, but how are you going to persuade the governments which are themselves giving a very bad example, for if the information we have on the Rotterdam spot market is right, it is purchases instigated by the French Government which are causing such an upsurge in prices! Furthermore, some of the Community countries have signed bilateral supply contracts, and one may be entitled to wonder whether, to forestall a new increase and new shortages, they will not themselves rush into a spate of panic buying, given the scant influence which some of these countries have on the big supply companies. Our first question is therefore: How is the Commission going to persuade the governments, what legal instruments can it use to bring pressure to bear on them in an effort to discipline the markets?

The second point on which you also want proposals to be submitted is reduction of demand. There, of course, we have to trust the Member States themselves to organize the reduction in demand and consumption. But many of these States are poorly prepared and the situation varies appreciably from one country to another. Does the Commission envisage Community

Herman

laws which would help to fill the gaps left by national legislation in this connection?

The third problem is stock management. How can the companies be persuaded to draw on their stocks rather than go to the spot market? This interesting question ties in with another, more complex, problem, since the stocks of certain Community countries are situated in other Community countries. Would not the enactment of Community legislation guaranteeing the free availability of stocks established by one country on the territory of another be a practical and effective way of improving stock management? This appears to me self-evident, but in a panic situation everyone is afraid that countries which have on their territory stocks established by other countries will put national interest before free movement, using the crisis or the shortage as a pretext. What is needed therefore is Community legislation that would guarantee free movement and use of stocks.

As regards measures to increase production, it is plain that we have not as yet explored the possibilities offered by flexibility of production. Let me explain. In North Sea oil extraction, as in any rational production operation, the actual flow is not the theoretical maximum flow because, firstly, we want to recover the gas and, secondly, we have to carry out servicing and overhauls. This gives a certain flexibility permitting production to be raised in the short term, say for a few months, even though it could not be done in the long term without risk to the environment, production, etc.

Since it may be assumed that the war between Iraq and Iran will not last for years it is possible that in the shorter term — for a year or a year and a half — use could be made of the oil companies' capacity to increase their rate of extraction so as to meet market needs over a fairly short period.

The fifth problem is that of prices. It is now plain that efforts to distribute stocks and supplies more fairly between the countries in accordance with their needs could be thwarted by the huge distortions of consumer prices still prevalent in the Community. Steps should surely be taken to remove the advantages or disadvantages systematically enjoyed or suffered by individual supply regions.

Finally, as regards the problems of allocating quotas in times of shortage, I believe that under the International Energy Agency agreements the Commission or the international authorities may, when certain levels of shortage are established, take measures to allocate supply quotas. Would it not be useful to have intermediate stages where the Commission could already be given powers without waiting for the development of an excessively serious shortage, which could result from a fall-off in supply on the markets?

There, Mr Davignon, are some questions that I would like to put to you on the eve of the meeting we shall be

having with the Council. Is the Commission not perhaps a little timid and not specific enough in the proposals which it is to put forward? Would it not carry more conviction in its dealings with the Member States if its proposals were more coherent and more thoroughly worked out?

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

Mr Seligman. — Mr President, I thank the Commissioner for his reassuring speech, even though I find it very hard to agree with him. I must support the deep concern of our other speakers so far in this debate. Last week people were talking as if the Iraq-Iran war was nearly over and saying that the West had ridden the storm. The major attack this weekend reminds us that the storm is still continuing. It is going to get worse. Mr President, you will remember the Bible story of Belshazzars Feast. Over 2 000 years ago Belshazzar was King of Babylon — the very country now involved in the war with Iran. During an ungodly feast mysterious fingers wrote unintelligible messages on the wall. These were called the writing on the wall. Only the prophet Daniel could interpret this message. It said 'you are weighed in the balance and found wanting; your kingdom is divided'. Those fingers might well have been talking about Europe today and the divided situation we have on energy policy. I could substitute Davignon for Daniel.

The Community reaction to the latest oil crisis is definitely inadequate. We still have no united energy policy. Our response to this crisis has been too little and too late and we are dancing at the feast, oblivious. How many more warnings must we have before we heed the writing on the wall? How much longer is Europe to be dependent for its energy supplies and its whole economy on an unstable part of the world?

As a result of the present war 4 million barrels of oil a day have been lost, 3·2 to the West and 0·8 to Comecon. The main losers have been France, Brazil, Japan and Austria. But the full effect of this has been delayed because oil tankers already on the high seas have continued to deliver their load at the pre-war rate. Also, Saudi Arabia has increased its production to 10·4 million barrels a day and the West has built up enormous stocks which are helping us at the moment. But despite all this, speculation has bumped up oil prices by 42 % in the last 6 weeks, and I do not understand Commissioner Davignon's contention that it is a steady controlled increase. It is not. And this increase has come about because we have ignored Sheikh Yamani's request to use the stocks to avoid a price scramble. Indeed, as Mr Linkohr was saying earlier on, France seems to have ignored this request and is, in fact, asking people not to use their stocks to stabilize prices. And this is very bad.

Seligman

Has the Commission studied what may happen to this already precarious situation? What if Kuwait is drawn into the battle? What if Saudi Arabia decides to bring pressure to bear on the Americans to solve the Arab-Israel crisis by cutting off their oil supplies, as they could easily do. OPEC could run perfectly happily on only 20 million barrels of oil a day. They do not need to sell 28 million. What would happen if the powers hostile to the West managed to close the Straits of Hormuz? That would lose 15 million barrels of oil a day, one-third of our total consumption. So this situation is really not tenable.

The Council must move faster to reduce the Community's dependence on oil. If the Council fails, look what a grim prospect faces us. Rationing on the lines that the Americans are now preparing, a ban on Sunday motoring, a ban on leisure boating, temperature restrictions in buildings. But above all, the Community will have to abandon all prospect of a resumption of economic growth and a solution to our oil-induced inflation and the high unemployment which it produces.

In six weeks' time we shall have a new Commission and a new Energy Commissioner. I hope the new Commission will adopt a more effective role in this crisis. I do not mean that it has got to take more powers or spend more money, but it must persuade Member States that joint action is absolutely necessary, and the Commission must act as a coordinator, especially of investment in energy.

Within the European Democratic Group, Mr President, we have emphasized the close link between energy investment and economic recovery. We consider that one of the best solutions to unemployment and inflation is a dynamic energy investment policy financed partly by some form of energy tax or oil import levy and partly by loans. With a new President in the White House who believes in the necessity of nuclear power and the need to set free private enterprise in the energy sector, as well as in increasing exploration and much more energetic conservation, we now have an opportunity to go flat out for a major investment initiative in energy conservation and alternative fuels. Together with him Europe must initiate real discussions with the OPEC nations and the world financial institutions on how to recycle OPEC surpluses.

The oil companies and some governments often say that there is no shortage of money for energy investment. I challenge this. The oil companies may well have plenty of money to invest in relatively profitable, riskless projects, but will they invest in the marginal, long-term projects like enhanced oil recovery, exploration for oil in the Third World, nuclear power investment in the smaller Member States of the Community who cannot afford it but need it? New financial initiatives for these aims are urgently required. And this is where the Community can fulfil

an important coordinating and stimulating role. I welcome the decision to increase the Ortolí facility by 500 million units of account. That is very welcome, but it is only a drop in the ocean. We need 50 million units of account for investment in energy every year for the next 10 years, and we need also a lot more for investment in the Third World. That is why we want to recycle OPEC surpluses. That is why we advocate an oil import and production levy or some sort of energy tax.

Incidentally, I would like to quickly clear up one illusion on the oil import levy. As it is conceived, Britain would not benefit from it any more than any other Member State. The North Sea produces thin, high-grade oil. It does not produce the heavy oil that we have to import. Britain imported 54 million tonnes of crude oil last year — half our total production. As I see it, we would have to pay a levy on that amount, just like any other Member State. Furthermore, Britain would have to pay a levy on the oil she produces, as I understand the Commission's plan. So Britain is going to be exactly on the same basis as everyone else where this import levy is concerned, and I would like the Commissioner to confirm that.

Finally, Mr President, a word on energy prices and taxes. They greatly affect the fair competition that we all advocate in the Community. Britain has pursued a clear policy to discourage the use of energy by raising the price of all energies to compare with world oil prices. This is a harsh policy, but it is the right one. It is causing a great outcry in British industry which is convinced that it is having to pay much more for electricity, oil and gas than its competitors on the Continent. The tomato and lettuce growers of Sussex have proof that competitors in the Netherlands are getting their gas much more cheaply than they are.

What is more, it is scandalous that consumers of electricity on the Continent are getting substantial discounts when they consume larger quantities. What sort of conservation policy is that? We are trying to discourage the use of electricity, not promote it. Clearly electricity and gas suppliers are schizophrenic and they have got the whole question of objectives completely mixed up. Living in an artificially cheap energy situation is like a farmer killing his milch cow to eat it. It is accelerating the day when nonrenewable sources of energy will run out. Already we are consuming the world's supply of oil much faster than we are discovering new sources. We are discovering 15 billion barrels a year and using 20 billion.

With this scenario I implore the Council of Ministers and Member States to see the logic of giving much more support to the Commission in organizing joint action to deal with the long-term crisis which has only been accentuated by the last Middle East war. Our future depends on the vision which the Council shows in the next few months.

President. — I call Mr Veronesi to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Veronesi. — (*I*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, my time is too limited to permit me to treat adequately the themes which have been proposed. I, too, trust it will be possible to examine the question more thoroughly, in the presence of the Council, in the next parliamentary sitting. I would like to say that, if it is not wise to 'scream before you are hurt', it is nevertheless prudent to take protective measures when risks are present; therefore the discussion we have undertaken is, in my opinion, a valid one, pertinent and opportune in the context of the current political scene.

I must say that I much appreciated the response given by Mr Davignon in the preceding debate. I was slightly less impressed by a certain optimism, or, at least, a perhaps excessive confidence shown by the Commission in its evaluation of our questions. We co-authored these three questions because we do not consider them to be rhetorical; we believe on the contrary that they clarify some extremely interesting points, which must be provided for with precise aims and political orientations.

Commissioner Davignon urges us not to be anxious. We cannot be lulled into accepting the illusion that we possess reserves greater than the obligations we assumed in the 1974 agreement which would allow us to resist recession for longer than we had supposed. This is not enough, for, as Mr Linkohr was saying, the situation has greatly deteriorated of late, and it has assumed implications unknown in the past. For this reason we urge the Commission to communicate our anxieties to the Council.

It should also be stated quite clearly that the solutions we must envisage are political in nature and made up of political measures, for we have been aware of a tentative gesture in the direction of old means of pressure and intervention on the international level, which we believe to be totally inappropriate. The gunboats of the industrialized countries should no longer take the sea to protect raw materials. We believe there is a more efficient weapon, more important, more modern, and more just: political negotiation and collaboration.

We appeal to the Council to act on this fundamental problem, for it is only by this means that we can hope to attain the goals we have set for ourselves.

President. — I call Mr Galland to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Galland. — (*F*) Mr President, whilst, like some of my colleagues, I was convinced by what Commissioner

Davignon had to say in his previous statement, even if I did not go along with all his conclusions, I must say that as far as the present debate is concerned I am not in the least convinced. In fact, I have to confess that I am deeply disappointed.

The consequences of the war between Iraq and Iran were felt immediately, despite the efforts of some of the Gulf countries which increased their production. The deficit at the moment is 2 000 000 barrels per day. Those in authority lost no time in reassuring public opinion by announcing that stocks were at a very high level — 120 days — and that there was no risk of shortages for at least a year!

Even if it may upset some people I have to say, Mr President, that I utterly reject this philosophy. We must tell the public the truth and adjust our energy strategies to stark reality. Now, what is the truth? Certainly, we do have 120 days' supply, but this boils down to 30 days since, as has been pointed out, we have to maintain strategic stocks of 90 days. And the world situation is such that no responsible politician would begin today to draw on the strategic stocks. We thus have only 30 days' stocks available, and some of this has already been used, and we have a deficit of 2 000 000 barrels per day. Even if the war between Iraq and Iran were to end tomorrow (a number of experts have visited the installations that have been destroyed or damaged in the two countries), it would take close on a year to rebuild and recommission the installations in these two countries. The truth is that we have a shortage already now and, as Mr Seligman pointed out, rationing could come tomorrow.

A rise in the price of crude oil is therefore inevitable. And let's face it, Mr President, we Europeans will be partially responsible for it. In the face of shortage and the threat of rationing Europe is still unable to demonstrate solidarity and responsibility. Selfish and uncoordinated attitudes will lead a number of our countries to buy on the Rotterdam spot market, at any price. In fact, the price just doesn't matter.

Accusations against France had been levelled by Mr Linkohr and Müller-Hermann. It is possible that my country is at the moment resorting to the Rotterdam spot market for supplies, but given the nature of the rises produced by the Rotterdam spot market France can in no way be blamed for these rises. It is not a problem generated by any individual country, it is a general problem and it is that general problem which we have to contend with.

Prices will naturally surge forward and, as usual, will give an excellent alibi to the hard-line OPEC countries for an appreciable increase in their official tariffs. It is high time that the European Council and our energy ministers took decisions enabling us to get the free market in hand.

Galland

Moreover, all possible steps must be taken to reduce rapidly our dependence on oil. That is an absolute priority.

Mr Davignon, you bear a heavy responsibility in the eyes of this Assembly, for it is you who will have to define a European policy and get it on the move, something which the Commission has in the past failed to do. In this connection what you have said makes me fear that the Commission will not show sufficient determination or political clearheadedness to overcome the total absence of political will in the Council, with which we are only too familiar. If the Commission does not set an example we shall never get anywhere.

Ladies and gentlemen, unemployment is constantly on the minds of us all. We know that employment depends on the health of the economy, and that this in turn depends on energy. To reduce this dependence on oil, whilst we have to distinguish between the short and the medium term, a Community energy policy is an indispensable adjunct to the national policies.

In the short term, Mr Davignon, we believe that two measures are called for. Firstly, we have to launch at European level an imaginative energy-saving policy, and, forgive me for saying so, Commissioner, in my view we must on no account play down the seriousness of the situation and we must also provide appropriate motivation.

In each of our countries we have acted in isolation, taking the easiest measures. The hardest tasks remain to be faced, and we must face them together. If you want to create a sense of responsibility amongst Europe's citizens, you must cut out the wastes that we can now no longer afford. Make industrial managers shoulder their responsibilities! Install in homes, factories and offices thermostats that will ensure that a given maximum temperature is not exceeded. Commissioner, it is high time to launch a large-scale Community energy-saving policy with common objectives and instruments. Ladies and gentlemen, this large-scale European plan must be implemented, but I do not have the time to spell out . . .

President. — You have been allocated five minutes speaking time, but you have already spoken for five minutes and forty-two seconds. I must ask you therefore to conclude.

Mr Galland. — (*F*) Mr President, my Group has not used up its speaking time, for other speakers are to follow and I have an arrangement with them.

The second measure we must take is rapidly to diversify our consumption. For this we need a policy on coal, to which Mr Müller-Hermann referred. But there is another problem, Commissioner, we need a

Community policy on energy and joint investment in new technologies and energies, matters which the Liberal and Democratic Group will go into in detail in the major debate scheduled for January.

In conclusion, we must set an example in the months ahead and in the major energy debates to be held in this Parliament. They will provide us a unique opportunity to show our effectiveness, and the Commission will bear a heavy responsibility when it comes to sketch out future prospects for us in January. Instil a sense of common purpose in our governments, reawaken the citizens of Europe, find the resources, techniques and instruments needed to overcome this extraordinary upheaval that is threatening the very foundations of our industrial society, that, Mr President, is the great challenge before us.

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

Mrs Hammerich. — (*DK*) Mr President, there are sometimes grounds for optimism in a situation. It has pleased me much during this debate to note the complete absence of requests to ensure supplies of oil through military intervention. It was also pleasing to hear Commissioner Davignon state that he regarded himself not only as the guardian of the Treaty, but as its servant. This is a very correct and humble attitude.

I would therefore ask M. Davignon to look at Point 3 in the document we have been discussing today. There he will find a rather hasty example of energy policy in Parliament's decision on intervention in the energy sector. Briefly, this states that in such cases, Parliament will take upon itself a certain power, a certain authority as a law-making body at the expense of the Council and also the national assemblies. We cannot agree with this, nor can our Government, nor, do I believe, can the Commissioner, as there is an implicit extension of competence here. I would greatly appreciate his opinion on this point.

President. — I call Mrs Charzat.

Mrs Charzat. — (*F*) Mr President, the alarming international situation and the absence of a Community energy policy are posing a serious threat to the future of the Europe we are trying to build.

In the autumn of 1980, just as in the autumn of last year, oil prices on the free markets increased dramatically. In 1979 most of the Member States regarded the overthrow of the Iranian monarchy as a fortuitous event which would soon be over. In 1980 those same Member States were forecasting that the Iraq-Iran conflict would be short-lived.

Charzat

The truth is that the constant underestimating of international tension since the Yom Kippur war of 1973 by the European Economic Community is based on a carefully calculated policy. It appeared convenient to the governments in power to justify the economic crisis and the rise in unemployment by the growing cost of oil. The reluctance of the Member States to implement a concerted energy policy has been exploited by the governments.

And yet the oil problem has placed the Community's economic and political survival in jeopardy. In the first place because the situation in the Middle East has steadily destabilized since 1978. The West's main source of supply in hydrocarbons, the Middle East region, has been shaken by the fall of the Iranian monarchy, the upheaval in Mecca, the prolonged detention of the American diplomats in Iran, the aggravation of the Israeli-Arab problem and, now, the Iraq-Iran war.

Even more than the price of oil, the conflict between Iraq and Iran underlines the fact that the shipment of crude is becoming a major supply problem for the consuming countries. In view of the growing number of trouble spots in the Middle East, the Community's continued strong dependence on oil in the decade ahead underlines its extreme vulnerability.

Events in the Middle East hit Europe more than any other area. It would be futile to regard as transient the extreme instability of the Persian Gulf. The evil influence of the oil multinationals is holding back a structural effort which the countries of the Community need to make in the energy sector in the decade ahead. At the moment the price of oil on the free markets has reached 40 dollars a barrel. In order to increase their profits the multinationals are seeking to cash in on their stocks. Such a policy will in turn lead the OPEC countries to introduce sharp rises in the price of crude in December. The multinationals are creating conditions which are likely to lead to constant and grave confrontations with the oil-producing countries. They are following their own strategy, which is designed neither to safeguard supplies nor to secure supplies at a more reasonable cost. Their action is totally at odds with all efforts to reach stable and balanced agreements with the countries of the Third World. At the end of 1979 the countries of the Community proved incapable of counteracting the swingeing increases in the price on the free markets. As if that were not enough, a misguided decision by the United States led the American multinationals to launch a veritable economic war against the Community countries, causing a further upsurge in oil prices.

One year later the situation looks like repeating itself. It shows that the measures for analysing the free markets by the Commission, like the measures for recording imports of crude into the Community, are ineffectual in practice. These measures do nothing to deter speculation on the oil market. A few months ago

the Socialist Group voted in favour of arrangements to regulate transactions on the free market. It can only take note of the Commission's impotence, the impotence of the governments and the lack of coordination among them, which is once again resulting in a price explosion and a scramble by the companies to replenish their stocks. The present conflict between Iraq and Iran highlights a major political fact of life, namely that if the Community countries do not get together to develop on a large scale sources of energy to replace oil then they will be abdicating in favour of the multinationals and the International Energy Agency. It is true that Saudi Arabia and the Emirates are increasing their production to compensate for the lost deliveries from Iraq and Iran. However, the political development of the situation in the Middle East is tending to allow the United States and the big powers to call the tune, through the International Energy Agency, when it comes to the allocation of the available oil supplies.

As a result, the Community no longer functions within the framework of its own legally established institutions. This explains the inertia of the Community policy in regard to energy. This explains also the abdication of the Commission, and the Council, in the face of efforts to implement policies aimed at developing substitutes for oil. At the time of the Iran crisis, and now since the beginning of the Iraq-Iran war, the sole reaction on the part of the Community institutions is to slash the energy budget, contrary to the recommendations of the Committee on Energy of this Assembly. The dilution of the Community's own legal institutions under the influence of a loose grouping operating under American protection leads to denial to Community citizens of access to information on the real energy situation, in particular as regards oil supplies.

If, in the Community as a whole, oil consumption has been 9% below what it was in the corresponding period of 1979 this is not because of measures to reduce dependence on oil. The fall in the consumption of oil is due to the economic crisis. With their total apathy both the Commission and the Council are surrendering to the blind laws of the invisible hand, at a time when the mechanisms governing the operation of the oil market are functioning less and less satisfactorily. It is not by bureaucratic edicts, such as bans on the use of cars on Sundays, that the Community will be able to compensate for its enormous energy handicap. As I see it, there is no energy crisis but there is a crisis and bankruptcy of the economic policies adopted. Energy, especially with the development of substitution energies, is certainly not scarce. Since the first oil crisis of 1973 the Member States have simply lacked the will to invest massively in energy alternatives to oil. Nuclear power is seven years behind schedule. The coal sector is not exploited sufficiently. In France coal has been deliberately sacrificed. The new technologies that would permit solar and geothermal energy to be harnessed are held back by the strate-

Charzat

gies of the big multinationals. Since energy investment is still subjected to the criterion of short-term profitability, the development of energy production has been impeded and the Community has to this day failed as regards energy redeployment. Apart from the Commission's and the Council's responsibility in the matter, the public authorities in the Member States have not played the determining role with respect to energy investment. And as far as the period 1980-1990 is concerned the time available for the vital redeployment is now very short.

In conclusion let me say that the Community's inadequate effort in the energy sector, as regards cooperation between the States, the information made available to the citizen and public investment, are placing the Community's future in jeopardy. As long as the Community continues to suffer from this crippling handicap it can enjoy no credibility in international politics. A Euro-Arab dialogue and North-South cooperation will remain pipe-dreams until Europe shows its determination to achieve independence in the field of energy.

President. — I call Sir Peter Vanneck.

Sir Peter Vanneck. — I agree with the last speaker that it is our independence that is at stake. We are immensely vulnerable in this respect, given this threat in the Gulf, and it is the bottleneck of the Strait of Hormuz that worries me particularly.

As the defence hawk of our European Democratic Group here, I am extremely concerned about the vulnerability of Europe in respect of energy supplies and, of course, in this case I am concerned with oil, not nuclear energy, on which I speak in another forum. I am immensely concerned about the vulnerability of our supplies from the Persian Gulf. We feel, and I am not trying to pre-empt Mr d'Ormesson's motion nor Mr Diligent's report on that motion, extreme concern about the security of our supplies of oil right down the Indian Ocean round that important Cape of Good Hope with its wonderful naval base at Simonstown and the whole way up to the Tropic of Cancer where NATO takes over.

But it could all be throttled at the Straits of Hormuz, and it is in that respect that I am concerned over these muddied delta waters of the Euphrates and the Tigris in which the great powers are fishing. I am very anxious that Russia should now be blocked — and since we have the Madrid Conference on at the moment it is, I hope, indeed being blocked — in what it is attempting to do in Afghanistan and in Poland; but it may now turn its attention to exacerbating the conflict in Iran and Iraq, so that we may lose some of the oil that we should have from the Persian Gulf through the Straits of Hormuz.

That is why, in the very short time that is left to me, I would like to make a suggestion, Mr President, that the Commission might turn its mind to, namely that the Commission, and the Council of Ministers, might give thought to an initiative, and perhaps even provide financing, for some sort of pipeline scheme that would link the Persian Gulf with the Mediterranean. And our friends, and they are undoubtedly our friends in places like Kuwait and Saudi Arabia, would not feel themselves hamstrung by the potential of hopelessness in the Gulf region and we could see oil supplies coming across overland and not risk this hernia in Hormuz.

President. — I call Mr Davignon.

Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission. — (F) It is clear that Parliament is not entirely satisfied with the explanations I gave, and I understand its reactions. But I believe that in this connection we must be extremely clear and precise.

In the first place we have had a debate on the problem of energy as a whole, and Mrs Charzat surveyed the whole picture and put forward serious criticisms with regard to everything that should have been done and has not been done. For my part, I tried to keep within the context of the oral question as redefined by the Bureau, and this concerns the immediate problem. Whilst the situation is already difficult if one has to reply to precise questions, it becomes even more difficult when one is reproached for not replying to questions that were never put . . .

Secondly, what is the ambiguity of the situation? It is that the Commission would not think it responsible at the present stage merely to describe the difficulties without at the same time stating what the solution should be, for otherwise we might produce what we do not want to produce. I wanted to get that across to Parliament. We have decided, and this has been a point I dwelt on throughout my statement, that the Commission and Council must make sure of being in a position to prevent matters from getting worse.

Until now things have not got worse. So far the dangerous factor on the free market has been not the price but the quantities. Why do prices rise so quickly on the free market? It is because it is such a restricted market, the quantities available are so small that even a tiny variation in quantities results in a very large variation in price. In this instance it is not the price which gives cause for concern but the question whether this price will lead to a change in the price of the bulk of supplies. It is there that the difficulty might arise and it is precisely this difficulty that we want to avoid. And so the important thing in the immediate term is how precisely the governments are to arrange with the Community and the other states to compensate in real terms for the shortfall of two million barrels of oil per day, which is the problem facing the international

Davignon

community. The quantity is not in fact a large one, and it is absurd to think that we shall not find a way of overcoming the difficulty. Once we have taken steps to compensate this shortfall of two million barrels per day it is of course true that we shall not have solved the energy problem, and there I am obviously in full agreement with Mr Herman, Mr Galland and the others who made that point.

The first thing, then, is to prevent the worst from happening, that is to say an upsurge of prices and a repetition of the developments during the Iranian crisis, but we must then go on to tackle our energy problem. That is why I said that it seemed important to us to hold a debate on the issue in January, and that is why I announced that at the beginning of next week we should be submitting a review drawn up by the Commission setting out the main areas where action was needed.

The answer I give you today is therefore this: The Commission's priority is to ensure that on 27 November the Council takes the measures necessary to prevent this shortfall of two million barrels per day leading to additional strains on the market. That is the immediate objective. And that is what we shall do. When we get together again in December we shall be able to see to what extent our efforts have been successful. Our immediate objective is to deal with the most pressing problem; it is not to wonder what will happen if the Straits of Hormuz are blocked or the oil pipelines are blown up. If some cataclysm overtakes us, that will be different. But let us not confuse the issue by indulging in conjecture. Let us instead see how we can cope with this deficit of two million barrels and let us establish a genuine overall Community energy policy. That was the point I was trying to make, nothing more, nothing less. That is the priority we have set ourselves, to ensure that we can control our own destiny.

And now I should like to say something to you, Mrs Charzat. What we have had here is an allegation — which I utterly reject — that the Commission does not have the will to work for Europe's independence. If that allegation were true then everything we are doing would have no meaning. It would be ridiculous. We have immediate measures to take. Let us try to take them, and to do so well, and let us then return to the problem as a whole after preparing the ground thoroughly and establishing what we want to talk about. When the time comes, the Commission will give you precise and specific replies, as it has done in connection with the report by Mrs von Alemann.

(Applause)

President. — The debate is closed.

I have received two motions for resolutions with request for an early vote, pursuant to Rule 47 (5) of the Rules of Procedure, to wind up the debate on the

oral question on Community oil supplies from the Middle East (Doc. 1-592/80):

- by Mr Müller-Hermann, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group), and Mr Seligman, on behalf of the European Democratic Group (Doc. 1-598/80)
- by Mr Linkohr, on behalf of the Socialist Group, Mr Müller-Hermann, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group), Mr Ippolito and Mr Veronesi (Doc. 1-599/80).

The vote on these requests for an early vote will be taken at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

12. *Multiannual Community programme in biomolecular engineering*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-521/80) by Mr Schmid, on behalf of the Committee on Energy and Research, on

the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 1-750/79) for a multiannual Community programme of research and development in biomolecular engineering (indirect action 1981-1985).

I call Mr Schmid.

Mr Schmid, rapporteur — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, on 10 January of this year the Swiss molecular biologist Charles Weissmann announced to the world's press in Boston that his team of research workers had succeeded in culturing bacteria which produce Interferon. Interferon is considered to be the cancer cure of the future and as the super-weapon against virus diseases. At present it is the most expensive substance in the world. One gram of Interferon is ten million times more expensive than one gram of gold. The shares of the company which has Mr Weissmann under contract rose by 25 % the next day. What conclusions should be drawn from this? Genetic engineering, the controlled change of bacteria, other micro-organisms and also plants, undoubtedly has an economic future. There is also a future in the use — this is covered by the second part of the research programme submitted by the Commission — of enzymes in chemical synthesis. Even if only one-tenth of the projects now being discussed are implemented, biotechnology will assume enormous economic importance over the next few years. This discussion centres, for example, on the production of hormones, vaccines and antibiotics, the substitution of energy-intensive nitrogen fertilizers, the cultivation of improved plants and cheaper chemical synthesis using less energy. The importance of such projects is obvious. On the other hand, there has for many years been a heated discussion, triggered off by the scientists themselves, on the possible risks of genetic mani-

Schmid

pulation, that is of changing the genotype of micro-organisms and plants. This debate was not sparked off by some accident or other at the time. Fortunately nothing has happened so far. The research workers have been cautious, because in this case they have taken account of the possible risks from the outset. For example, a scientist working for General Electric in the United States of America, who implanted genes into *coli bacteria* to enable these bacteria to decompose cellulose, eventually destroyed his organisms because if the bacteria escaped from his laboratory, they could cause epidemics of diarrhoea.

The risk involved in the use of certain technologies, for example nuclear energy, which we have discussed today at some length, is established by assessing the probability of damage occurring. The cases themselves are known. The possible consequences are also known. What has to be assessed is the likelihood of something happening. In genetic engineering, however, the scientist refers to hypothetical risks, because, no information is at present available on incidents which have had harmful effects. For this reason possible incidents taking the form of scenarios are taken as the basis. Most of these scenarios concern new artificial pathogens of the disturbance of the biological balance, which is already in danger.

We now come to the most important point, and I would ask you to listen very carefully. Compared with a technical facility, the danger possibly emanating from artificial organisms is not limited to a given geographical area. It has been possible to remove the contaminated soil around Seveso. Even if the reactor at Three Mile Island had exploded, the effects would have been horrific, but they would nevertheless have affected a limited area. But dangerous micro-organisms released into the environment multiply spontaneously and spread spontaneously. They can never again be fetched back into the laboratory where they were created. For this reason above all others particular caution is required. And that is why we need supranational regulations, because microbes do not have passports to show when they cross frontiers, even if some people apparently still believe this as they proclaim their national sovereignty.

So we need supranational safety regulations. All the more so as the safety problems to which the transition from the research laboratory to industrial production have not yet been solved by any means. The discussions on this have not yet been concluded, but are still in their initial stages.

In view of these factors, which no one can deny, the Committee on Energy and Research generally approves the Commission's proposal for a programme of research and development in biomolecular engineering, but calls for certain amendments to be made. The Commission has assured the committee that it intends to incorporate most of these amendments. I take the

precaution of bringing this to the attention of the Commissioner present — if he is prepared to listen.

I would draw the Commissioner's attention to the fact that if the Commission does not accept our ideas, we shall have to make extensive use of our budgetary rights. I can say this on behalf of all the groups, because the committee adopted the report virtually unanimously. Amendments have been tabled to this report by the members of the Committee on Budgets to give some of our proposals more definite shape. We want to see them incorporated into the Council resolution. I should, however, make it quite clear that that does not mean that we are forgetting the rest of our proposals. We expect the Commission to adopt all of them.

The most important demands we make are as follows:

Firstly, the programme must be tightened up. It must concentrate on a small number of objectives. We shall not allow the Commission to take what is in effect political action in setting the targets itself by indicating as wide a range of objectives as possible. This Parliament owes it to itself to set these political targets.

Secondly, we call for a precise definition of the requirements of a social and economic nature in the next two years. The almost ritual reference to the competition in the United States and Japan is no substitute for a genuine European industrial policy with accurately defined objectives and methods. To give an example, the Commission refers in its proposal to the enormous number of Japanese patents in a certain sector. I have checked this. Some of these patents concern the production of ingredients of soya sauce. I happen to be very fond of Asian food, ladies and gentlemen, but I fail to see how these patents can be so important in relation to the world market.

Thirdly, we call for more effective progress reporting and for the involvement in such reporting of highly qualified scientists who are not themselves participating in this programme and benefiting financially from it. We find the present method inadequate.

Fourthly, the observance of the national safety regulations we have in our Member States is at present ensured for the most part not by law but by making the financing of research work dependent on compliance with directives. Allocations from the Community must not therefore be allowed to undermine these national directives.

Fifthly, we set particular store by further research into safety questions and particularly into the problems connected with industrial application. We expect this to be included in the programme as a new item. We also expect this because the scientists themselves do not show any great enthusiasm to bother with such matters, on the principle that they cannot make a career out of such things.

Schmid

The committee also proposes that the advisory committee for this research programme should be composed differently. In the past the national governments have delegated three representatives each to these advisory programme committees. We should like to see one-third appointed by the governments and two-thirds by the Commission. Why? Firstly, because otherwise there is at least a risk — I will choose my words carefully — of these advisory programme committees acting as mini-Councils, which cannot be the purpose of the exercise.

Secondly, because experience shows, as things now stand, that it is not highly qualified scientists who are not appointed to these advisory committees, but usually officials from the national research bureaucracies, who may be qualified for the tasks they have to perform — I will not dispute that — but who are not absolutely up to date, and no one would expect them to be, with scientific research and development in a very advanced area.

On these points the committee was unanimous. The only controversy occurred when we had to decide whether two or three A posts were needed. The majority were in favour of three.

To conclude, I should like to say something about the immediate objectives of the programme. By this I mean genetic engineering on human beings. This is not, I must make this quite clear, the subject of the programme. But it is not a Utopian idea. The first experiments in this field have already been carried out in Member States of the Community as well as other countries. The search does not always follow a straight line. Many important discoveries are the by-products of research into other fields. This was, for example, the case with the discovery of nuclear fission. Otto Hahn was not trying to invent the atom bomb, but what he found formed the basis for it. Research is not therefore a pure art in the long run. Every event in the history of science and technology shows that it is simply wrong to imagine that a division can be made into pure basic research and a subsequent application for a given purpose, at which time the discussion on values can begin. We must not therefore ignore the future application of technologies now being developed. We are today spending money on experiments on microorganisms and plants. I feel we must soon begin the discussion on the consequences of and limits to genetic engineering on mankind if we do not want to be overtaken and trampled underfoot by developments and so-called constraints tomorrow.

On the committee's behalf I ask you to approve this motion for a resolution. On my own behalf I call on members of all groups to be prepared for discussions on this subject in the next few months, because I

believe it would stand us in good stead if we, as a European Parliament, were to discuss this matter in depth.

(Applause)

President — I call Mr Gautier to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Gautier — *(D)* Mr President, it is certainly not easy to discuss this relatively complicated subject in so short a time, and I will therefore try to be brief. But I cannot promise that I will succeed.

To begin, I should like to congratulate Gerhard Schmid, a member of my Group and also a professional colleague, on discussing so complicated a subject in his introductory statement in relatively simple terms, thus enabling most members of this Parliament to understand what is at stake. He has shown that we chemists are also capable of thinking politically and of supporting draft scientific programmes in this field.

When the Commission submitted its draft programme early this year, I found, as a biotechnologist, my heart beating much faster because my scientific colleagues and I saw it as a new source of finance. The Commission's draft programme in fact covers practically everything that can be and is being done at present. This means that we scientists can apply to the Commission for funds to finance our current projects. But politically this means that the Commission is not opening up any new fields of stimulating new programmes, which a European programme should be expected to do. We Socialists therefore welcome the fact that the Commission has drawn up a programme on biomolecular engineering. But we should like to see it far more concise and directed at fundamental areas of European policy, as Gerhard Schmid has said.

I should now like to make a few comments on the programme as such and on the amendments I have tabled.

I have tabled an amendment calling for the deletion of paragraph 2, which concerns genetic engineering on human beings, because this field does not belong in the programme. But the problem is extremely important, because we know that a very great deal is now being done in this field, as Mr Schmid has already said to some extent. However, there are also genetic screening methods, which are now being developed, and methods for the diagnosis and pre-natal recognition of certain diseases.

This raises a number of moral problems, which we shall have to discuss and on which my group will also be taking appropriate action. But this has nothing to do with this programme on biomolecular engineering. On paragraph 3 of Mr Schmid's motion for a resolu-

Gautier

tion — and this goes back to the Commission's explanatory memorandum where it states that the biotechnology programme will improve Europe's position in the world market in future and will encourage an approximation of scientific development in the Member States — I should like to say the following:

I consider this to be rather ironic, because, for one thing, one of the fundamental difficulties I see is that there is no European energy policy and, for another, the 5 m EUA a year the Commission intends to spend for five years will not, with the best will in the world, encourage any convergence within the European Community. I would point out that the Federal Republic alone spends ten times as much on biotechnology every year as the Community intends to spend on research in ten countries. At best the Commission's programme represents a modest impulse for the encouragement of science and technology at European level. But the document should have said so, rather than talking about economic convergence or the improvement of Europe's position in the world market.

If the Commission wants to do something in this area, it might perhaps help biotechnology by suspending certain import levies, on maize for example, because they artificially increase the cost of many raw materials used in biotechnology, which is not necessary.

I should now like to say a few words on project selection. A layman looking at this Commission programme and seeing all the items under Projects 1, 3 and 5, will find his head spinning. I myself have been working in this field for seven years now, and all I can say to the Commission is that, if it carries out only one of these programmes and achieves really concentrated action, that alone will consume the money available. We really cannot accept this hodge-podge of draft programmes and proposals and the Commission should concentrate the money available on just a few. I have therefore tabled a number of amendments seeking deletions from the Schmid report and suggested that certain areas should be omitted and the whole thing concentrated more specifically on those areas in which the beginnings of a European policy exist. These include the development of agriculture, to which Mr Schmid has also referred, for example fertilizers and the use of cellulose and other wastes for protein production. Although we consider certain subjects important, either the chemical industry itself can raise the necessary finance, or else the question of implementation is not of topical importance, an example being solar energy. In some cases, there is not even a reference, politically or scientifically, to these matters.

Mr President, to conclude, I should like to say a few words about safety, because I have tabled an amendment on this in which the committee calls on the Commission to be guided by the most stringent directives where the national safety regulations diverge too far. I have called for this reference to be deleted, not

because my Group does not want to see the strictest possible safety directives to protect workers and the public against possible dangers. No one wants to predict the dangers when little is known about the potential risks from the scientific premises and findings. Nevertheless, opinions differ very considerably within the scientific community. There have been cases, for example, where people — in the USA, for instance — have lost their jobs because they conducted experiments which were banned in the USA but which are allowed in laboratories in Germany. People have therefore found themselves in an intolerable competitive situation, because they have had to work under difficult conditions. We therefore consider it reasonable to harmonize the directives, but it will be difficult to enable the Member States to raise the safety requirements to a high enough level for the whole programme to be coordinated. If, for example, Denmark says it does not want to participate in biomolecular engineering at European level, it can make its safety requirements so strict that nothing can be done in that country.

Mr President, I come to the end of my statement. I regret that I am not able to comment on the Commission's spending, as I would like to have done. I wanted to make a comparison with the costs incurred by German scientists and so put things into perspective. But there is unfortunately no time for this.

President — I am sorry that I must urge you to be brief, but I should like to get this item at least over and done with today. I trust therefore that I may count on your understanding.

I call Mr Fuchs to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

Mr Fuchs — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, with extreme brevity, which is undoubtedly inappropriate in view of the importance of the subject, I should like to say the following: we have just heard two experts familiarizing the House with the subject, as I see it, from a political point of view. I thank them for this. But I should like to call on the Commission to concentrate more on the political aspect when submitting proposals of this kind in the future. It has been fairly successful in concealing this aspect in its present proposal. There should be a change of approach in the future.

Secondly, reference has already been made, I believe, to the importance of the programme, and to Mr Gautier I would say that we should not underestimate modest contributions. We have the same situation with other research programmes, but if we do not make a start, we shall not make any progress. On behalf of my Group I should like to place particular emphasis on the importance of the programme for agricultural devel-

Fuchs

opment. The American professor Wittwer recently said that the technical revolution in agricultural production is now about to be followed by the biological revolution, which will be more significant than the technical revolution. This alone, I feel, shows how important this programme is.

But there is also cause for concern, about the safety question, for example. When we read in Mr Schmid's explanatory statement that safety is at present economically impossible where industrial applications are concerned, we can but prick up our ears. We therefore support the demand for particular importance to be attached to the safety question. We hope that the Commission will provide Parliament with accurate information on this aspect. I feel this is something we can expect of the Commission.

Secondly, there is concern about genetic engineering on human beings. This is surely a tightrope situation. You can fall off a tightrope. We therefore need fixed, clear ethical guidelines from the outset. In my view, the debate must begin now and such scientific development must stop when human dignity is endangered. I would remind you of the words of Pope John Paul II at the UNESCO meeting in Paris in June of this year. We should not say that this concerns only industrial products and plants. Frequently the dividing line is crossed unintentionally with terrible consequences. We should be discussing this question now, and this is an important task for the European Parliament in particular. In the light of the amendments adopted by the committee and of Parliament's budgetary rights, we approve this motion for a resolution.

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

Mr Beazley. — I wish to put my full weight behind Mr Schmid's excellent report. Biomolecular engineering is a revolutionary breakthrough in technology as great as, if not greater than, the conquest of space. The benefits it will bring to the human race are almost certainly more immediate. The Americans and the Japanese are well ahead of the Europeans in developing this technology, and we have a long way to go to catch up. We support the rapporteur in calling on the Commission to tighten up the programme and particularly to ensure that clear goals are defined. We naturally endorse the report's demand for the observance of the strictest rules for safety in this new and, in many aspects, as yet unexplored field. Finally, we approve the idea that while certain forms of direct and coordinated action are discussed, the indirect action proposed by the Commission is regarded as the best way to carry out this research programme. My colleague, Mr De Ferranti, wished to make the point that he would like to see full recognition by the Community of the importance of this new technology

and that he would like to see a common market established in this new technology.

President. — I call Mr Colla.

Mr Colla. — (NL) Mr President, I should like very briefly to explain the few amendments I have tabled, which do not concern the content but the procedure and the setting up of the advisory committee. My amendments therefore refer to the text of the decision and the annex submitted by the Commission. The first amendment proposes a different text for Article 4, the intention being that Parliament should be informed after three years of developments that have taken place and that it should be able to deliver an opinion before any revisions are made, thus preventing a situation in which Parliament is formally notified after the changes have been decided. The second amendment seeks to replace the present text of the first paragraph of Annex B with a clearer version that stresses the consultative nature of the advisory committee. My third amendment seeks to ensure that there is at least equal representation on the advisory committee. I note the rapporteur's proposal that two-thirds of the members should be appointed by the Commission. My amendment is therefore no more than an alternative should his proposal be rejected. My fourth amendment calls for the chairman of the advisory committee to be appointed by the Commission. There is nothing unusual about this, because it is a Commission committee. And so I come to the last amendment, and I would ask you to consider this carefully. The rapporteur's resolution does not take account of Mr Ryan's amendment, which was approved by the Committee on Budgets and which seeks to replace Article 2 with a text consisting of two parts, a clause providing for the repayment of the assistance granted where results are achieved and products are marketed, and a rule that the maximum contribution from the Commission should be estimated at 50 %. I should like to make an addition to this amendment to the effect that, if this percentage is exceeded for some reason or other, a specific decision must be taken by the Commission and the budgetary authority notified beforehand. These amendments concern only the practical application of the general principles which Parliament approved at the time of its debate on the Battersby report on the giving of a discharge in respect of the 1978 accounts.

President. — I call Mr Burke.

Mr Burke, Member of the Commission. — Mr President, I should like to begin by thanking Mr Schmid and the Committee on Energy and Research for the very comprehensive and indeed searching report on the Commission's proposal. The report recognizes the importance of Community research and development in the growth of European bio-industries and of European agriculture. If Europe lags behind Japan and the

Burke

United States in the exploitation of modern biotechnologies, it is because the present research basis is insufficient and fragmented. It needs a push, it needs organization, because at the moment research efforts in the Member States are still too modest. Scientists are isolated in their own disciplines; information does not circulate properly between fundamental and applied research; and there is no tight linkage between the private sector and university laboratories.

This brings me to the object of our proposed programme in biomolecular engineering, which is precisely to stimulate multidisciplinary mission-oriented research, which lies half-way between the fundamental and the applied fields. The Commission, after extensive consultations with scientists and with industrialists, has identified some of the major bottlenecks which prevent innovation and large-scale application of modern biology to agriculture, pharmacy, medicine, food industries and chemical industries. I would insist on this point, if I may, in order to answer Mr Gautier's charge of excessive modesty. The research needed for the removal of these bottlenecks is difficult, complex, slow and not necessarily spectacular. It is through the type of research which the Commission advocates that the Community will be able, in the long term, to produce new types of plants combining the properties of different species and to exploit the unique properties of enzymes for making new compounds of high industrial value. This is the type of research we need in order to avoid, in relation to biotechnology, the kind of situation we have encountered in the motor industry or in micro-processors.

There are no basic contradictions between the motion for a resolution before the House and the policies which the Commission intends to follow in the area of research and development in biomolecular engineering. I should like, however, to comment on three of the points raised in the motion.

In paragraph 5 it is recommended that the aims of the programme be clearly defined and that the contractual research work be executed with concrete and useful applications in mind. Now while the Commission obviously agrees with this recommendation, I must repeat that our proposal does not deal directly with industrial and agricultural applications. It deals with the removal of the bottlenecks which prevent these applications. While the Commission will, of course, always support research which is of a kind in the medium or long term to contribute to the objectives listed in the report, it cannot for the time being modify the very specific research goals which we have identified as prerequisites to new developments in biotechnology.

Paragraph 6 of the motion deals with the composition of the advisory committee for programme management. It recommends that only one-third of the members of the advisory committee be appointed by

the governments of the Member States, with two-thirds being appointed by the Commission. The Commission, on the other hand, proposes in this case to follow the stipulations set out by the Council resolution of 18 July 1977, which apply to all Community research programmes. This resolution provides that each national delegation shall consist of not more than three officials appointed by the Member States. The delegation of the Commission shall also consist of three officials appointed by the Commission. As long as the rôle of the advisory committee remains really consultative, the stipulations of the Council resolution are, in my opinion, adequate and satisfactory. Before implementing the various parts of the programme, the Commission needs to know the opinions of the Member States taking part in the programme and should therefore consult experts appointed by each Member State. This does not at all prevent the Commission from seeking additional advice and from inviting as many outside experts as are needed to attend, as observers, the meeting of the advisory committee.

Now I fully agree with Mr Schmid when he stresses in paragraph 7 of the motion the necessity that the advisory committee include highly-qualified scientists. This is, indeed, the central condition for the efficiency and usefulness of an advisory committee, and I am pleased to see it underlined.

Paragraph 9 (3) deals with the repayment of research costs. I quite appreciate the proposal made on this point. I would, however, point out that the Commission proposes to support medium and long-term research. It would be extremely difficult for the Commission to obtain payment of research costs some ten or fifteen years after the end of the research contract. The problem would be further complicated by the fact that other institutions besides the Commission would probably have participated in financing the research.

Mr President, in deference to the wishes of the House, although I am willing to do so, I shall not deal specifically with the amendments, which I think I have covered in my main reply. I stress that I am quite willing to do so if the conditions were otherwise.

President. — The debate is closed.

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

13. *Urgent procedure*

President. — I have received from Mr Alber and others a motion for a resolution on Uganda (Doc. 1-

President

593/80) with request for urgent debate pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure.

The justification for this request for urgent debate is contained in the document itself.

I shall consult Parliament on this request for urgent procedure at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

We shall now suspend our proceedings.

14. *Agenda for next sitting*

President. — The next sitting will be held tomorrow Wednesday, 19 November 1980 at 9 a.m. and 3 p.m. with the following agenda:

- Decision on requests for an early vote
- Decision on the urgency of several motions for resolutions
- Joint debate on
 - the statement on political cooperation by the President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation
 - the oral question on the situation in Turkey
- Moreau report on the annual report on the economic situation in the Community
- Motion for a resolution by Mr Glinne and others on the seat of the European Parliament
- 5.30 p.m. : Question Time (questions to the Council and to the Foreign Ministers)

I call Mr Provan to speak on a point of order.

Mr Provan. — Mr President, I should like to make a point of order regarding the Kirk report on catch quotas for fish. The report has not yet been issued and

yet amendments have to be in by 8 o'clock tonight. I hope that you will give us some latitude, perhaps until 1 o'clock tomorrow, and that we can have a ruling on that tonight so that there is no misunderstanding about it.

President. — You are obviously not aware that during this afternoon's sitting I already announced that the deadline had been extended, because the Committee had adopted the report only today. The deadline has, in fact, been extended until 1 p.m. tomorrow.

I call Mr Prout to speak on a point of order.

Mr Prout. — Mr President, I only want to ask you whether you can assure us that the Ferri report will be taken at a very early stage on Thursday. I gather it might be taken immediately after the budget and I would be grateful if you would confirm that from the chair.

President. — I can give no guarantees, but I shall try to put it to the Bureau and to see that what you ask is done.

Mr Prout. — Mr President, my concern was that there may be matters which are not concluded during the course of tomorrow's debate. If they are not, I would like to be assured that they are dealt with after the Ferri debate on Thursday.

President. — As things stand at present, I presume, though I cannot promise this, because you never know what is going to happen in a parliament, that it will be taken on Thursday, probably after the discussions on the budget.

The sitting is closed.

(The sitting was closed at 7.30 p.m.)

SITTING OF WEDNESDAY, 19 November 1980

Contents

<i>Point of order: Mr Chambeiron</i>	102	(Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs):	
1. <i>Approval of minutes</i>	103	<i>Mr Moreau, rapporteur</i>	137
2. <i>Documents received</i>	103	<i>Mr Ortoli (Commission); Mr Ruffolo; Mr von Bismarck; Mr Hopper; Mr Fernandez; Mr De Clercq; Mr Deleau; Sir Basil de Ferranti; Mr Wagner; Mr Beumer; Mr Purvis; Mr Herman; Mr Bonde; Mr Delors; Mr Ortoli</i>	139
3. <i>Decision on requests for an early vote and urgent procedure:</i> <i>Mrs Seibel-Emmerling; Mr Bangemann; Mr Klepsch; Mrs Weber; Mr Seefeld; Mr Berkhouwer; Mr Klepsch; Mr Glinne; Mr Klepsch; Mr de la Malène; Mr Fanti; Mr Fergusson; Mr Pannella; Mr Beyer de Ryke; Mrs Roudy; Mrs Van den Heuvel; Mr Klepsch; Mr Pannella; Mr Calvez; Mr Forth; Mr Haagerup; Mr D'Angelosante</i>	103	7 <i>Seat of the European Parliament — Report (Doc. 1-500/80) by Mr Glinne (S), Mr Klepsch (EPP-CD), Mr Scott-Hopkins (ED), Mr Fanti, Mr Gouthier, Mr Bangemann and Mr Nord (L), Mr de la Malène (EPD) and Mr Pannella:</i> <i>Mr Seefeld; Mr Klepsch; Mr Scott-Hopkins; Mr Gouthier; Mr Nord; Mr Nyborg; Mr Coppieters; Mr Seal; Mr de Goede; Mrs Flesch</i>	152
<i>Point of order: Mr Glinne</i>	109	8. <i>Question Time (Doc. 1-570/80) (continuation):</i> <i>Questions to the Council:</i> <i>Question No 48, by Mr Seal: Compulsory origin marking:</i> <i>Mr Thorn (Council); Mr Seal; Mr Thorn</i>	159
<i>Mr Klepsch; Mr Radoux; Mr Klepsch; Mrs Kellett-Bowman; Mr Cecovini; Mr Forth; Mr Adonnino; Mrs Kellett-Bowman; Mr Israël; Mr Coppieters; Mr Denis; Mr Michel</i>	110	<i>Question No 49, by Mr Hutton: Influence of the European Parliament:</i> <i>Mr Thorn; Mr Hutton; Mr Thorn; Mr Israël; Mr Thorn; Mr Penders; Mr Adam; Mr Seeler; Mr Curry; Mr Thorn</i>	159
4. <i>Future of Eurocontrol — Motion for a resolution (Doc.1-576/80) by Mr Seefeld and others (Committee on Transport):</i> <i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	112	<i>Question No 51, by Mr Adam: Regional policies:</i> <i>Mr Thorn; Mr Adam; Mr Thorn; Miss Quin; Mr Thorn; Mr Price; Mr Thorn; Mr Marshall; Mr Hutton; Mr Thorn</i>	162
5. <i>Political cooperation — Situation in Turkey — Joint debate on the statement by the President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation and the oral question with debate (Doc. 1-507/80) by Mr Glinne (S), Mr Klepsch (EPP-CD), Lady Elles (ED), Mr Nord (L), Mr de la Malène (EPD), Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli and Mrs Bonino:</i> <i>Mr Thorn (Council); Mr Glinne; Mr Haferkamp (Commission); Mr Blumenfeld; Mr Fergusson; Mr Berlinguer; Mr Haagerup; Mr de la Malène; Mrs Castellina; Mr Romualdi; Mr Cariglia; Mr Møller; Mr Tindemans; Mrs Hoffmann; Mr Pintat; Mr Penders; Mr Spicer; Mr Pannella; Mr Antoniozzi; Mr Capanna</i>	112	<i>Question No 52, by Mr Megaby; Tuition costs of Greek students:</i> <i>Mr Thorn; Mr Megaby; Mr Thorn; Mr Patterson; Mr Thorn</i>	163
<i>Point of order: Mrs Macciocchi</i>	135	<i>Question No 53, by Mr Seeler: Commission negotiating mandate for a new agreement with Canada on uranium supplies:</i> <i>Mr Thorn; Mr Seeler; Mr Thorn</i>	164
<i>Mrs Macciocchi; Mr Thorn</i>	135	<i>Question No 54, by Sir Frederick Warner;</i>	
6. <i>Decision on the adoption of the annual report on the economic situation in the Community — Report (Doc. 1-550/80) by Mr Moreau</i>			

<i>Importation of perry-pear juice concentrate:</i>	
<i>Mr Thorn; Sir Frederick Warner; Mr Thorn; Lord O'Hagan; Mr Thorn; Mr Seefeld; Mr Thorn; Mr Welsh; Mr Thorn</i>	164
<i>Question No 55, by Mr Antoniozzi: Respect of human rights in Poland:</i>	
<i>Mr Thorn; Mr Antoniozzi; Mr Thorn</i>	165
<i>Question No 56, by Mrs Ewing: Land purchases in Scotland:</i>	
<i>Mr Thorn; Mrs Ewing; Mr Thorn; Mr Seligman; Mr Thorn; Mr Purvis; Mr Thorn</i>	166
<i>Question No 57, by Mr Prag: European charter for the disabled:</i>	
<i>Mr Thorn; Mr Prag; Mr Thorn; Mr Boyes; Mr Thorn; Mrs Clwyd; Mr Thorn; Mr Moreland; Mr Thorn</i>	167
<i>Question No 58, by Mr de la Malène: Change in the method of determining the value of special drawing rights:</i>	
<i>Mr Thorn; Mr de la Malène; Mr Thorn; Mr Cousté; Mr Thorn</i>	168
<i>Questions to the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation:</i>	
<i>Question No 78, by Mr Lomas: Arms sales to Indonesia:</i>	
<i>Mr Thorn; Mr Lomas; Mr Thorn; Mr Marshall; Mr Thorn</i>	169
<i>Question No 79, by Mr Spicer: Surveillance and security of the Community's oil supply routes:</i>	
<i>Mr Thorn; Mr Seligman; Mr Thorn; Mrs Hammerich; Mr Thorn</i>	169
<i>Question No 80, by Mrs Lizin: Attitude of the Nine to the right of representation of the Pol Pot régime at the UN:</i>	
<i>Mr Thorn; Mrs Lizin; Mr Thorn</i>	170
<i>Question No 82, by Mr Boyes: Discussions with non-aligned countries:</i>	
<i>Mr Thorn; Mr Boyes; Mr Thorn</i>	170
<i>Points of order: Mr Cousté; Mr Israël</i>	171
<i>Question No 84, by Mr Israël: Concerted Community action on the Middle East:</i>	
<i>Mr Thorn; Mr Israël; Mr Thorn</i>	171
9. <i>Urgent procedure</i>	172
10. <i>Agenda for the next sitting</i>	172
<i>Annex</i>	173

IN THE CHAIR: MRS VEIL

President

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

President. — The sitting is open.

I call Mr Chambeiron on a point of order.

Mr Chambeiron. — *(F)* Madam President, I have requested leave to speak on the Rules of Procedure in connection with something which I feel is of the utmost concern.

You are aware that Rule 25 of our Rules of Procedure states that 'Any Member may table a motion for a resolution on a matter falling within the sphere of activities of the Communities'. Conversely, this means that any motion which is not covered by this must be by nature inadmissible.

I found among the documents which were distributed yesterday a motion for a resolution concerning the freeing of a war criminal who was justly sentenced for his crimes by an international court set up by the four powers which helped to smash the Nazi régime and

which were among the founder members of the United Nations Organization. Two of these powers are in fact Member States of the Community while the other two are not. I think in the circumstances that there must be grave doubts about the admissibility of this motion for a resolution.

Be that as it may, Madam President, I beg leave to submit that the issue of admissibility is not of primary importance. The shocking thing about this motion is the disgraceful tenor of the text. I may be expressing my indignation, but I am having a hard job suppressing my anger, believe you me! During our last part-session we paid tribute to the victims of the murderous attack which took the lives of several French people in Paris, and many Members joined in this tribute. Now, a month later — no doubt in memory of that event — there are Members who have the gall to suggest freeing an individual who symbolizes all the horrors perpetrated by the Nazi régime and someone who was sentenced both on moral grounds and by international law. I feel I really must protest against this motion for a resolution, Madam President. If you ask me, the very idea of agreeing to discuss it in this Assembly is tantamount to laying the House open to suspicion and to running the risk of discrediting it in a fashion which it will not be easy to redeem. I would add that the goal of the European Community is the democratic ideal. But we cannot defend democracy by being indulgent towards those who crushed and destroyed it.

Chambeiron

I feel bound to say — and I shall finish on this point — that the UN General Assembly settled this matter conclusively when it declared that the punishment of those guilty of war crimes and crimes against humanity was an important element in safeguarding the values we hold dear and an important element in preventing the recurrence of such crimes in order to protect man's fundamental freedoms and to promote peace and security in the world. I cannot forget the millions of victims of the Nazi régime, those who survived the concentration camps and prisons, and all those who struggled to restore democracy. On behalf of them all and for the good name of this Assembly, Madam President, I ask you to rule against debating this motion for a resolution.

(Applause from the left)

President. — Mr Chambeiron, as far as the Rules of Procedure are concerned, may I remind you that sole responsibility for deciding whether or not to draw up a report lies with the committee to which a motion for a resolution is referred. There is no authority in this Chamber which allows the Secretary-General, the President or the Bureau not to forward to the committee a motion which has been properly tabled.

1. *Approval of minutes*

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

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

2. *Documents received*

President. — I have received a number of documents, details of which will be found in the minutes of proceedings of today's sitting.

3. *Decision on requests for an early vote and urgent procedure*

President. — The first item is the decision on a number of requests for an early vote.

We shall consider first *three motions for resolutions (Docs. 1-587/80, 1-588/80 and 1-595/80): Situation in the iron and steel industry.*

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

(Parliament rejected the request for an early vote)

The motions for resolutions are therefore referred to the appropriate committee.

*
* *

President. — We shall now consider *two motions for resolutions (Docs. 1-598/80 and 1-599/80): Supply of oil from the Middle East.*

Again I propose that Parliament take a single vote.

(Parliament adopted the request for an early vote)

The two motions for resolutions will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

*
* *

President. — We now have to consider several requests for urgent debate.

We shall begin with the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-571/80/rev.) by Mrs Seibel-Emmerling and others: Aids for the private storage of veal containing hormones.*

I call Mrs Seibel-Emmerling.

Mrs Seibel-Emmerling. — *(D)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, permit me to outline the reasons supporting our request for urgency. To clarify matters and avoid misunderstanding, can I first of all explain what this motion is not? We are not trying to anticipate the extremely important basic debate on the use of hormones and antibiotics and so on in animal husbandry. Parliamentary committees will be tackling this subject in the coming weeks, and it will be a major topic at our next part-session. The Socialist Group — in common, it is hoped, with most people in the House — is very definitely against interfering with the work of the committees by tabling requests for urgency. I want to make this quite clear, so that we do not go on talking at cross purposes.

The reason behind our request to have this matter dealt with during the current part-session is that it is an extremely topical problem. On 6 November the Commission issued a regulation providing for the granting of aids for the private cold storage of veal. But when we get round to the debate on the main topic, this initiative will have been completed. What is so unusual about it? First of all, this regulation came about by virtue of a legal infringement. Secondly, with this regulation the Commission circumvented the will

Seibel-Emmerling

of the European consumer, which had expressed itself in the form of a boycott.

Many European consumers are complaining about an unhappy state of affairs, and this is going to be the motivation for our December debate. They have opted for a boycott. This is the only way the will of the consumers can be demonstrated — and it is a legitimate tactic. The boycott can be equated with strikes in other areas. The result of the boycott was a market situation which cannot be compared with normal market fluctuations. The Commission reacted to the boycott with market support measures. This is like reacting to a strike by means of a lockout. But something else was done which I consider to be an infringement of the law. Reference was made to Article 23 of the regulation on the common organization of the market in beef and veal. This article states that account should be taken of the restrictions on free circulation which may result from the application of health protection measures.

I am sorry, ladies and gentlemen, but I am afraid that we cannot go along with this. There is nothing infectious about the controlled use of these substances which have come under criticism.

Since you are indicating that my speaking time is up, Madam President, let me say simply that I appeal for the House's support on the question of urgency.

President. — I call Mr Bangemann to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Bangemann. — (D) Madam President, the reasons put forward by Mrs Seibel-Emmerling clearly show that there is no case for urgency here.

(Laughter)

We know for a fact that the Commission is going to give particulars to the two committees — the Committee on Budgetary Control and the Committee on Agriculture — that the two committees are already considering the matter and that a debate on this topic is scheduled for December.

As for the claim that the Socialist Group has never tabled a request for urgency like this when a committee has been dealing with the matter, that is sheer hypocrisy. If I look down the list, for example, I can see Mrs Roudy's request for urgency on the abolition of the death penalty. As everyone knows, the Legal Affairs Committee and the Political Affairs Committee are considering this matter.

(Interruption)

You are constantly bringing up matters which really have to be looked at properly. Consequently, we are against urgency on this matter.

President. — I call Mr Klepsch to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group).

Mr Klepsch. — (D) Madam President, I should like to echo Mr Bangemann's words in speaking out against the urgency of this matter. There are one or two things I should like to add, however.

There is a gentlemen's agreement among the group. Every group chairman knows that in his group there are plenty of Members who are ready to table request after request for urgency in order to catch the public eye. We really have to ask ourselves whether our gentlemen's agreement can last any longer, if one of the groups is going to carry on serving us up with these publicity-conscious motions in the guise of requests for urgency. We said this on Monday amongst ourselves. Since Mr Glinne has not managed to reach an agreement with his group, however, I have to come out and say it again. Things really cannot go on like this.

Mrs Seibel-Emmerling quite took me aback when she said that the committees should not have to deal with such urgent matters. Are we trying to put a stop to the work of the House? This is the crux of the matter. We know that the matter will be carefully gone into by the committees, that the Commission is giving the two committees all the documents and that we shall be in a position to reach a final decision as early as December. We see no reason for urgency today.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mrs Weber.

Mrs Weber. — (D) Mr Bangemann and Mr Klepsch, I wish you would listen a bit more carefully when a request for urgency is tabled. This request concerns the current subsidies in this sector as well as the use of hormones. The committee will look into and discuss the use of hormones. The aim here is to provide effective protection for the consumer and to support the justified action he has taken. This has nothing to do with pandering to the public, however much you go on about it. It is funny that whenever this subject crops up your attitude is that it is suddenly no longer an urgent matter.

The Commission measures are currently operational in the Community countries, and there has to be a stop to them, right away. I am therefore in favour of this request for urgency.

(Applause from the left)

(Parliament rejected the request for urgent procedure)

President. — The motion for a resolution is referred to the appropriate committee.

*

* *

President. — We shall now consider the request for urgent procedure in respect of the *Seefeld motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-576/80): Future of Eurocontrol.*

I call Mr Seefeld.

Mr Seefeld. — (*D*) Madam President, I should like to thank you. It is really pointless repeating yet again what the European Parliament has been saying for years — namely, that Eurocontrol is an important institution which deserves to be kept and expanded. Urgency is justified because tomorrow, 20 November, the government ministers from the seven Member States in Eurocontrol are having a meeting which could well determine the continued existence of Eurocontrol and provide a final answer on the fate of the organization.

The Committee on Transport and a number of Members in the House consequently felt that before tomorrow, 20 November, Parliament ought to direct — as it were — another word of warning to the powers-that-be in the seven governments and repeat what has always been undisputed and constantly been given the full support of every Member in this House. This is the reason for urgency.

I realize what the problem is and should like to point out the following fact. If there is anyone who cannot make up his mind today, tomorrow will be too late, because it is tomorrow morning that the ministers are meeting. If we reach a decision tomorrow afternoon at three o'clock, the problem will already have been dealt with and any decision will be pointless. Consequently, Madam President, I should like to know if there is any chance of having a vote today, either now or at three o'clock, on this motion without having any discussion. There is no justification for further debate. We should simply make known what we think and what we want. But it has to be done today, otherwise there is no point to it.

(Applause from various quarters)

President. — I call Mr Berkhouwer to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Berkhouwer. — (*NL*) Madam President, our group has always been enthusiastic in its support for the retention, and indeed expansion, of Eurocontrol. This being so, I can only give my total backing to the proposal in the motion for a resolution by Mr Seefeld

and others. Our group is unanimous in this matter, and on behalf of the group I second Mr Seefeld's request that Parliament take a vote today, at three o'clock, on this motion.

President. — I call Mr Klepsch to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group).

Mr Klepsch. — (*D*) There are two things I want to say, Madam President. The whole House is in agreement on this matter. Every group supports the motion, as far as I am aware. There is just a problem in connection with the Rules of Procedure to be solved. It is within your power whether we begin today's agenda, after the votes on urgency, with the vote on Eurocontrol. The problem becomes complicated only if someone in the House wants to speak, because then we run into difficulties with the Rules of Procedure. I should like to make another suggestion. Since I have the impression that we are all in agreement, I propose that we proceed as follows, Madam President: let us vote in favour of urgency. You could then have the kindness to suggest that we vote on the motion immediately after the vote on urgency.

(Applause)

President. — Thank you, Mr Klepsch. You make my job much easier.

In view of what Mr Seefeld said, I was going to suggest that by way of exception — even though there is no voting time at three o'clock today — we take a vote on this motion for a resolution, which will be meaningless unless we adopt it today, provided of course that urgency is adopted.

It would perhaps be easier if we had the vote after the vote on the requests for urgency. I do not want you to think in terms of voting time, because if that were the case, we should have to vote on all the other urgent motions today.

Consequently, by way of exception, I propose that we accept Mr Klepsch's proposal and vote on the substance of the motion as soon as we have dealt with the requests for urgency, provided urgency is adopted in this case and in view of the fact that the motion is meaningless unless we vote on it today.

(Parliament adopted urgent procedure)

The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote this morning after we have considered the requests for urgency.

*

* *

President. — We shall now consider the request for urgent procedure in respect of the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-577/80) by Mr Glinne and others on behalf of the Socialist Group: Right to strike in Greece.*

I call Mr Glinne.

Mr Glinne. — (*F*) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, recent events in Greece have been brought to our notice by several international trade union organizations. The most serious of these events are the court cases against the leaders of the electricity workers. It goes without saying that we are not going to tackle the substance of this matter today and discuss the misuse of Law No 330/1976 by the Greek authorities to attack the unions. Today, given the urgent nature of this matter, I just want to read a few words from a letter which I received some days ago from the Christian World Confederation of Labour. I quote:

In the last few days the Greek Government has refused to take part in the negotiations which the Greek democratic trade unions are seeking and has begun a broad offensive. Ninety leaders of the striking electricity workers' union were taken to court in the literal sense of the word, because they were dragged from their homes and violently brought before summary courts. The President and the Secretary-General of the union were each sentenced to five months in prison and a fine of 100 000 drachmas.

I can add that there are further cases pending against the President and Secretary-General of this union and that other leaders are also in the dock. To our mind, Madam President, these events fully justify our request for urgent procedure.

President. — I call Mr Klepsch to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

Mr Klepsch. — (*D*) Madam President, I have also received a letter on this subject from a trade union organization of our persuasion. Our group has attempted to get as much information as possible, so as to be in a position to speak about the matter here. We made every effort to get information both in Greece and from the Greek delegation here which listens in to our debates but which will not take its place in the Chamber until 1 January, when it will be able to make its own contribution on this matter. The information we received was contradictory.

Our group feels that in view of the importance of this matter — the accession of Greece on 1 January 1981 — we cannot just rush through a debate. It makes more sense to take a careful look at the matter. We do not think we should be arriving at weighty conclusions and decisions unless we have had a careful look at the matter, and we think it would be a good idea if we referred Mr Glinne's motion to the Political Affairs

Committee. We therefore believe it would be a wrong move to rush into an urgent debate and make snap decisions. Our group proposes that the matter be dealt with by the Political Affairs Committee, and for this reason we shall not be voting in favour of urgency. This is not to say that we do not unreservedly support the freedom of the trade unions. As far as the Treaties of Rome are concerned, we regard this as a self-evident assumption in the European Community.

President. — I call Mr de la Malène to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr de la Malène. — (*F*) Madam President, our group is shocked that this request for urgency should be tabled today of all days. We are about to welcome our Greek friends to this Parliament, and we feel it is in bad taste to have an urgent debate on a subject like this. It is obviously to a large extent a matter for domestic politics in Greece, and under the circumstances it is quite regrettable that a request for urgency has been tabled. Our group will therefore vote against the request.

President. — I call Mr Fanti to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Fanti. — (*I*) Madam President, this motion for a resolution gets the full backing of the Communist and Allies Group. Contrary to what Mr de la Malène has just said, we feel that it is a good idea, before Greece joins the Community, to take a clear look at the issue of the right to strike. This is a right which must be guaranteed to all workers, as it already is in the Member States.

This is why we think there is an urgent need for this debate. A delegation from the Greek Parliament is here to establish contacts in view of the forthcoming accession, and in welcoming them we want them to know — and we trust that the whole House shares the same view — just where we stand on the vital issue of the right to strike.

(Applause from the left)

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

Mr Fergusson. — I must say that Mr Fanti has already seized his opportunity to make it quite clear what his views on the right to strike are. As usual, people are inclined to use these debates on urgency to make the points that they ought to make in the debate, if allowed. Madam President, my group associates itself with what was said by Mr Klepsch and Mr de la Malène and would point out that the form of

Fergusson

the justification of this particular motion is really quite unacceptable. If we are going to have urgent motions then the justification at the bottom of these texts becomes extremely important. By no stretch of the imagination is urgent procedure justified by the contents of this resolution. There is nothing about that side of it at all and for that reason apart from any other we oppose urgency on this one.

President. — I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (*F*) Madam President, I am not speaking on behalf of the group. I asked to speak in accordance with Rule 14 (2), which stipulates that one speaker in favour and one against and then the group spokesmen may speak. At any rate, thank you for letting me speak. While I go along with what Mr Glinne and Mr Fanti said, I want to denounce the political chicanery that goes on in this Parliament. What I mean is that the Socialist Group, supported by all the others, managed to exclude from the agenda any debate on Turkey, where things are going from bad to worse. It is a disgrace . . .

President. — Mr Pannella, at the moment we are discussing Greece and a request for urgency on events in Greece.

Mr Pannella. — I am touched by the attentive care with which you listen to what I say, Madam President. I shall vote in favour of urgent procedure and I hope that our colleagues in the Socialist Group will be here on Friday for the vote, because it is about time we put a stop to this habit of requesting urgent procedure and then sloping off when it is time to vote, with the result that the Conservatives — who stay in the House — swing the vote their way.

(*Applause from the European Democratic Group*)

President. — I call Mr Beyer de Ryke to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Beyer de Ryke. — (*F*) I must confess, Madam President, that I am always amused whenever Mr Pannella speaks, and I should like to thank him for these excerpts from the *commedia dell'arte*.

As for the problem at hand, it really has very little to do with the right to strike. We Liberals have no argument with that, and we leave the whole matter to the Communists who are the experts. On this particular occasion we have a strike which was going on — and is going on — in a tense atmosphere on the run-up to the elections. This is proved by last Sunday's very violent demonstration in Athens which resulted in one dead and 100 injured. Consequently, I feel the proper

thing to do is to leave it up to the Greek Government to decide whether it is advisable to have a general strike in the country at the moment. At any rate, it is our view that when we have to judge events which are happening in a country which is about to join the Community — Mr de la Malène made this point a few minutes ago — the proper thing to do is to take a serious look at the situation and, if need be, arrive at a carefully reasoned and objective assessment. The Liberal and Democratic Group is therefore against urgency.

(*Parliament rejected the request for urgent procedure*)

President. — The motion for a resolution is referred to the appropriate committee.

*

* *

President. — We shall now consider the request for urgent procedure in respect of the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-589/80) by Mrs Roudy and others: Abolition of the death penalty in the Community*.

I call Mrs Roudy.

Mrs Roudy. — (*F*) Madam President, I am a little saddened by the fact that Mr Bangemann thought he could discuss veal and the death penalty in the same breath when he spoke earlier. However, if that is how he feels about things, that is his problem, not mine.

What I should like to say is that I am capable of reading and absorbing information. I am aware that in March Mr Schwartzberg tabled a motion for a resolution calling for the abolition of the death penalty in all countries. It is currently under discussion in committee, and Mrs Vayssade is responsible for drawing up the report.

If I have taken the liberty — with your kind permission, Mr Bangemann — to table a new motion, it is because something new has happened, which interests me even if it does not interest you. There have just been three new death sentences in a country which still has capital punishment, and I thought that this Parliament, in the knowledge that its debates carry some weight, might ask the country in question for a stay of execution . . .

Mr Calvez. — (*F*) Certainly not!

Mrs Roudy. — (*F*) . . . until we have completed our work. This is a fair request and would be to the credit of Parliament. This is justification for urgent procedure in my opinion. While we wait for the outcome of

Roudy

our work, we must ask the country in question to grant a stay of every execution. After all, we are talking about the death penalty.

President. — I call Mrs Van den Heuvel to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mrs Van den Heuvel. — *(NL)* Madam President, I want to make it quite clear that the Socialist Group's view is that the number of requests for urgency should be restricted. The Socialist Group wants to resort to urgent procedure as little as possible on matters which are being discussed in committee. But sometimes the rule has to be broken. This is the case now. Cases like this occur now and then in Parliament, and Mr Klepsch and Mr Bangemann are occasionally involved. This is an urgent case of this kind. Death sentences have been pronounced in one of the Member States. We are constantly going on to other countries about the respect of human rights in the Community, and here we let one of our Member States sentence people to death. We have to change this if it is possible, and we cannot afford to wait until it is too late. I really do ask all of you to vote in favour of this request for urgency.

President. — I call Mr Klepsch to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group)

Mr Klepsch. — *(D)* Madam President, I have to go back to what I said at the beginning. We know that this issue is not our responsibility, but we also know that the appropriate parliamentary committee is also considering how we can harmonize the administration of justice with regard to legal penalties at Community level. You are all aware that, regardless of what we decide before or after the committee makes its views known and regardless of whether this has any significance, application in national legislations cannot occur by virtue of any decision of this House.

What we have here is another typical example of how we argue about something which should not be dealt with as a matter of urgency. Our group can only say that the abolition of capital punishment is not a subject that should be discussed in this House by way of urgent procedure, because otherwise Parliament is going to be asked to pass judgment whenever at some future date somewhere or other a similar sentence is passed which we do not agree with. Why should we not worry about poor Harry, if we are going to express concern about Tom and Dick? This is something which no one here can ignore in my view, and I want to urge you to desist in future from tabling requests for urgency like this, because otherwise we are going to make a mockery of the whole idea of urgent procedure. I am not thinking particularly of

Mrs Roudy, but of other Members in the Socialist Group.

Let me just say again that within every group there are Members with various pet concerns which for the sake of publicity they try to have discussed in urgent debates. If we agree to this every time, we are going to get bogged down in urgent debates and never have any time for the proper work of the House . . .

(Applause)

. . . and I have to stress this because at some point we have to put our foot down. How can we carry on with this gentlemen's agreement when we get involved in these arguments every time we meet? We shall not vote in favour of urgency.

(Applause from the centre)

President. — I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — *(F)* Madam President, I shall plead in favour of urgent procedure. As was explained, we have to urge a country to grant a stay of execution because it will be too late afterwards, even if the European Parliament or other parliaments take a stand.

I think we have to make this plea as a matter of urgency. Could I just say, Madam President, that since the beginning of our work here I myself have always voted in favour of urgency — no matter who tabled the request, but especially when it came from the right — whenever human rights or civil rights or whatever were at stake.

It is essential in my opinion to stand up for the principles of humanity and legal decency in our own countries too, Mr Klepsch, if we hope to get a more sympathetic hearing when we set out to pass judgment on events in other countries, where our comments are even less likely than here in the Community to carry some weight.

This is a serious matter and I hope that the House will vote in favour of urgency — after all, it is a matter of life and death. And once again I really hope that everyone will do the right thing and be here on Friday. It would be a disgrace if they adopted certain decisions and then abandoned the people in question to their fate.

President. — I call Mr Calvez.

Mr Calvez. — *(F)* Madam President, I just want to say that there is no case for urgency because in France, unlike other countries, a person is not executed within a few days after being sentenced to death. I think we

Calvez

can quite happily wait. The men who have been sentenced can wait for their appeal to be heard, and then for a presidential reprieve. There is consequently no case for urgency.

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

Mr Forth. — Madam President, I should like to echo very warmly what Mr Klepsch has said. It seems to me self-evident that, until the legal systems of the Member States of this Community are harmonized, if indeed that ever takes place, they differ so much in principle in their basis, in their history, in their application, that to attempt to impose one rule in one particular aspect of the criminal law would be utter folly. It would be yet again an example of this House trying to take a position on something in which it has patently got no powers whatsoever. This will, in my view, reduce the standing of this House in the Community. Time and time again we try, through the vehicle of urgency motions, to assert a point of view that can have no influence whatsoever within the Member States. I would add, Madam President, that it should have no influence in such matters until the day comes when we have got to the stage where we can harmonize our legal systems. This sort of motion is completely irrelevant, and I would personally oppose it.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Haagerup to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Haagerup. — *(DK)* Madam President, I shall not take up much of your time, since what Mr Klepsch and others have said is in line with the views of our group. We feel it would be anticipating the debate currently being prepared in committee if we were to adopt urgent procedure. I find it wrong that one single party should try to jump the gun on a matter which concerns so many people. I would remind you that the manifesto of the Liberal Confederation also advocates the abolition of the death penalty. I therefore recommend that urgent procedure be rejected.

President. — I call Mr D'Angelosante to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr D'Angelosante. — *(I)* Madam President, let me say on behalf of my group that I find it odd and improper that this House, which worries about civil rights everywhere in the world, even in the remotest corners, should suddenly claim that it has no say in matters which are closer to home. I just want to remind the Members here that we do have a say and that there is a parliamentary committee, the Legal

Affairs Committee, whose job in fact is to investigate infringements of human rights within the Community. Outside the Community it is the job of the Political Affairs Committee. What this means is that this Parliament not only recognizes its competence in this area but has also done something about it in an organized manner.

Having said that, Madam President, I do not think anyone can ignore the fact that the problem of the abolition or retention of the death penalty is nowadays one of the major problems facing politicians and those who campaign for basic human rights as well as the experts on criminal law. There are a considerable number of people who believe that the abolition of capital punishment is an essential step along the road to a civilized legal world and indeed civilization itself. I realize, of course, that there are conservatives who want to keep capital punishment . . .

(Protests from certain quarters)

. . . but, Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, it would be an absolute disgrace if this Parliament lined up with those in favour of the death penalty!

The arguments voiced against urgent procedure are simply ridiculous. Of course we know there is leave to appeal in France; we are not ignorant, after all. This does not alter the fact that when a sentence has been passed, this Parliament ought to make some comment. It is pointless to say that there is a committee dealing with one specific case and not with the general issue. And it is also pointless, Mr Klepsch, to say that this is not the place to harmonize the criminal law of the nine Member States. Our job here is simply to voice an urgent plea that a particular sentence is not carried out. In this way we are far from contradicting but actually bolstering the position we are advocating in committee

For these reasons, Madam President, totally unaffected by all that has been said before along party lines against urgent procedure, our group will be voting in favour of urgency.

President. — I put to the vote the request for urgent procedure.

As the result of the show of hands is not clear, a fresh vote will be taken by sitting and standing.

I call Mr Glinne on a point of order.

Mr Glinne. — *(F)* Madam President, I request a vote by roll call.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Klepsch.

Mr Klepsch. — (*D*) Madam President, this is just a matter of form. Can I suggest that we have another vote by sitting and standing? It will make the counting easier. There are many Members in all the groups who have left their cards in Luxembourg or somewhere else.

President. — According to the Rules of Procedure, the request for a roll-call vote was in any case made too late. It is just a matter of how we are going to go about things, and I hope there will be agreement on this. It would be simpler if we used the electronic system.

I call Mr Radoux.

Mr Radoux. — (*F*) Madam President, we can have all the will in the world but it depends on the circumstances. I left my card in Luxembourg. I have asked for it, but I haven't received it yet.

President. — I think there are several of you without cards. At any rate, Mr Glinne's request came too late.

I call Mr Klepsch.

Mr Klepsch. — (*D*) Madam President, we know that there are replacement cards. The Members who do not have their cards with them must be given the opportunity to go and get the replacement cards. In view of the circumstances, and so that we do not waste too much time here, I suggest that we have the vote at three o'clock this morning. I think that is an offer no one can refuse.

(*Laughter*)

I know there are Members here who would like to spin out the voting on urgent procedure for another hour — and I suppose that is going to happen now. Anyone who does not want us to have a debate with the President of the Council can fritter away the afternoon on formalities. I am not talking to these people but to everyone who wants us to get on with our business as quickly as possible. Anyone who does not have his card with him can get a replacement card. That way there will be no problem when we come to vote later. But it cannot be done in a couple of minutes, and that is why I am suggesting we vote at three o'clock and get on with our business now. I think this is the best option, and I hope the House will go along with my suggestion.

(*Applause*)

President. — I do not think we can defer the vote until three o'clock, Mr Klepsch.

I call Mrs Kellett-Bowman.

Mrs Kellett-Bowman. — Madam President, either the vote is open or it is not. If it is not open, many of us would like a roll-call vote on this matter. If it is open, then it should be taken now.

President. — I call Mr Cecovini.

Mr Cecovini. — (*I*) I think we could have a vote by sitting and standing. It would make the counting quicker and easier.

President. — We shall vote using the electronic voting system. If some of you do not have your cards with you, by way of exception we can record your votes directly.

(*Parliament adopted urgent procedure using the electronic voting system*)

I call Mr Forth.

Mr Forth. — Madam President, I handed in my vote on a piece of paper. I handed my vote on a piece of paper to you during the voting. I wonder if that figure there takes into consideration my vote which was against. You have it there.

President. — Mr Forth, we recorded two votes, one for and one against. It does not make any difference, therefore.

I call Mr Adonnino.

Mr Adonnino. — (*I*) Madam President, I am also among those who unfortunately left their voting cards in Luxembourg. I wanted to give my vote against urgency and I have been waiting here for ten minutes in order to speak, even though I have repeatedly tried to catch the attention of the Chair.

President. — Mr Adonnino, the vote has been taken. Those who wanted to vote have voted.

I call Mrs Kellett-Bowman.

Mrs Kellett-Bowman. — Madam President, when you announced quite clearly that you would in fact accept the vote of those who for exceptional reasons had not got their cards with them, you did not say that the vote had to be in writing. Mr Adonnino, in the

Kellett-Bowman

presence of many of us, had his hand up trying to attract your attention and did not succeed in doing so. His vote should be recorded.

(Protests from the left)

*
* *

President. — We shall now consider the request for urgent procedure in respect of the *motion for a resolution (Doc 1-591/80) by Mr de la Malène and others on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats: Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.*

I call Mr Israel.

Mr Israel. — (F) Madam President, the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe prompted a certain amount of hope among those who, like us, had a rather naive idea of how international affairs are conducted.

We now feel, in the face of the problems which have been encountered, that failure in Madrid would have especially serious repercussions. We cannot ignore the possibility that, should the 35 delegations depart without reaching any conclusions, the countries of eastern Europe might find a rather familiar solution to the Polish problem. It is therefore vital that we make every effort to ensure that the conference keeps open the fragile dialogue between East and West on the subject of human rights. This is why this Parliament adopted a resolution on the Madrid conference on 15 October. The least that can be said is that this resolution hardly stirred the enthusiasm of the Council of Ministers. Mr Rumor, chairman of the Political Affairs Committee, knows what I am talking about.

The agenda for the Madrid conference has now been set, Madam President, ladies and gentlemen. The agenda consists basically of two parts: firstly a review of efforts towards *détente* and the respect of human rights, and secondly the consideration of new proposals. Where the two parts are concerned, Parliament has put forward specific proposals in connection with the review stage. We have stressed that it must be made clear to the Soviet Union that there can be no cooperation and security in Europe without the protection of human rights. If human rights are not respected in eastern Europe, we intend to point this out. As for the new proposals — obviously a time-wasting ploy — we felt that the best thing to do was to put forward a proposal in the Rumor resolution for the creation of a committee to study the progress of *détente* between the CSCE conferences. We felt we had to put forward these new proposals in another motion which has been tabled with a request for an urgent debate, firstly because of the lack of enthusiasm

which the first Rumor resolution aroused among the Council and secondly to drive home the fact that this Parliament attaches particular importance to the talks which are going on in Madrid. There is a case for urgency, Madam President, ladies and gentlemen.

President. — I call Mr Coppieters.

Mr Coppieters. — (NL) Madam President, in considering this request for urgency I think we ought to separate the substance of the motion from the request for urgent procedure. It is obvious in this case that there is no call for urgency in the strict sense of the term. A lot of fine words have been uttered about the protection of human rights in general and about *détente*. But I should almost go as far as to say that it is shocking that this motion comes from Mr de la Malène and his group. They are now making solemn pronouncements to the effect that exposing violations of human rights does not represent intolerable interference in internal affairs.

Ladies and gentlemen, I should like to remind you how Mr de la Malène and his group, unhappily with the support of many of you, responded to other motions on violations of human rights within the Community. Mr de la Malène and his group have hardly got a right to table a motion like this, when for years special courts in Paris have been dealing with the separatists that have been dragged before them. For this reason I shall be voting against urgency, and I hope you do the same.

President. — I call Mr Denis to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Denis. — (F) Madam President, on behalf of the French Communists I wish to speak against urgency. We are delighted that the Madrid conference opened as scheduled and that the talks have begun, in spite of the wrangling and the hitches which a few people here were rather too eager to see as marking the end of the process of *détente*. The talks can now proceed for the benefit of everyone in Europe, no matter to what country or to what social system he belongs. This indicates the strength of the ideas of *détente* and cooperation.

It is not easy to revert to the cold war era, ladies and gentlemen, and the resentment of the NATO hawks which runs through this motion is not going to alter anything. The Madrid meeting has to be useful and bring positive results, and it must not become a pointless exercise in confrontation. Efforts to this end have failed so far. We must now move towards *détente* along all the lines of the Helsinki Agreement, without disregarding or paying special attention to any one of them. Besides, this was the brief for Madrid from the Final Act of the Helsinki Agreement. The authors of

Denis

this motion have obviously not even bothered to read it.

(Parliament rejected the request for urgent procedure)

President. — The motion for a resolution is referred to the appropriate committee.

*

* *

President. — We shall now consider the request for urgent procedure in respect of the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-593/80) by Mr Albert and others: Uganda*.

I call Mr Michel.

Mr Michel. — *(F)* Madam President, I beg leave to speak in support of this motion. There are three reasons which I should quickly like to outline.

The matter is very urgent because the elections are due to be held on 10 December. The country is under military occupation and is in the unhappy situation of being troubled by Amin's armed gangs which, especially in the north, are still plundering the population. There is a need — and this is my second point — to ensure compliance with the aim of this motion, which is to have a team of OAU or Commonwealth observers sent, as happened in Zimbabwe, to see that the elections are properly conducted in December.

The third point I want to make is that we of course realize that, in accordance with the Lomé Convention, we do not want to interfere in the domestic affairs of any country, especially an ACP country. But in view of the serious situation in this country which is emerging from one of the bloodiest dictatorships in history and which now needs stability, it is essential that democratic elections can be held and that in connection with this there can be a form of international intervention, not in the election itself, but in supervising that everything is done in a proper manner.

The December elections will therefore mark a decisive step in the life of the new Ugandan State. International solidarity and cooperation must be swift in the response to the Ugandan people who wish to see their country free again and to see it progress without any foreign occupation and without any interference in the proper conduct and fair result of their democratic elections.

(Parliament adopted urgent procedure)

President. — The motion for a resolution will be placed on the agenda of the sitting of Friday, 21 November 1980.

4. *Future of Eurocontrol*

President. — I put to the vote the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-576/80) by Mr Seefeld and others: Future of Eurocontrol*.

The resolution is adopted.

(Applause)

5. *Political cooperation — Situation in Turkey*

President. — The next item is the joint debate on

— statement on political cooperation by the President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation,

— oral question with debate (Doc. 1-507/80), tabled by Mr Glinne on behalf of the Socialist Group, Mr Klepsch on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group), Lady Elles on behalf of the European Democratic Group, Mr Nord on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, Mr de la Malène on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli and Mrs Bonino to the Commission, the Council and the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation, on the situation in Turkey.

I call Mr Thorn.

Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Council. — *(F)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, as you know, political cooperation is not at the present stage among the subjects covered by a proper treaty between the Member States of the European Community. It is simply based on a political agreement, on the Nine's affirming their determination to consult together on all major foreign policy questions and wherever possible to seek joint positions. This is still not a common foreign policy, but it is a sincere attempt, with due regard for national sovereignty, to arrive at attitudes which all the Member States can share.

On the other hand, however, political cooperation is not divorced from the Treaties of Rome, as some people fear. Indeed, our activities have always been based on the principle of a correlation between membership of the Community and taking part in the work of political cooperation. We cannot have one without the other. This being so, Greece, which is to become a Member of the Community on 1 January 1981, is already present as an observer at the main

Thorn

political cooperation meetings, in order to be able to join in fully and effectively from the beginning of next year. Conversely, it is out of the question to admit other countries, however important they may be or however interested we may be in maintaining close links with them. For those who are destined to become Members of our Community, transitional arrangements will provide for increasingly close harmonization of our points of view; for the others, normal consultations via the Presidency of the Nine will, I think, ensure the coordination which is so essential.

The Member States of the Community have now become accustomed to working together, along the lines I have just indicated, on all the outstanding questions of international politics. I propose now to give you a report, as you expect, on the essential points of their work over the past year.

The Middle East situation, and more particularly the Arab-Israeli conflict, has always been a central preoccupation of our Community and has continued to be over the past year. Although it is the view of all the Nine that the Camp David agreements and the peace treaty between Israel and Egypt were a correct application of the principles of Resolution 242 and lessened the threat of war in the region, we are still unfortunately very far from the comprehensive settlement which is the only way to peace.

Being conscious of the tensions which continue to affect this part of the world and of the consequent threat to peace, the Heads of State or Government meeting at the Venice European Council considered that the traditional ties and common interests which link Europe to the Middle East oblige them to work in a more concrete way towards a settlement. Their governments have frequently expressed their national positions, which are based in particular on Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338. On this basis, the time has come to put into effect two principles universally accepted by the international community, i.e. firstly the right to existence and to security of all the States in the region, including Israel, and secondly justice for all the peoples, which implies recognition of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people. The Palestinians in particular, who are conscious of their existence as a people, must be placed in a position, by an appropriate process defined within the framework of a comprehensive peace settlement, to exercise fully their right to self-determination.

You are familiar, ladies and gentlemen, with the text of this Venice Declaration, from which I have just quoted the essential points. The European Council, anxious to do something effective, decided to contact all the parties concerned with a view to ascertaining their respective positions with regard to the principles we laid down in our Venice Declaration. It is in the light of the findings of this consultation process that the Heads of State and Government will in due course decide the form of any initiative on their part.

In my capacity as President-in-Office of the Council, I was given the task of making these contacts with all the parties concerned. As you know, I thus went to the Middle East, where I had meetings at the highest level in Israel, Syria, Jordan, Lebanon, Iraq, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia and Egypt. I also met the leaders of the Palestine Liberation Organization since, as you know, the Nine take the view that this organization must 'be associated with negotiations for a peace settlement'.

There were other contacts with officials of the Arab League in Tunis and the Tunisian authorities, with the Vatican, particularly on the question of Jerusalem, and of course with the United States.

The results of my mission were communicated to the Member States on various occasions, and their Foreign Ministers, with the help of expert advisers, are still deliberating on the report to be transmitted in a few days' time to the European Council on 1 and 2 December. It will be up to this Council to draw the necessary conclusions.

At this stage, I shall confine myself to putting to you a few considerations I also had the occasion to put forward at the United Nations. I noticed the anxiety, or even anguish, felt by all those I spoke with at the way the situation had developed during the summer and over the past few months. This means that most of the leaders I met stress the urgency of decisive action to achieve peace — I am talking now about the period when I made this trip, in other words the period up to the beginning of October.

In Israel, the need for security clearly goes beyond a strictly military concept and reflects a deep-felt yearning to be accepted finally by the Arab world, but unfortunately this is still largely beyond their reach. However, I must underline the fact that this need for security is not an exclusively Israeli preoccupation. It is strongly felt in the whole region, and particularly in the Arab countries adjacent to Israel, as well — need I add — as among the Palestinian population of the present occupied territories.

The second thing I found was that all the Arab countries and the Palestinians are unanimous in regarding Israeli withdrawal from the occupied territories and consequently the right of the Palestinian people to adequate self-determination as two fundamental principles. It was my impression that this demand corresponds to a profound desire for justice. That is why the creation of settlements, as well as the law recently adopted by the Israeli parliament proclaiming Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, arouses particularly intense feelings on the part of the Arabs.

Each of the parties directly concerned categorically rejects any imposed solution worked out without their participation. This of course applies more particularly to Israel and the Palestinians.

Thorn

Lastly, I should like to tell this House of a thoroughly personal reaction. The sight of so much human suffering, so much effort wasted on war and thus lost for the cause of peace, should be an additional incentive for us to work for a solution to the conflict.

The information I was able to gather in the course of my mission confirms the line the Nine have followed up to now. Indeed, more than ever it is now apparent that only a comprehensive settlement can lead to a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. This means that all the parties concerned must be associated with the negotiations and also, as everyone must accept, that the problem of Israel and that of the Palestinian people are inextricably linked.

Apart from this major initiative undertaken by the European Council in Venice, the Member States have been led on various occasions to make pronouncements on aspects of the Arab-Israeli conflict, particularly at the United Nations and in other international assemblies. They have always supported Israel's right to existence and security, as well as its consequent right to participate as a full member in international organizations. They have also made known their serious concern at certain Israeli measures which are bound to present obstacles in the way of a settlement, such as the creation of Israeli settlements in the occupied territories, the expulsion of local leaders from the West Bank and the law on Jerusalem.

The Middle East unfortunately contains other centres of tension. The Nine thus continue to follow with great anxiety the situation in Lebanon. They are committed to the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of that country and have appealed at the highest level to the countries and parties concerned to put an end to any actions which would be detrimental to these principles. They stress the essential role of the UNIFL, to which several Member States have sent contingents and which must finally be put in a position to carry out in full the tasks assigned to it, including controlling the territory of Lebanon up to the international border.

A more recent conflict is that which has broken out between Iran and Iraq. The Ministers of the Nine deplore this military confrontation and have expressed the hope that other States, particularly the Great Powers, will exercise the greatest restraint and see that the conflict does not spread. To date, it is as if this appeal has been heeded, although unfortunately we are still very far from the settlement which the Member States are prepared to help achieve. They have also stressed the extreme importance, for their countries and for the whole international community, of maintaining complete freedom of navigation in the Gulf. Here too, the fact is that the conflict has not really interfered with navigation as we feared at the start, although its broader consequences for oil supplies to Europe may still present us with some unpleasant surprises.

So far, the European Community has not felt that more direct intervention on its part in the form of mediation between the belligerent parties would have any chance of success. Over a year ago now, one of these belligerents, Iran, committed a flagrant violation of the elementary rules of international law in the form of the taking of diplomats as hostages with the backing of the highest authorities in the State. Such behaviour was bound to call forth the most vigorous condemnation on the part of the Nine, who have expressed their complete solidarity with the people and the Government of the United States. They made very forceful representations to the Iranian Government, via the usual diplomatic channels, for the immediate and unconditional release of the hostages. When efforts in this direction proved futile, our Community imposed sanctions on Iran in accordance with a draft resolution which would have been adopted by the United Nations Security Council but for a Soviet veto. These measures, which were applied at national level by each Member State, came into force on 17 May. They served to severely restrict relations between the Nine and Iran in all fields and definitely contributed to making that country more fully aware of the severe disapproval its barbaric action had provoked throughout the world.

As you know, the question now seems to be moving towards a solution. The Nine, who appreciate the positive features in the Iranian revolution, hope that the release of all the hostages will make it possible for them then to normalize their relations with Iran.

Another exceptionally grave situation, I am sorry to say, is the result of the invasion of Afghanistan by the Soviet Forces. The Member States have condemned this invasion, as have an overwhelming majority of the Members of the United Nations. They have on several occasions — in particular at the highest level in the European Council — declared emphatically that the Afghan people has the right freely to determine its own future. In their opinion, a formula should be found for a solution which would allow Afghanistan to remain apart from the rivalry between the super-powers and to return to its traditional status of a neutral non-aligned country. Both Afghanistan's neighbours and the Great Powers should agree to forego all forms of intervention, whether military or otherwise, in the internal affairs of Afghanistan and respect its sovereignty and integrity. Up to now, despite the more or less universal reprobation it has encountered, the Soviet Union has maintained and even, we fear, increased its military presence, thereby inflicting grave suffering on the Afghan people, which is putting up valiant resistance with the means at its disposal.

A more positive note is provided by the revival of the Euro-Arab Dialogue. At the Venice European Council, the Heads of State or Government stressed the importance they attach to this dialogue at all levels and the need to develop at all levels its political dimension.

Thorn

In order to give effect to this policy, intensive contacts between the Presidency of the Nine and our Arab partners made it possible to organize, on a limited scale, an initial meeting of a political character in Luxembourg on 12 and 13 November. At this meeting the two sides, the Arabs and the Europeans, underlined the desirability of holding a Euro-Arab meeting at Foreign Minister level. Any such meeting should be very carefully prepared, so that it could be held before the summer holidays next year.

Before talking about the problems facing us in Europe, I should like very briefly to touch on the burning issues in South-East Asia, Southern Africa and Latin America which the Nine have discussed in the course of the past year.

We have to admit that there has been little change in the situation in Cambodia. The effect of the Vietnamese aggression against this country is to impose by force an illegitimate, oppressive government which replaces, it must be said, a government of tyranny. The efforts of the Nine must be directed essentially at relieving the suffering of the innumerable refugees driven from their homes. In increasingly close cooperation with the five countries of the Association of South-East Asian Nations, ASEAN, they are watching developments extremely closely and are assuming their part of the burden of aid to the people driven out of Cambodia.

In Africa, one extremely positive development deserves to be highlighted. Thanks to the determined and persistent efforts of the United Kingdom authorities, and most particularly of my opposite number at the Foreign Office, Lord Carrington, and as a result of the willingness to compromise on the part of all the parties concerned, Zimbabwe has at last been able to gain its independence, and has done so in peaceful fashion. This country, scarred by bloody internal conflicts, now has a democratically elected government. It has been admitted to the United Nations and was recently able to become a party to the Lomé Convention. Such a positive outcome . . .

(Applause)

. . . to a particularly difficult question is too rare an occurrence not to deserve the acclaim of this Community.

This is all the more important since in Namibia we are still far from a settlement which would be in accordance with the aspirations of the people and the requirements of the United Nations, despite persistent efforts by the group of five Western countries, to which the Nine have always given their full support.

South Africa, which maintains the same odious system within its own territory, thereby incurring almost universal reprobation, has still not understood that only an arrangement which fully takes account of the aspira-

tions of human beings of all races will ultimately be acceptable to the international community and thus viable. The Member countries of the Community are using their individual and collective influence to induce South Africa to open the way to applying Security Council Resolution 435 in Namibia and to reform its own internal arrangements as soon as possible, with a view to recognizing the equal rights of all men.

As regards Latin America, the Nine are particularly concerned at violations of human rights in a number of countries with which they are linked by traditional ties of a personal and cultural nature. Desiring as we do to strengthen these ties, we are particularly concerned at the practice of torture and the disregard for human rights in this continent. I can assure you that representations through diplomatic channels, often made with discretion, have brought relief in a large number of individual cases. In certain countries, however, the situation in this field remains extremely grave. It is especially deplorable that in Bolivia a democratic regime has had to give way to a military dictatorship. This means that the Nine are currently having to re-examine their links with the countries of the Andean pact, of which Bolivia is a member — while taking care, of course, not to harm the interests of the other Members of the Pact, which are governed by democratic regimes.

As to the Cyprus problem, this has always been a source of concern to you, and to us all, because of the close links our Community has developed with the island and with the other parties immediately involved. It is therefore, ladies and gentlemen, with some satisfaction that we have heard of the decision to restart the inter-community negotiations, which had been suspended for so long, under the auspices of the United Nations Secretary-General. I myself was able, on the spot, to inform the leaders of the two communities of the Nine's support for these negotiations and of their hope that they will be carried out in a realistic and constructive spirit so that a solution can finally be worked out.

The Community Foreign Ministers have also had an exchange of views on developments in Turkey following the military *coup d'état*. Any attempt to put democracy into cold storage, particularly in an associated country of the Community with ambitions to become a Member, obviously gives rise to some apprehension. The Nine therefore express the hope that the Turkish military authorities will honour in full the assurances they have given concerning the rapid restoration of democratic institutions, respect for human rights and the treatment of political prisoners. On this basis the Community will, as it stated publicly on 15 September, continue its cooperation with Turkey.

Relations between the 35 countries involved in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, which I have already mentioned, entered a new phase

Thorn

with the opening, on 11 November, of the much-discussed Madrid meeting. As they have from the beginning, starting at the first preparatory meeting for Helsinki in 1973 and continuing through all the phases of the CSCE process, the Nine have closely coordinated their positions, in accordance with your wishes, in preparation for the Madrid meeting. I can assure you they will continue to do so during the meeting itself.

I myself had the occasion in Madrid to present the objectives which the Community proposes to pursue and the spirit in which the Member countries intend to take part in the Conference.

As you know, firstly as full an assessment as possible will have to be made of the implementation of the Helsinki Final Act with regard to all its provisions. This examination will have to be free of dogmatism and confrontation, but must also be carried through without indulgence. All the States — and I mean all — must accept fair criticism if they have failed to honour the undertakings formally given in Helsinki.

Secondly, it will be important to provide fresh impetus by taking specific initiatives in all the fields covered by the Final Act. This Act forms a whole, and its balance must be respected, so that the proposals put to the Madrid meeting do not unduly emphasize certain parts of the Final Act to the detriment of the others.

It is in the light of these general criteria that the Nine have defined their attitude to the three baskets of this Helsinki Final Act.

To go briefly over the essential points, as regards Basket One the Foreign Ministers of the Member States decided on 20 November 1979 to support an approach aimed at the adoption in Madrid, in accordance with the French plan for a Conference on Disarmament in Europe, of a mandate laying down the conditions under which negotiations could be started to reach agreement on militarily significant confidence-building measures which would be open to verification, applicable on a continental scale to the whole of Europe and capable of creating the conditions, by helping to give the States improved security, for proceeding at a later stage to a process of arms limitation and reduction in this same geographical area.

As regards cooperation in the fields of economics, science and technology and the environment, the Nine attach importance, among other things, to improving the administrative and technical arrangements for the exchange of economic and commercial information and statistical data and to improving facilities for business contacts. These fields should provide scope for progress in the short term, which will be in the interests of industry and more particularly of the small and medium-sized enterprises.

In Basket Three, the Nine attach particular importance to the question of the free circulation of citizens of all participant States. They also take the view that the dissemination of information, which should contribute to improved understanding between our peoples, and working conditions for journalists are fields in which substantial progress needs to be made.

As you know, the Madrid Conference had a difficult start because certain participants were disinclined to accept a balanced pattern of work which would allow sufficient time to be devoted to looking at implementation.

In my speech on behalf of the Member States of the Community, I expressed our concern on this question. The solution finally adopted on the agenda, the pattern of work and the timetable for the meeting will, in the Nine's view, make it possible to safeguard their essential interests. They will see to it that the work proceeds in such a way that these interests continue to be preserved.

Madam President, I have tried to sum up the main subjects to which the Nine have given their attention in the course of the past year. There are many other questions, of lesser or of less general importance, which I have been unable to discuss and which I no longer have time to mention. In the major international assemblies, the Community's presence has made itself felt both, I must emphasize, in the day-to-day work of consultations between the delegations and in the adoption of joint positions. I have myself had the opportunity on three occasions of speaking on behalf of the Nine before the United Nations General Assembly. Both these official speeches and the everyday work of the Member States' representatives, under the guidance in each half-year of the country holding the Presidency, mean that the Community is in fact now a reality on the international scene, an imperfect reality, it is true, but none the less an effective one.

(Applause)

As for Mr Glinne's question, the rules require me to read out the reply the Nine have adopted on this subject. The Council would remind you that on 16 September 1980 the Ministers of the nine Member States meeting in political cooperation adopted the following declaration:

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 guarantees regarding the treatment of those politicians currently under house arrest.

They are deeply anxious that these assurances should be fully and speedily put into effect.

Thorn

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

That is what we said on 16 September 1980, and this is in fact something we have already discussed in this Chamber.

At this stage, the Council as such has not discussed the situation in Turkey.

In addition, at the meeting of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe on 16 October 1980 the Turkish Foreign Minister stressed his Government's determination to re-establish a system of parliamentary democracy within as short a time as possible and re-affirmed that in the transitional period the Turkish Government would fully conform to the principles of the rule of law and the observance of human rights and fundamental liberties.

On the same occasion the Committee of Ministers — which, and this is why I mention it, includes the nine Community Foreign Ministers — took note of the Turkish Minister's statement and stressed the importance it attached to the principles of parliamentary democracy, respect for the law and the right of all the people to enjoy all fundamental liberties.

President. — I call Mr Glinne to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Glinne. — (F) Madam President, we listened with enormous interest to the various items of information which Mr Thorn gave us in outlining the many problems facing us, and I shall begin by asking him, on the question of political cooperation, how he plans to organize *rapprochement* and dialogue between what I would call the countries of the inner circle, namely the Member States of the European Community with our own internal political cooperation, and the countries of the outer circle, the democratic countries of Western Europe which are members of the Council of Europe. There is no need for me to stress the common bond of ideology and fundamental structure which unites all these countries politically, and often, in our respective political groupings, we note in our relations with our Swiss, Austrian and Scandinavian friends a certain frustration on their part at not being fully involved in some at least of the questions we deal with. In the Assembly of the Council of Europe voices have been raised in favour of this kind of cooperation. I would very much like you to tell us what the national governments and the President of the Council himself think of it, since any such move should be made without confusing institutional responsibilities, with the aim of sharing and strengthening the ideal of political democracy and the attachment to fundamental liberties which are common to all the countries concerned.

On the question of political cooperation, let me say directly, before returning to this point later, that I regret that aid has been so disappointing recently in an area whose importance you none the less stressed, i.e. the inadequacy of the Member States' contribution compared to the objective of 0.7 % of the gross national product which was discussed at such length at the extraordinary session of the United Nations General Assembly. It is disappointing particularly in view of the outstanding and well-reasoned appeal contained in the Brandt report, to which I hope to be able to return to later.

Europe still, and perhaps more than ever, presents a problem of peace and *détente*. To a certain extent the present crises in the world have weakened the process of *détente* in Europe, but happily they will not be able to halt it. It is exceptionally fortunate that in spite of enormous difficulties attempts are being made in Madrid, Vienna or elsewhere to find the political impetus which is necessary above all if we are to succeed in the first place in reducing current military potential while maintaining a mutual equilibrium in our own geographical zone which contains the greatest military potential in the world. In this connection, Mr Thorn I should like to say that our group particularly supports the initiatives of the French and Polish Governments, which have suggested a European disarmament conference, and of course there can be no question in our view of taking action only on the basket dealing with military balance. A pan-European disarmament conference? Very well, but maintaining the indissoluble link with the two other traditional elements of Helsinki, Belgrade and Madrid, and particularly without losing sight of the primordial question of human rights.

Mr President, you referred to the difficulty created for some months now by the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan. I should like to say that recently, at the Madrid congress of the Socialist International, we expressed our disappointment and very deep regret that the Soviet Union has not responded to date to the appeals of the United Nations and of the international community to withdraw its occupation forces from Afghanistan and to respect the independence and non-alignment of that country.

Democratic socialists the world over support the declaration of Vienna on this point, which was reaffirmed by the recent Madrid conference, and in our view those who are fighting for reasons of collective and personal dignity in Afghanistan are not so much rebels as freedom fighters, a difference worth stressing.

You spoke a great deal, Mr President, about the Middle East. It is possible that as a result of the present international situation less attention is focused on this particularly disturbed region of the world than in the past. It is probable that the outbreak and continuation of hostilities between Iran and Iraq, the recent

Glinne

presidential elections in the United States, and the forthcoming elections in Israel, have combined to detract from the previous urgency surrounding the need to act to establish an improved Israeli-Arab dialogue and to solve Israel's security problems and the problem of the Palestinian community's right to exist.

Let me say that we greatly appreciated the fact that in your speech you emphasized the obstacles which stand in the way of *rapprochement*. You mentioned the creation of settlements and the recent law passed by the Israel Parliament making Jerusalem the capital of Israel. Indeed you described these measures as a political obstacle to a gradually improved understanding, holding out the prospect of a political agreement.

We appreciate what you said on this issue, and I would point out to you that we are anxious to hear both sides fairly. This was evidenced for our part at our recent congress of the Socialist International in Madrid, to which I have already referred more than once. During this congress we admitted for the first time a progressive socialist party from Lebanon, an Arab partner who will in future be present in the special community which the International represents, on the same footing as our friends from the Israeli Labour Party.

Next, Mr President, let me stress the importance of political cooperation in areas of the world as vast, as important for the future and as racked by troubles as Latin America and southern Africa.

In particular, after the presidential elections in the United States, held in democratic fashion but with results as regards the composition of the Senate and the occupation of the White House which are not likely to reassure everybody and certainly not the Socialist Group, the test is likely to be the way in which the United States supports or crushes political democracy in Latin America and the struggle for human rights and independence of nations in southern Africa. We are very anxious that, on this point, Europe should not be afraid to assert its own indispensable identity and to maintain the necessary distance in its bilateral relations with the United States, which remains its ally — nobody wishes it to be otherwise. But alliance does not mean acquiescence, and Latin America and southern Africa urge us as democrats genuinely to dissociate ourselves when necessary from any American policies which might be inadmissible.

Mr President, you mentioned the question of Turkey, but I assume that we will have an opportunity to return to this in greater detail.

As regards Turkey, I should like the question asked to have the logical follow-up of the resolution adopted by the European Parliament on, if I am not mistaken, 13 October. The Council is invited to comment on the latest developments following the military *coup d'état*

in Turkey, its implications for the Association Agreement, and the moves to restore democracy. Let me say directly, Mr President, and in spite of my personal regard for you, that I found your reply just now very disappointing.

Parliament is asking you to comment on the effects of the military takeover, its implications for the Association Agreement, and the moves to restore democracy and, through you, the Council has simply reminded us of its declaration of 16 September 1980, adding as sole commentary that in the course of the discussions of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe on 16 October 1980 in Strasbourg, the Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs emphasized 'his government's determination to restore a parliamentary democracy as soon as possible', and reaffirmed that 'in the transitional period the Turkish Government will comply fully with the principles of the pre-eminence of law, of respect for human rights and of fundamental liberties'.

In listening to this very incomplete, and dare I say naïve, reply to a very clear and complex question, I wondered if the worthy persons who make up the Council of Ministers of the EEC read the newspapers, the most important ones at any rate.

Mr President, we would like to know if the Council has taken any concrete measures to restore democracy since the military *coup d'état*. In what way has the development of the situation been followed, and what action have you taken in response to the alarming news from Turkey?

I quote from the *Financial Times* of 14 October 1980:

At least three Turks have died after torture since the generals seized power a month ago, according to reports reaching London. These are the first indications that torture in Turkey — which Amnesty International described in June as being 'widespread and systematic' — may have continued after the *coup*.

In *Le Monde* of 17 October 1980:

On Wednesday 15 October a military tribunal in Ankara sentenced Professor Ebraken, head of the National Salvation Party (pro-Islamic), and 21 members of the party's national steering committee to prison. Four other NSP members of Parliament have already been sentenced and are being held in the military prison at Ankara.

In the *Financial Times* of 29 October 1980:

Over 11 000 arrests since Turkish *coup* ... This was revealed yesterday by General Haydar Saltik, secretary general of the five-member military leadership, at a news conference for foreign correspondents.

In the *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* of 5 November 1980:

39 ex-Members of Parliament on trial in Ankara

A message from Agence France Presse on 12 November 1980 ran as follows:

Glinne

It has been learnt from official sources in the Turkish capital that on Wednesday the prosecutor of the martial law tribunal in Ankara issued warrants for the arrest of the leaders of two parties, one of the extreme left, the other of the extreme right.

These warrants are for 42 leaders of the Turkish Workers' and Peasants' Party, including its chairman. They are accused of violating Article 141 of the Penal Code, which provides for up to 15 years imprisonment for any militant member of a communist organization and the death penalty for those leading 'one or more of these organizations'.

I could continue quoting such extracts for some time. For example, *Le Monde* of 13 November 1980:

Publication of the centre left daily *Cumhuriyet* was suspended on Tuesday 11 November 'until further notice' by the martial law commander of Istanbul. May I add that this centre-left daily is one of the oldest newspapers in Turkey and that two newspapers also are still banned namely the *Aydinlik* and *Demokrat*.

We have also learnt of the dissolution of municipal authorities and of a series of infringements of political and trade union rights normally regarded as elementary.

In view of these facts I think that one cannot confine oneself to the very brief declaration of intent which you read out just now. It is not admissible that the Council of Ministers of the Community has apparently done nothing which has made any impact since 16 September.

It is not enough to adopt a declaration on the prompt restoration of democratic institutions, respect for human rights and guarantees regarding the treatment of politicians under house arrest. This is why the Socialist Group considers it indispensable to table a motion for a resolution under Rule 47.

In this we include two crucial paragraphs, the first and the fourth of the resolution which Parliament passed earlier in plenary sitting: the Turkish people must hear us repeat our determination to ensure that steps are taken immediately toward guaranteeing them the enjoyment of political and trade union freedoms within a democratic institutional framework. We must also reaffirm that respect for internationally recognized human rights, as laid down in the European Convention on Human Rights, is an essential condition for dialogue with a European country associated with the European Economic Community.

This was stated in our resolution of 18 September and it must be repeated today. We add, however, statements on the arrest of trade unionist and on inadmissible practices such as torture, brutality and murder. We condemn the banning of various newspapers, in particular those to which I referred just now. We wish to reaffirm the important role that the Turkish press must

play during a period when the political parties have been suspended, and finally, Mr President, we suggest that a delegation from the European Parliament visit Turkey as soon as possible, just as Parliamentary delegations have often visited other countries subject to dictatorial and oppressive regimes, with the task of establishing the broadest possible contacts with former colleagues of the Joint Parliamentary Committee, other political leaders, trade union leaders, with those responsible for social organizations, and thereby to obtain the maximum of information on the situation so that there can be a new debate based on the delegation's report.

We very much hope that the other democratic forces in this Parliament, will accept this text, which is consistent with the text which we jointly agreed on, negotiated, tabled and adopted on 13 November last and which will, I hope, be heard in Ankara as the anxious and determined manifestation of the concern of European democrats, democrats who without doubt wish not only to discuss this issue but above all to act.

(Applause from the left)

IN THE CHAIR: MRS DE MARCH

Vice-President

President — I call Mr Haferkamp.

Mr Haferkamp, Vice-President of the Commission. — (D) Madam President, you are no doubt aware of the Commission statement of 12 December in which we called in particular for full respect of human rights and stressed the need for the rapid restoration of democratic institutions. You will also be aware of the statement issued by the Foreign Ministers of the Member States of the Community on 16 September regarding the rapid restoration of viable democratic institutions and respect of human rights. The Foreign Ministers' statement also says that the Community will continue its cooperation with Turkey in this spirit. As far as the Commission is concerned, this means the implementation of the outcome of the EEC-Turkey Association Council meeting on 30 June and 1 July of this year.

The results of that meeting concern various sectors, with the effects on ensuing activities differing from case to case. For instance, there is the agricultural sector with the step-by-step elimination of customs tariffs; there is the social aspect, where the central element is the provisions affecting Turkish workers employed in the Community and their families; there is the question of economic and technological cooperation; and there is also the financial aspect, where the central element is the setting-up of the cooperation fund and the fourth financial protocol.

Haferkamp

As regards the elimination of customs duties on agricultural products, this will be tackled automatically by reference to a fixed timetable. The social questions — affecting Turkish workers and their families — essentially concern internal Community provisions; in other words, the decisions of 30 June and 1 July on these matters can be implemented without involving the Turkish side. That we shall do.

As regards economic and technological cooperation, the drafting of the financial protocol and the provision of 75 million EUA for the financial cooperation fund, contacts have been established between officials, with the essential aim of preparing specific projects as part of this cooperative effort.

The Community made an offer regarding the fourth financial protocol on 30 June and 1 July. The negotiations needed before this offer can be implemented have not yet begun. This aspect differs from the automatic processes and the contacts at expert level in that, as regards the fourth financial protocol, we have made the Turkish Government aware of the importance of ratification in this matter. The ratification of agreements is, after all, generally a matter for parliaments, and this will doubtless be an important point in the process of normalization.

We have also left the other side in no doubt that all the steps to be taken to implement the decisions taken by the Association Council will of course depend on the undertakings spelled out in the Foreign Ministers' and the Commission's statements regarding the restoration of democratic conditions and respect of human rights being fulfilled.

Before we can assess the situation and the way it develops, we need information over and above what is available from press reports. As you know, the Commission does not maintain a network of diplomatic services which could get the additional information. Nor can we — on the basis of official reports and without any further research — determine whether these trials are of a political or criminal nature. The early statements made by the military authorities in Ankara referred to this distinction. I would stress the need for full and comprehensive information, including information of a political nature. For that reason, we believe the suggested visit by a parliamentary delegation to be an interesting idea; a mission of this kind would at any rate be highly valuable as regards the Commission's future activities in this matter. We have always maintained that we are highly concerned about keeping a careful watch on developments in Turkey and taking every opportunity to do whatever is appropriate to ensure that definite and visible progress is made towards the restoration of normal democratic conditions.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Blumenfeld to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

Mr Blumenfeld. — *(D)* Madam President, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, I should like to begin by thanking Mr Thorn most warmly for what he has done, not only as a minister in his government, but also — and particularly — as President-in-Office of the Council over the last few months. He has shown a great degree of open-mindedness and understanding for many of the parliamentary quirks we tend to indulge in here. He has at any rate given us all the information he could, and I should like to take this opportunity of thanking him, this being the last time he will appear in this House in his present capacity. It is a pleasing prospect, Mr Thorn, that we shall shortly be able to continue our work with you in a different capacity.

There can be no doubt that European political cooperation among the Nine has worked better this year under the Italian and Luxembourg presidencies than it did previously, thanks to the improved channels of communication and the fact that the challenges facing Europe in 1980 were clear for all to see. It is also worth making the point that the basic differences in certain central elements which you yourself spelled out, Mr Thorn, were obvious to anyone with a basic grasp of things and the ability to think clearly. I am thinking here particularly of the preparations for the Madrid Conference, which I shall be dealing with a little later. There is one point I should like to add, though, and that is that we, the Group of the European People's Party, feel bound to express our continuing dissatisfaction at the inadequate cooperation between EPC and this House, and this despite the great trouble taken by Mr Thorn on such occasions as last week, when we were given information immediately after the meeting of the Foreign Ministers in Luxembourg.

None the less, Parliament has not really been addressed at all over the last eight months by the Ministers. So far, the Council of Ministers has failed to take sufficient advantage of the opportunity to discuss questions relating to a joint European foreign policy with the Members of the European Parliament, and I would suggest that, over the coming year, there should be better cooperation between this House and the Council of Foreign Minister on this matter, which looks like becoming — and should become — increasingly important.

I should like to comment briefly on two main issues, the first of which is the Madrid Conference. We are very pleased, Mr Thorn, that you took the opportunity at short notice of speaking on behalf of the Community in Madrid in your capacity as President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers, because it is

Blumenfeld

important that the European view be made known at the Conference in what is a very serious situation.

European cooperation in the widest sense — in other words, *détente* — has suffered a serious setback. Our view is that we are now so far removed from the spirit of Helsinki that many people are right in opposing the continuation of *détente*. Many of the principles agreed on in Helsinki have been seriously violated by the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, and any more such violations — for instance, in Poland — could spell the end of the Madrid Conference and of the Final Act. I believe we should tell the governments of the Nine that they should give priority at the Conference to a balanced consideration of the three baskets in their consultations, speeches, discussions and other work, and that the question of human rights in particular must not be overshadowed by a discussion on arms limitation pure and simple. As regards the disarmament issue, we also feel that pride of place should be given to specific measures rather than grand sounding but easily misunderstood declamations.

The second central element of Mr Thorn's speech concerned the Middle East, where there are — hardly surprisingly — differences of opinion within the Council of Ministers, Parliament and the various political groupings represented in this House. But as regards your statement on behalf of the Nine that developments since the Venice Conference have proved you right and confirmed your own view and that of the Nine that the search for a comprehensive solution should be persevered with, allow me to ask the Nine whether they have really registered the fact that, since June of this year, we have seen not only serious military conflicts like that between Iraq and Iran, but also important political changes in the whole structure of the Middle East. Let me also draw your attention to the fact that the United States of America will have a new President in January and that he will be following a completely different line from that of his predecessor on the Middle East and on confrontation — otherwise known as the political conflict with the Soviet Union. In the light of all this, surely the European governments would be better advised not to take time off for reflection — as suggested by such people as the Federal German Chancellor — but rather to give all-out attention to the question of what policy they intend to pursue in future with the Americans on the Middle East. After all, the Middle East issue is of importance to both Americans and Europeans.

I really wonder whether word has not got around yet among the Nine that, should we be landed with a desperate energy crisis over the coming months, the reason will not be the Palestinian-Israeli conflict so much as the war between Iraq and Iran and the closing of the Straits of Hormuz — with all its consequences — not by the Israelis, but by the Iranians.

I wonder how the Europeans can think of resuming the Euro-Arab dialogue as if this were a purely routine affair, and despite the fact that — to my utter astonishment — the Presidency of the Arab League is already, this November, prematurely in the hands of a member of the Executive Committee of the PLO. We were told in the course of the discussions between the Political Affairs Committee and the President-in-Office of the Council that it had been agreed that the Arab League would be presided over next year by a representative of the PLO. There is probably nothing we can do about that, but why has a high-ranking representative of the PLO now been allowed to open the Euro-Arab dialogue as President of the Arab League, and why have you not protested about this? This is something I am bound to ask you, because it is perfectly obvious that, if the PLO representative — in his capacity as President of the Arab League — has his way, this political dialogue will degenerate into a purely political confrontation aimed at the United States and Israel. Surely that cannot be what our European policy is aiming at.

In my view, should a meeting of Foreign Ministers actually come about in these circumstances in the summer of 1981, it must be subject to extremely careful preparation. In that case, Mr Thorn, it is of the utmost importance that you tell your colleagues from the other eight Member States to take note of the changes which have taken place over the last few weeks — and in view of developments in the United States — in the opinions of the political leaders in the European capitals.

Turning briefly to Turkey: we believe that this country should find its way as quickly as possible — but without setting any deadline — out of its current profound economic, social and political crisis back to parliamentary democracy. This is a matter for the Turkish people, and we hope to hear as soon as possible from the current military government in Turkey that it genuinely intends to make progress towards a return to parliamentary democracy, so that we are not once again faced with a regime like the colonels' in Greece. I think Mr Glinne's suggestion that a delegation from the European Parliament should be sent to Turkey as soon as possible is an excellent one. We have just heard Mr Haferkamp emphatically confirm that the European Parliament has economic and social levers at its disposal.

Finally, we must all realize that, in the changing age we live in, the old forms of international order no longer work and new structures have not yet emerged to take their place. The system of coordinates for international security for the 1980s is still uncertain, and that is the real danger facing us in this decade. That is why we need cooperation between Europe and the United States. We need a much greater measure of

Blumenfeld

mutual understanding than has existed in recent years, and that is a wish shared by the great majority of this House.

(Applause)

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

Mr Fergusson. — May I too, on behalf of the European Democratic Group, express our appreciation of what Mr Thorn has given us from the chair of the Council. His forthright explanations of what has gone on in political cooperation have been based, who can doubt it, on his own knowledge of what we look for in this Chamber. As Mr Blumenfeld has said, we are grateful for the splendid precedent he has set for his successors.

On the Middle East we have noted what the President has said and await with great interest the deliberations of the Council in early December. We must observe nevertheless that although the Arab-Israeli dispute is traditionally the central issue in this arena, in Lebanon there are, as I understand it, 38 separate armies at work and 4 nations at least engaged directly and others by proxy in the fighting. The situation there is hardly less desperate and even that one seems to us at times of minor importance compared to the war in the Gulf. I wish we could have some confidence that an outbreak of calm in the area of Israel would spread much further afield. But we must commend of course nevertheless the efforts which Mr Thorn has made to create that calm.

Now my colleague, Mr Spicer, will be dealing with the Turkish question, the vexed subject of the oral question before us. I would simply confine myself to saying that when by misfortune a friend has broken a leg it is clearly futile to say that he should not have broken it and it is not helpful to insist that he take off the splint and the plaster and throw away his crutches before he can walk without them.

We wish Turkish democracy and individual freedom there the speediest possible recovery and we are confident, I think with good reason, that its restoration to health will not be needlessly delayed and we shall do what we can by contact and encouragement to aid that convalescence.

In a year and a presidency of the greatest tension and lack of *détente* in East-West relations, when, and lately in the name of *détente*, the Soviet Union has openly regarded Communist revolution as a one-way ratchet, we are looking with growing impatience for some signs from the Council, from the West, of effective action to thwart Soviet expansionism. The moral condemnation of Madrid may be useful but it cannot be enough when Moscow uses *détente* as no more

than a stalking horse — a cover — for behaving as aggressively as ever. It is true that in consequence of Afghanistan there have been some marginally useful agreements between EEC countries and the United States but I hope that from now on there will be far greater realization of what the Community acting in political cooperation and the United States can do together — two of the greatest economic units in the world. I hope that the incoming US Administration in particular will understand this. It remains astounding how little is understood at all levels in America of the Community's political potential.

The point to grasp is that with political economic cooperation comes political economic power. The closer the one, the greater the other. What signs are there, and I leave the question with Mr Thorn under whatever hat he chooses to consider it, now or in the future, that the Nine will marshal its economic muscle in self-defence against a Russian Communism which is still flagrantly on the move and threatens us economically no less than militarily? But that Communism's Achilles' heel — its most vulnerable point — is the broken-down, discredited economic system on which it rests, a system and theory which decries human nature and which the West in its simpleness, and its greed too, with credits, technology and cheap food, chooses materially to sustain.

If *détente* eludes us, if disarmament is unattainable, we must consider the other side of the arms-race coin. There are complementary means of restraining aggression, of restraining those who pursue revolution to the point of war among their neighbours. In a word, the hope of world peace must return when the Russian economy is obliged at last to concentrate on providing for itself not guns but butter. And, if I may say so, their own butter. That, I trust, will be the theme we can pursue here in the coming months.

And may I conclude then by wishing the President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers all the best for his future as he proposes to take off one hat and prepares to put on another.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Berlinguer to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Berlinguer. — (I) Madam President, we are holding this debate at a critical moment in international affairs, at a time when, more than ever, the only solution seems to be a new role for Europe and more particularly for our Community. I do not believe that this is made clear in Mr Thorn's report: it is a careful, measured report but neither its priorities nor its proposals are at the same level as our own responsibilities. Until now, in fact, political cooperation between the EEC countries, which is to say the will to deter-

Berlinguer

mine common goals and initiatives in foreign policy, has not been at the level demanded by the serious nature of international relations and by the appalling problems which our world has to face today. There have been one or two efforts, one or two attempts in recent times but they are not only a long way from being a common foreign policy, but a long way from demonstrating effective coordination.

When that is lacking there is little sense in lamenting the fact, as some do, that any particular country has felt obliged to make individual initiatives. Indeed, it is our view that some of these initiatives, particularly those relating to the situation which arose as a result of Soviet intervention in Afghanistan, helped to keep the way open for renewed dialogue between East and West, which in turn has its effect both on Europe itself, when we consider it from the point of view of the careful attitude adopted by many governments and political powers towards the crisis in Poland, and on relations between the USA and the USSR, at least as far as concerns negotiations on medium range missiles in Europe.

What is however also true is that these initiatives would have had far greater effect had they been given the full, joint support of the Nine.

And if, as well as looking to the past, we look to the present and the future, the need for these joint initiatives becomes even more clear.

We shall henceforth be needing a common plan and policy on the question of the military régime in Turkey, whose hallmark continues to be the repression of democratic liberties. None of us are satisfied by Mr Thorn's vague words on this question. Our view of the Turkish situation is that the time is now ripe for the EEC to suspend the association agreement until such time as lawful democracy is restored in the country. The entire Communist and Allies Group has tabled a motion for resolution to this effect.

There is at present a good deal of speculation on what the policies of the Reagan government will be. Can Europe wait passively, though, for the new administration to be installed and define its opinions, or should we not take this opportunity of general uncertainty in international relations, show clearly our own irrevocable choices and then proceed with the policies which follow from them?

It is known that we Italian Communists are seeking no reduction in relations with the United States as they are defined in the Atlantic Alliance. But at the same time we do not consider that, if the European Community wishes to have a future, it should allow itself to be considered as a sort of branch of the Atlantic pact, as some political opinions would appear to have it. The Nine have their own role to confirm and develop, and that role cannot be restricted to the problems of our own continent.

Of course, *détente* in Europe is our first objective. Some of the highest authorities in the International Socialist Congress share this view, and said so recently when speaking about the new American administration, and stressed that *détente* is for Europe a need which cannot be abandoned.

It is from this that we perceive the importance of the Nine's duty to see that the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe in Madrid makes balanced progress towards a positive conclusion with tangible results, including first of all a pan-European conference on disarmament. We are living in a world where more than a thousand million dollars a day are being spent on the arms race; a race which goes on untrained and which can lead only to universal disaster. It is Europe, where the greatest concentration of total destruction weaponry is kept, which can and must make first steps to stop and then reverse this trend. We, the European Parliament, must appeal to all the governments represented at Madrid, to the USA and to the USSR, to the countries of the Warsaw pact and the Atlantic Alliance, to the neutrals and the non-aligned, that they should make it their responsibility to recreate by words and actions that minimum of mutual trust which is necessary in the quest for security by means of monitored and balanced reductions in arms.

Europe's responsibility for *détente* and disarmament is also essential if we are to prevent the two superpowers being forced by the very logic of their antagonism towards a form of mutual intolerance which would have disastrous repercussions throughout the world. But a European initiative is also essential so that we can state in new terms the problems of North-South relationships and deal with hunger in the world, as it is this Assembly's responsibility, a responsibility which, if it is to be more than mere empty words, calls for both a reduction in arms expenditure and a start in building a new international order which is capable of making the development of the world's vast underdeveloped areas the linch-pin of a new, more rational and more equitable kind of economic development within the industrialized countries themselves.

There are many indications in the developing countries of a demand for Europe to start a new and brave economic and political policy tainted neither by neocolonialism nor by ambition for power. Failure to grasp this opportunity, failure to respond to these hopes, would condemn Europe to abandoning its new role in world affairs and to consequent decline and irresistible crisis. Demand for a European political initiative is now arising in the Middle East in particular. We should act quickly because throughout the area the situation is very serious and further conflict threatens.

Without an equitable solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict there will never be peace in this particularly jittery region whose nervousness reverberates across and well beyond the Mediterranean. No matter what

Berlinguer

the views of the governments of the Nine on the Camp David Agreement may be, it is now clear that the overall need is for peace founded on the recognition of the right to exist and right to security of every State in the Middle East, including Israel, and on the confirmed right of the Palestinian people to create their own State. It is to be hoped that the political initiative which was only glimpsed at the Venice Summit will be given real impetus when the Council meets at Luxembourg at the beginning of December, on this basis and on the basis of the facts gathered during Mr Thorn's mission.

The initiative I have been speaking of is for *détente*, for disarmament and for cooperation both within our continent and throughout the world. It is an appeal to our governments but also — and we are very much aware of it — to the political and social movements and particularly to those movements which represent workers and the working classes, whose ideals are peace, justice and solidarity. This is a great area in which the left, despite its divisions, must seek common ground, agreement, even joint ideals and proposals. This is a path to which we Italian Communists are and shall remain committed, with our own independent judgment open to dialogue and to negotiation with each and every other movement for peace and for progress.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Haagerup to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Haagerup. — (DK) Madam President, even if the Member States of the European Communities are still far from speaking 'with one voice', there is a great deal of evidence of the progress of political cooperation. One indication is the wide interest displayed in EPC, as political cooperation is called, by countries both outside and, of course, especially inside Europe, by other democratic countries who are members of the Council of Europe but not of the EEC and to whom Mr Glinne referred in his speech. The talks which have just taken place between the Norwegian Prime Minister and the EEC, also raising the question of contacts at ministerial level on political cooperation between Norway and the Nine, is one such indication. We welcome this development. It reflects the positive Norwegian interest in closer relations with the Community and in political cooperation with the Nine. In our view it can only be in our own interest to develop and expand contacts such as the Norwegian initiative.

Having said this, I must add that the entry of more and more new Member States cannot and should not replace already established contacts with countries outside the EEC nor efface the difference between Member State and non-member State of the Community. Whereas as a matter of course we should main-

tain the Community's openness to other countries including also to those which like Norway and Sweden have no plans to seek direct entry to the EEC, political cooperation must inevitably have the special stamp of being undertaken by countries which have joined the Community.

I should like to participate in the question Mr Glinne put to the President of the Council of Foreign Ministers. In my own and my group's view we must endeavour to find a satisfactory formula which permits continued development of political cooperation amongst the Member States and at the same time uphold and improve contacts with countries outside it. These countries' possible future membership of the EEC and thereby full participation in EPC is obviously a matter to be decided primarily by these countries themselves.

President. — I call Mr de la Malène to speak on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

Mr de la Malène. — (F) Madam President, in the short time allotted to me I will limit the comments on behalf of my Group to three topics: the Iran-Iraq war, the Madrid Conference and our relations with Turkey.

On the first point, we are witnessing, as you said and as is clear to all, a new conflict which has erupted in the Middle East, and this time it is at the very heart of the powder keg instead of on the edge; moreover, we find that in this conflict — as if by chance and as is the case elsewhere — Russian and American arms are being used by the opposing sides.

Everybody proclaims their desire to see an end to the conflict. That this is true of the immediate neighbours, we can easily believe; that it is true of certain others who are at a greater distance we are far less certain, and we are not even sure that while perhaps wishing to end the conflict they will not find themselves obliged to intervene directly or indirectly for one reason or another. And then, also bound up in this conflict is of course the problem of the hostages. But we in Europe, for whom this region is obviously vital, have our hands free in this matter and it is because our hands are free, which is not the case for many others, that in spite of the lack of faith in European intervention which can be noted in various quarters, we regret that Europe is not more conspicuous. And we regret that some helpful proposal by Europe is not increasing the chances of scaling down, and then ending a conflict which — as we will see in the coming weeks — will have consequences for life in Europe which it is very difficult to measure. This view is not supported, perhaps, in European circles, but for our part we think that something should be done without delay.

de la Malène

After these few words on the war, I should like to say a word about Madrid. We have always been in favour of the Madrid Conference. We are in favour because we believe that this is a unique opportunity to use the principal weapon of the free world which is freedom, and that the Madrid Conference with all its ramifications and consequences is one way of using the only true force of the free world, namely freedom. However, at this Madrid Conference there must be conditions and there must be consequences.

There are numerous conditions and I am not going to list them all. I will mention a few so that we do not go to Madrid, either from near by or from afar, excusing or even forgetting Afghanistan which must always be part of these discussions. We must not go there without taking stock of what has happened since the Helsinki Conference, particularly in the sphere of human rights. We must not go there forgetting the balance between the so-called 'baskets'. We must not pass over in silence, either, the lack of freedom which the third basket is intended to investigate. Nor must we go there without perpetuating the Conference as we have proposed, by setting up a committee which would be permanently responsible for ruling on human rights. Those are a few conditions but there are many others.

Then there are the consequences: the free world has lost a lot of ground in the last decade. Now it must assess its losses. It must strengthen its determination and consolidate its resources otherwise the Helsinki Conference which promised such a happy outcome, is likely to be no more than an unfortunate Munich, which was perhaps not blameworthy in itself but was blameworthy to the extent that it did not influence the determination of Western democracies to learn a lesson from it. Well, at Madrid too the free world must draw its conclusions and say that it has enough of intervention, of Soviet expansionism in Asia, in Africa and elsewhere, either directly, or indirectly, in particular through the use of intermediaries. Unquestionably everyone is free in this world, must be free to choose his destiny and nobody must have a choice, a destiny imposed on him from the outside. This is also one of the conclusions to be drawn by the free world from Madrid.

To conclude I will say a few more words on Turkey. We have explained our position in a resolution. We deplore the suspension of Turkish democracy, but we know that freedom must not be a caricature and that the freedom which prevailed in Turkey was principally the freedom to kill and that is not democracy. We are therefore patient and understanding, but at the same time we must urge that the objectives be defined and the timetable fixed. The objectives meaning the steps towards restoring democracy, and the timetable stating the deadline. We say all this in our resolution. Those, Madam President, were just a few brief remarks in the five minutes allotted to me. Obviously there are many things to be said, but I have tried to

outline the fundamental demands of our group on these three points.

President. — I call Mrs Castellina to speak on behalf of the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members.

Mrs Castellina. — (*I*) Madam President, Mr Thorn said that the Community had a real presence on the international scene, but I think it would have been more accurate to say that the Community is still at the stage of promise and hope. And it will not remain even that for much longer, because even promise and hope run the risk — in the face of the expectations aroused by direct elections to this Parliament, among other things — of turning into their opposite, i.e. yet another contribution to the decline in confidence both in Europe and in the validity of democratic institutions themselves, for our debates are becoming ever more vacuous, as are the Community's international policy statements.

The list of such statements which Mr Thorn gave us just now is extremely telling — mere verbal diplomacy in nearly all cases, and initiatives which are so contradictory that they lose all effectiveness. For example, what is the point of acknowledging the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and approving the Camp David agreements, when the policy enshrined in those agreements itself negates the right to self-determination proclaimed just before? This is only one example — I could give more if I had more time.

I do not think that Europe can achieve any real autonomy by following this road. And, take note, this is all the more true now that a man like Reagan has been elected President of the United States, for this means that the room for manoeuvre available to us for achieving that autonomy — which we expect to achieve painlessly, at no cost — is likely to decrease dramatically. At this stage, if Europe does not want to be trampled upon, a much more decisive European initiative is required, capable of confronting an American policy which seeks to make Europe a mere satellite.

Since the urgency of world problems makes it impossible to go on toying with the North-South problem by reducing it to a few paltry aids given in a spirit of far from disinterested charity, Europe must prepare to make a real response to the basic demands of the developing countries, or the way will remain open for uncontrollable processes, as well as for the extension of the economic and military blackmail exercised by the two superpowers. The only real way of avoiding the extension of Soviet power in the Third World is to create a Europe which will be a positive point of reference for developing peoples, so as to free them in practice not only from the most burdensome form of dependence which they suffer — neo-colonialism —

Castellina

but also, as in the case of some Latin American countries including El Salvador, from the burden of American support for execrable dictatorships.

But in order to become this autonomous and positive point of reference for developing countries, Europe must courageously seek an understanding with the non-aligned countries, undertaking to create a relationship which is no longer based on unequal trade; in other words, it must create a new development model which is complete and egalitarian with regard to the Third World.

Unfortunately, however, this is not happening and this is where we come up against the real problem of Europe — its internal policy, which displays not only ever greater discord, but also increasingly strong tendencies towards a restrictive economic policy of cutting back on social expenditure, tending in the opposite direction to that which our official statements have repeatedly indicated, particularly in the case of the North-South dialogue. It is for these reasons that I am not at all satisfied with the statements made to us here by Mr Thorn.

President. — I call Mr Romualdi, non-attached.

Mr Romualdi. — (I) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the main features of the current international political situation were summed up in the speech by the President of the Council, whom we thank wholeheartedly. As he rightly stressed, no effort has been spared in the difficult search for new and different equilibria to guarantee security, and thereby a peace policy — although we would add that this must be based on facts, i.e. on political and military forces really capable of maintaining peace in the world, and not merely on a mountain of illusions which crumbles in the face of each new event and each new difficulty, as occurred after the invasion of Afghanistan.

On that occasion the decisions of the Council of Ministers, recalled here by Mr Thorn, together with those of the Commission and Parliament, served merely to irritate, or indeed to bore, Mr Brezhnev, and certainly did not make him revise any of his plans.

The first of the events which occurred in this period was the war between Iraq and Iran. The latter's internal and international destabilization, resulting from the revolution and Khomeini's fanaticism has been total, and is disturbing and dangerous for all of us, as the deplorable and unsolved problem of the hostages — mentioned here today — demonstrates. This situation requires, in our view, more attention than the President of the Council cautiously suggested, when in connection with freedom of navigation in the Gulf — essential for European oil supplies — he stated only that this freedom is necessary, and gave no hint as to how it could be guaranteed. Mr Thorn also spoke of

the importance of resuming the Euro-Arab Dialogue, but what at present are the real conditions for making this resumption entirely possible? In our view it is difficult to say. As our own President reaffirmed, we must confine ourselves to hoping for a resumption, since the Middle East situation rather than improving, seems to be deteriorating further, thus showing that the parties involved are not the best fitted to solve the pressing problems of Palestine and Israel. Quite apart from any pious resolution of the United Nations or other resolutions or statements full of laudable intentions, those peoples must at all costs realize — and we must do everything we can to help them to do so, partly because this is the positive aspect of the Camp David agreement which remain valid and to which the new Reagan administration also seems committed — that a solution to the problem of the existence of Palestine and of the State of Israel within secure and recognized frontiers cannot be achieved by the victory of one side or the other in a new cold war or actual war, nor by the terrorism of the PLO, nor by criminal reprisals regarded as justified by their perpetrators, but by negotiations leading to an agreement.

I now turn to the Madrid Conference, of which we have always been in favour. If we wish not merely to progress without running the risk of breaking the thread by which the policy of *détente* still appears to hang, but to progress without illusions, looking at the problems dispassionately, it is necessary to discuss all the 'baskets' at the same time, reaffirming the global nature of all aspects of *détente*, but above all stressing the indispensable nature of security and of the measures to guarantee it, for without security there can be neither peace nor defence of human rights. Otherwise the Madrid Conference, despite everyone's efforts, will end up as yet another illusion. This is confirmed by the fact that the Soviet Union and other Communist States wanted the Helsinki Conference — this is essentially our basic view, since we cannot believe that Communism is prepared radically to change its nature or methods of government, as Mr Berlinguer would have us believe — only in order to have their wartime conquests recognized together with the inviolability of absurd frontiers which, as we have said here before, have divided into two or more parts so many peoples and nations.

In conclusion, we are only too glad to take note of the President of the Council's statement that the Nine have acted in concert and will continue to do so, not only with regard to the work of the Madrid Conference but also with regard to the whole international policy of the Community. We would remind you that political cooperation is not a true common policy, partly because the Treaties do not provide for it, but it is none the less a political agreement in keeping with the spirit and perhaps even with the letter of the Treaties. This agreement which enables us to state that the European Community is a force to be reckoned with — albeit still imperfect, although hope it will become ever stronger and more capable of independent initia-

Romualdi

tives. This is what Mr Berlinguer also said, but of course we mean it in the opposite sense to that which he intended — i.e. in the spirit of an alliance which is not intended to be, cannot and must not be a restriction of our freedom, but a guarantee of our security, which depends not only on disarmament and on the absence of actual nuclear weapons from Europe, but above all on the response to the consistently expansionist and aggressive policy of the Soviet Union, which pious socialistic intentions are unfortunately not enough to check.

President. — I call Mr Cariglia.

Mr Cariglia. — (I) Madam President, I too would like to thank the President of the Council for his contribution to our debates on the most controversial themes of political cooperation. I hope we shall have the good fortune to continue to be addressed by Mr Thorn in his new capacity as President of the European Commission.

I wish to make just a few remarks on the subject dealt with in Mr Thorn's speech, since I feel that the Chairman of the Socialist Group, Mr Glinne, has amply covered the whole field discussed by Mr Thorn.

The first remark concerns Israel and Middle East politics in general. Leaving aside the assessments made by some other speakers, I think it is impossible to draw up an 'original' policy for the Middle East — I mean a European policy — without running the risk of becoming a tool of the policies of the two parties involved. I therefore think that Europe was right to acknowledge realistically that there are two conflicting interests, and that this acknowledgement was based on the principle of security for the State of Israel and the future Palestinian State. However, I think that Europe could play a greater role in terms of economic initiatives in an area where the gun has ruled for 30 years, and where peaceful initiatives are urgently needed.

My second remark concerns Afghanistan. There is no doubt that the Soviet occupation has a series of strategic implications which we cannot ignore. It is also certain that the events in Afghanistan interrupted the process of *détente* in Europe and the world. Of course, we do not say this because we derive any satisfaction from it, but because we think it is an objective fact, which is reflected above all in European public opinion. We say it also because we are aware that there is no alternative to *détente* in world affairs. Hence the commitment mentioned just now by Mr Berlinguer, on the part of us Socialists and Social Democrats, to pursue *détente* at every level.

My third remark concerns the role of Europe. We must acknowledge that, despite its considerable economic and commercial weight, Europe has not yet succeeded in defining its political role. There are

initiatives by individual States, but they do not always coincide with the interests and expectations of Europe. For example, I am worried that France can take the initiative of constructing a neutron bomb, thus reinforcing the arguments of the two superpowers in their arms race. There are those who hope for a new direction in American policy almost scorning the policy followed up to now which sought to safeguard civil and human rights. We Socialists take a different view. We think that Europe will be strong to the extent that it remains faithful to the values of its ancient heritage, and I also think that Realpolitik — that political realism which is so much mooted today — if it had any result, would be extremely negative for Europe, since it could lead to an agreement between the two superpowers over the heads of European countries.

Finally, Madam President, I would like to mention the Madrid Conference. Mr Berlinguer referred to an initiative for a pan-European disarmament conference. Clearly, we do not disapprove of this initiative, since it is in line with the decisions which our parties have already taken at the Congress which we held recently in Madrid itself. However, we need to be very clear and precise about this. We can attempt to follow the road of a disarmament conference, so long as it does not have the final result of neutralizing Europe — a result which would be damaging to Europe's interests. Therefore, to the extent that we believe we represent an undeniable vocation — the peaceful vocation of Europe — we can leave no stone unturned in pursuit of disarmament, provided of course that this disarmament is fully guaranteed and that our bonds of alliance with the United States of America are not weakened.

President. — I call Mr Møller.

Mr Møller. — (DK) Madam President, I should like to comment on what the rapporteur of my group, Mr Fergusson, said a short while ago. It is written that the last shall be first, and on this occasion I should like to say that it could also be written that the least shall be greatest. We are taking leave of Mr Thorn as President of the Council and by his effort in the past half year, when I have had occasion to watch his performance, he has shown that he has the ability to come from the smallest of our Member States and have a very big influence on the policy of Europe and of the Community. I would like to compliment him on this and thank him as a representative of a small country. Because it is clear that we also encounter challenges to our membership, we are told that we have no say. But now it has been shown that the smallest country can contribute something. This is to Mr Thorn's credit and we will be happy to see him again in January as President of the Commission.

Next, a few comments on Mr Thorn's intervention. First I would like to ask him if he has any comments on the Norwegian Prime Minister's, Mr Nordli's,

Møller

démarche vis-à-vis the Community. For us in Denmark at least it would be very gratifying if what happened in 1972 in the Norwegian referendum, when the people said no to the Community, could somehow be put right.

Next let me say to Mr Thorn that I feel that under his presidency we have really succeeded in achieving positive results at the Foreign Minister's meetings, thereby giving Europe an identity and an image in world politics. This is perhaps the reason why we now have the *démarche* from the Norwegian side. For me this is very important. I know well that some people regard this as of somewhat less importance, namely those who do not wish the Community to become a political success and who on the contrary believe that it is contrary to the Treaty of Rome to concern oneself at all with politics and with a Council of Foreign Affairs Ministers. I do not believe that this is contrary to the Treaty. Even without a Treaty of Rome it would be quite natural if the Western countries' democracies had a common foreign policy and a common approach to i.e. questions raised in the United Nations, at the Madrid conference, the Afghanistan question, the hostages in Teheran, etc. One cannot demand nor can one expect either that the nine foreign ministers should meet to assert that they do not have the right to pursue a common foreign policy. Because of course they have the right to do so. They simply do not have the right to bind the individual country's parliaments to pursue a particular course of action. Not everybody is satisfied with this and so have decided to try to establish a parliamentary basis for political cooperation in their country.

Thus I see this presidency, which is now about to change, as marking the successful development of the European Community's Council of Ministers which has now again acquired a significance which was on the point of disappearing since the Heads of State had decided to follow their own counsel, whereby they gradually shelved all the big decisions and resolutions. But now the Council of Ministers has again attained importance and we are grateful for that. We hope and I hope that your successor will live up to the status which you have given the office and for which I express my thanks.

President. — I call Mr Tindemans.

Mr Tindemans. — (NL) Madam President, I too should like to pay tribute to the President-in-Office of the Council of Foreign Ministers, Mr Thorn, on the occasion of his final appearance — for the time being at least — in this House in his present capacity. Our thanks are due to him for the way he has done his job.

I should like to comment on a number of aspects from his speech, and to begin with, I think we should give a little thought to what political cooperation really boils

down to. It seems to be that we often waste a lot of time dealing with problems which do not help Europe to move forward, whereas political cooperation is an extremely important aspect of the process of political unification. You were quite right in saying, Madam President, that political cooperation is not based on any treaty. Allow me, none the less, to remind Members that the Heads of State and Government at the Summit Conference in 1973 adopted a text which amounts to a fairly far-reaching commitment as regards political cooperation. One sometimes gets the impression that there is little in the way of continuity as regards the commitments entered into by Heads of Government in the field of European integration. Allow me to read you the text approved in Copenhagen in 1973:

The governments will consult with each other on all the important questions of foreign policy and will establish priorities in accordance with the following principles:

- The aim of consultation is to seek a joint approach in specific cases.
- The subjects must affect Europe's interests, on or outside our continent, in those fields where a common standpoint is essential or desirable.
- On these questions, each Member State undertakes, generally speaking, not to finalize its own position before consulting its partners in the framework of political cooperation.

This was agreed and laid down in a text which received the approval of the Heads of Government. It therefore follows that it is not true to say that political cooperation is not based on a treaty. If Europe wants to establish its own identity, we must increasingly have sufficient courage to adopt a specifically European standpoint *vis-à-vis* the major international problems. The text I myself formulated in 1975 says:

A European identity will not be accepted by the outside world if the States of Europe are alternately united and disunited.

The ball is therefore in our court. Let us go on from there to see what we have committed ourselves to:

The difficulty is one of having to reach a common point of view.

It is therefore not sufficient merely to discuss and consult; the question is how we should arrive at a common standpoint. In my report on European union, I named four areas in which we have decided of our own volition to speak with a single voice and to develop a common standpoint. These four were our relations with the United States, the problem of security in Europe, the new economic world order — in other words, the North-South dialogue — and the problems of the Mediterranean countries. Need I add that the Group of the European People's Party regrets the fact that, as regards the special UN session devoted to the North-South dialogue, the Nine are split and have failed to adopt a common approach?

Tindemans

Allow me to add here that, if we had made our position clear earlier *vis-à-vis* the United States and had worked out a common standpoint on the Mediterranean — that is to say, the Middle East — there would have been less need for us to improvise in the matter concerning the Teheran hostages, and we could have achieved a more unified approach on the part of the West at this difficult stage in international affairs. That is why I said we should adopt a common approach after clearly formulating our own standpoint. And that is why I rather regret the fact that we are now already busy taking up positions regarding the newly-elected US President. I believe I am right in saying that this is a unique situation, in that we are now — to put it diplomatically — categorizing or attacking a head of government before even knowing what his policies will be. There are heads of state and government in Europe who are managing to work together without sharing the same political views, and we do not see any danger in that. On the contrary, it is absolutely vital that they should be able to work together. I would therefore say that we should put off the really difficult problems to give us a chance to see whether we can arrive at a common standpoint. And let me add, Mr President, that I deplore the Nine's attitude to Turkey, although I shall refrain from going into the matter in detail right now. It is always a sad sight to see a democratic regime overthrown and replaced by a military regime. But why have the Nine failed to adopt a clear, common standpoint on this matter? I am thinking here of a government not a million miles away from me, which has adopted an opposing attitude. If we really want a common European foreign policy, it seems to me that we must in principle be capable of taking a common line at difficult moments regarding a country like Turkey, which is after all not that remote. We must wait to see what policy the United States will be pursuing, but we already know — at least, this is the impression we get — that the newly-elected US President wants America to show a greater element of leadership. In itself, we have no objection to that — quite the contrary. However, it does mean that the Europeans will have to clarify their policies so that we know what form cooperation will be able to take in the future. In other words, we must develop a more robust European sense of self-confidence. On a number of occasions over the last few months — and this is not intended as criticism — we have heard suggestions that the European heads of government have been inadequately consulted by the White House. On the other hand, we have heard complaints from the United States that the European countries want to be consulted, but when it comes to accepting their share of responsibility, their enthusiasm all too often wanes. Be that as it may, the moment has now come to build a foundation for new and better relations between the United States and Europe. Perhaps we shall now have a fresh chance to put our heads together, and perhaps now we shall be consulted, in which case there will be grounds for a change in attitude in Europe, in the hope that — and this is the point I wanted to make — a proper dialogue

will come about between the Community and the United States. This dialogue is something I have consistently referred to: a dialogue on such matters as energy policy, monetary policy and security. Questions like these cannot be solved or even dealt with adequately in isolation or in a climate of frosty relations. This is such an important point — we have only to think of the Middle East issue — that it might only take one misconceived air raid anywhere in the Middle East to provoke a war — and you all know what I am thinking about. Then there is the question of protecting the shipping lanes. My group has already put forward a proposal regarding our own supplies of — for instance — oil. But that is not something we can tackle alone: that is the kind of thing we need a proper dialogue for. I think the moment has now come to try to institute this dialogue with the new US Administration and thus to improve our mutual relations. Need I remind you that the world situation is anything but rosy. We have only to think of Afghanistan, and in this context I was struck by the appositeness of Mr Glinne's remark to the effect that those doing the fighting in Afghanistan were not so much rebels as freedom fighters. They are indeed, and I hope that this point is appreciated by all of us, including those who have spoken about peace and *détente* in this debate. I shall not draw any comparisons with events elsewhere; I merely hope that these Members will give the freedom fighters in Afghanistan the same assistance or sympathy that has been extended to people in similar cases elsewhere; the fact is that I have heard no reference to any such assistance or sympathy on this particular occasion.

The second point I should like to make is that the war between Iraq and Iran might be highly explosive if it were to extend to the Mediterranean. Thirdly, there is the question of South-East Asia, which the President-in-Office of the Council himself referred to. I shall not go into detail here, nor shall I discuss the tensions between other countries in the Middle East. Lebanon has not been mentioned here. Camp David has only been touched on. But how do we see the agreements between Israel and Egypt developing? Then there is Latin America and the general question of human rights.

That brings me on to the Madrid Conference. The Helsinki Conference in 1975 was a glimmer of hope for many people who followed developments on the world political scene. We thought that — given goodwill — a new chapter could be written in the annals of world affairs. Now, though, there are question-marks over the meeting in Madrid. In Helsinki, the late Aldo Moro spoke behalf of the Nine, and on that occasion Europe spoke with a single voice. So far, we have heard nothing to indicate that the Nine have taken a similar decision with regard to the Madrid Conference. In other words, European political cooperation has moved backwards rather than forwards since 1975.

Tindemans

The conference in Madrid bears the title *Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe*. When have the Nine ever seriously discussed the problem of security in Europe? To my knowledge, nothing of the kind has ever happened. Let us not then indulge in mere polemics and pretend we were in favour of *détente* and were going to the Madrid Conference to discuss security, when the fact is that we are not even aware of our own security problem nor have we discussed it among ourselves. Why, Mr Thorn, do we not discuss the matter? Why do we lack the courage to tackle this delicate problem?

In conclusion, let us summarize what we can do in the field of political cooperation, which is rightly a matter for this House. The fact is that there is more we could do to take genuine steps towards improving the existing situation in the Community of the Nine, shortly to become the Community of the Ten.

Let us make political cooperation an essential element of European integration. I think all the Members who have spoken so far in this debate have expressed their desire for peace and *détente*. I would add my voice to theirs, but let me say also that we should not lose sight of the question of European security.

President. — I call Mrs Hoffmann.

Mrs Hoffmann. — (F) Madam President, since the situation in Turkey and its impact on the Association Agreement with the EEC are again on our agenda, I would remind you that in the course of a previous debate which took place on the day after the military take-over in Turkey, the Communist Group alone in this House protested against the position of the Council and of the Commission, which at that time consisted in taking refuge behind the declarations of intent of the new Turkish leaders regarding the rapid restoration of democratic power in that country so as the better to sanction the military take-over financed by NATO and not to break off relations between the EEC and Turkey.

Our motion for a resolution was rejected by all the groups as was also an amendment tabled by us during the budget debate asking that the appropriations for assistance to Turkey be deleted until democracy had been restored.

Both the initial decisions as well as recent events in Turkey bring us to reaffirm our wholehearted condemnation of the installation of a Fascist type power in that country and to assure the democratic forces which continue to oppose it of our full solidarity. What has in fact happened since the take-over by the Turkish military junta?

Firstly, the junta installed a new government whose principal objective would be, according to the declara-

tions of its Prime Minister, the former Admiral Uluşu, to ensure the harmonious functioning of all the organs of a democratic and social State while respecting human rights.

But it is a curious concept of democracy which consists, *inter alia*, in strengthening the powers of the commanders of the martial law declared in the 67 provinces and in prohibiting the progressive press, the right to strike, and the freedom to meet and associate, which means that today no political party, no professional organization can exist publicly and fully exercise its activity and that the Turkish Communist Party still remains the only Communist Party to be banned in Europe!

The restoration of order by the Turkish armed forces since their take-over has involved 60 000 arrests since 12 September. It is State terrorism: the army and the police assassinate openly in the streets, and in two months 500 people have been killed.

Faced with this situation, what is proposed to us? Firstly, by Mr Thorn, that EEC/Turkish relations should continue as if nothing had happened since 12 September. Secondly, by the Socialist Group, to send a delegation to investigate on the spot whether human rights and democracy are really dead in Turkey.

What the Members of the House do not know, however, is that an official invitation from the Turkish military government has just been sent to the Bureau of Parliament through the offices of Mr Fellermaier of the Socialist Group! Thus, under humanitarian pretexts, the proposal of the Socialist Group is in fact complying with the wishes of the generals.

For us the situation is clear-cut. The Council, the Commission and this House must condemn through action, and not through hypocritical declarations, the take-over of power by the military junta and the assaults on democracy in Turkey. Why is it that these institutions and the majority of Parliament, which are usually so concerned about human rights and which again and again do not hesitate to pose as an international tribunal, prove to be so infinitely less touchy about the democratic credentials of the applicants knocking at the door?

In truth, the military *coup d'état* in Turkey has nothing to do — and you are well aware of this — with the restoration of democratic power. What is at stake is quite different. The aim is to change the institutional framework so as to radically obstruct the rise of the social opposition, to exclude the workers' movement from the political life of the country and thus to moor Turkey solidly to the imperialist system. In order to comply with the instructions of the big western financial institutions, in particular the IMF which has just released the second instalment of the loan granted to Turkey last June, it is of vital importance to the Turkish bourgeoisie and the United States

Hoffmann

to try to bring the workers' movement and its democratic organizations to heel.

For our part we will continue to press for the liberation of all prisoners and the freedom of institutions, political parties and trade unions, the presence of one of whose leaders in the gallery of this House today I should like to welcome. We will continue to oppose any ploy designed to admit Turkey to the Community.

It is towards this end that we repeat our proposal that the European Parliament demand the suspension of relations between the Community and Turkey as long as the military junta is in power.

President. — I call Mr Pintat.

Mr Pintat. — (*F*) Madam President, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, first of all I wish to thank Mr Gaston Thorn for the manner in which he is carrying out his task and tell him how happy and proud we are that he is crossing over to the other side of this Chamber in January. He will in fact be the only one of us to have been on both the right and the left and in the centre of the floor, and Europe is lucky that such a competent statesman as he has studied our European problems as a member of the three Community institutions.

I am going to speak on the problem of Turkey. There is no doubt that the sudden intervention of the Turkish armed forces in the political life of that country was a shock to democratic opinion in our countries. However, now that the initial adverse impression has passed, we must analyse the situation objectively and lucidly. Democracy had ground to a halt in that country, it had not been possible to elect the President of the Republic, vacant administrative posts were no longer being filled, no laws were being passed in Parliament, 86 political assassinations had been carried out in two months and the country was slipping slowly into anarchy and civil war while it occupies a strategic position of primary importance to Western defence.

However we must study the situation far more closely and of course we must above all stand guard over democracy in Europe watchfully and without wavering.

We have none the less a number of precedents: there is cooperation between the Community and countries with political systems which differ from our own. The countries of the Lomé Conventions, or even more so Yugoslavia, do not share the same conception of democracy. Furthermore, it is of vital interest to Europe that Turkey, a country which borders on the Soviet Union, does not become another centre of instability and does not experience a situation similar to that in Iran, which is provoking grave problems. We must therefore do everything we can to help restore

democracy in Turkey as rapidly as possible and, to that end, exert a certain amount of pressure on our Turkish neighbours.

There are of course a number of reassuring signs. The number of terrorist attacks has dropped in recent months; neither the political parties nor the trade unions have been officially dissolved; there are no political trials; important economic recovery measures which are indispensable to the restoration of the political situation have been introduced and are beginning to prove effective; the inflation rate has dropped sharply; there are devious signs of *détente* in the conflict between Greece and Turkey.

The objective is therefore to bring Turkey out of its present situation as rapidly as possible. The plans for the democratic process defined by our Turkish friends themselves have been finalized. It will be necessary to suppress extreme right and left-wing terrorism, to set up quickly a new constituent body to draw up a new constitution, to elect the President of the Republic democratically as soon as possible, to hold a referendum to adopt the new electoral law and to set up a democratic assembly and government: this will definitively ensure protection of human rights and freedom of the press.

The task has been mapped out, but the past is the best guarantee of the future, and Turkey has already shown that with a GNP of between 700 and 800 dollars per capita, it has been one of the very few countries of the world to have a system of democratic liberties comparable to those of countries with a GNP ten times greater, i.e. between 7 000 and 8 000 dollars per capita.

As a former member of the Joint Turkish-European Parliamentary Committee, a position I held for six years, I can bear witness to the friendship which the Turkish people have always borne us, and to the solidarity and strength of the democratic feeling in that country. It has a recovery plan which has the support of the IMF, the OECD and the World Bank. Its debts are far lower than those of Yugoslavia, Brazil or the countries of Eastern Europe. There are thus definite possibilities for recovery.

It would be a very grave error and a great injustice not to assist this country. Furthermore, in the past we and our American friends have done all that was necessary in this sphere. Did we perhaps commit psychological or economic errors? We must ask ourselves this question.

It is for this reason that the Liberal and Democratic Group believes that we must aid Turkey and that the Community must immediately see what can be done to assist economic recovery, because without a sound economy in that country there cannot be any social policy and thus no true democracy. In that way we would be all the better armed to exert the necessary

Pintat

diplomatic pressure on the Turkish leaders to respect and, if possible, speed up the timetable for the re-establishment of true democratic institutions.

President. — I call Mr Penders.

Mr Penders. — (NL) Madam President, I should like to begin by thanking the President-in-Office of the Council, Mr Thorn, not so much for the speech he gave this morning — although I thank him for that too — as on the occasion of his final appearance here in his present capacity. He has not always had an easy ride; let me remind you of the debate on his dual role as President-in-Office of the Council and President-elect of the Commission. I wish him every success in his new position and thank him most sincerely for everything he has done for us.

Moving on to the matter at hand, Mr Thorn said in his speech that European political cooperation as yet amounted not so much to a common foreign policy as to a 'sincere effort'. To my way of thinking, though, either you have political cooperation on foreign affairs on the part of a Community of nine Member States or you do not. There can be no half measures here, and that being so, I believe the European Parliament must protest at the Guadeloupe meeting between the United States on the one hand and the United Kingdom, France and Germany on the other. I have on previous occasions tabled written questions on this matter, and have received the all-too familiar and meaningless answer that we Members are used to getting.

It is to my mind intolerable that Chancellor Schmidt should go to Washington and first of all consult President Giscard and Mrs Thatcher without consulting the Nine. That kind of thing is simply unacceptable. It would appear that consultations take place in Washington every fortnight between the ambassadors of the United Kingdom, France and Germany and the Under-Secretary of State — not Mr Muskie himself, but nonetheless a very high-ranking politician. That too is unacceptable as far as the Nine are concerned; it is truly scandalous and must stop.

May I be allowed to comment very briefly on the Congress of the Socialist International in Madrid? In itself, I fully approve of an international assortment of parties getting together and holding discussions. That is something the Christian-Democratic World Union does too, and it is good for foreign policy cooperation. I must say, though, that I found the statement on the Middle East extremely disappointing. There was no mention of the Jerusalem law, no mention of the Israeli settlements policy and no mention of the PLO. And all that so as not to offend Mr Perez. That seems to me to be a great pity.

It is also at variance with the very positive attitude of the Socialist Group in this House, an attitude I paid

tribute to in the debate on the European Council's declaration in Venice on 13 June 1980. Mrs Van den Heuvel was the spokesman for the Socialist Group in that debate, and she referred in very favourable terms to the declaration and the point dealing with the possible mission to be undertaken by Mr Thorn. The very essence of the Venice Declaration was that an attempt was to be made somehow or other to get the PLO involved in the search for a solution. And that was the great merit of Mr Thorn's mission, despite what may appear to be rather meagre specific results. That was why the Socialist Group adopted its very positive attitude, and it was something I was very pleased to see. It is therefore all the more deplorable that the Socialist International meeting in Madrid should have made no mention of the matter. That is something I really deplore.

Turning very briefly to the question of Turkey, I am in favour of not taking any decision on this matter. We must still give Turkey the benefit of the doubt, although that is not a stance we can maintain *ad infinitum*. I believe that this House should review the situation in Turkey on a regular basis, that — if the military regime continues in power — we must press for the restoration of democratic conditions and that a decision one way or the other must be taken during the first six months of 1981, when the Netherlands holds the presidency of the Council.

President. — I call Mr Spicer.

Mr Spicer. — Madam President, there may be some merit in being the last speaker before lunch. I certainly hope so. Madam President, we are honoured today in having with us Senator Inan, formerly the joint chairman of the EEC-Turkish Committee who was for many years involved in politics in the Justice Party, but left the Justice Party and returned as an ambassador for his country in Switzerland. I think it is an apt commentary on the state of affairs in Turkey that a man of his ability could leave government, I would say in parenthesis perhaps in disgust, and go back to the job of being ambassador. He is a recipient of the gold medal of this Parliament and I know and have worked with him over the years and know him to be a true democrat.

We all know, Madam President, the crucial importance of Turkey and if we did not know it, it is of course always emphasized for us by our Communist colleagues, who make a lot of noise about freedom and democracy returning to Turkey, but what do they really mean?

I am not concerned with the fiction of democracy. I am concerned with the facts as we have seen them; those of us who have been involved over the past five or six years with events in Turkey have seen the drama unfold. What sort of democracy is it that can move

Spicer

from one government to another government and back again, can move from Mr Demirel and the Justice Party back to Mr Ecevit — and speaking of Mr Ecevit, there were many people on all sides in Turkey who welcomed his arrival, some of them in a muted way, but they believed that with Mr Ecevit there was a chance for democracy to survive. But inch by inch those of us who have been there, not those who observe by sitting round in here, have seen democracy fall in Turkey. When you reach the state of affairs where over 25 people a day are being slaughtered by the left and by the right, then surely there must be a change. Because you are seeing the death throes of democracy, a travesty of democracy and not democracy in fact.

Some people have called it a *coup d'état* in Turkey. But it is no *coup d'état* when those who take over power in a country warn the government three, four, five times in the last eight months and say we cannot continue like this. That is exactly what the army did and they took over unwillingly. I am very grateful to Mr Haferkamp for the words that he said about the need for us to continue to meet and talk with our Turkish colleagues. Over the past five years we have had gaps of a year, eighteen months or two years when we have not had an opportunity to meet them and I believe that we have suffered in the Community as a result of that. We need to meet them. We need to monitor what is going on in Turkey.

Madam President, I will close by just quoting for you the words of the President of Turkey, which I think need to be looked at again by us over the next six or nine months: 'The Turkish armed forces have repeatedly proved their loyalty to the concept of parliamentary democracy. They now intend in the shortest possible time to constitute a Council of Ministers to which they can hand over executive power. A constitution will be drawn up that is worthy of the Turkish nation. It will include proper laws to govern elections and the conduct of political parties so as to prevent any recurrence of the recent disreputable blocking of the parliamentary system. The ruling of Turkey can then be handed over to an administration which will give priority to the development of national solidarity whilst attaching prime importance to human rights and the peace, security and prosperity both of the individual and of society as a whole.'

If we have one role in our association agreement it is that we in this Parliament should be prepared to monitor this, to go to Turkey and to say to the President and to those who now hold the reins of power, how are you getting on with what you have promised us in the European Parliament and once you are in the Community, would like to carry out?

That, Madam President, is a task that those of us who have served on the Joint Turkish-European Parliamentary Committee would take up gladly if the

Bureau of this Parliament would do us the honour of allowing us to continue in our work.

President. — Since the remaining speakers on the list wish to speak this morning and since Mr Thorn must close the debate, as he is unable to be present at the beginning of the afternoon, I propose — and apologize to the staff for this — to conclude the debate before lunch. I ask everybody to be brief.

I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (*F*) Madam President, since this Parliament imposes silence instead of arranging speaking time, and since Mrs Veil and the bureaucrats who govern us are forcing me to speak for just one minute — of which I have already taken ten seconds — I will have to gag myself or once again recall the historic precedent of a general, and not of a member of Parliament, namely General Cambronne. I will not do so. Because indeed I lose all respect for this institution as long as it is governed in this manner.

To Mr Thorn, I should like to say that I will not force a quarrel with him blaming him for what primarily Parliament itself must take the blame for. It is outrageous, in view of the attitude taken by the majority of this Parliament — and by the Socialist International — towards Turkey, to complain and to hold the President of the Council of Ministers responsible for what was determined by the Socialist International itself and by all the other groups of this House, with the exception, for once, of our Communist colleagues.

Having said that, Madam President, I only want to add that in this Parliament we are not permitted to speak. Our rights are waived. It would be amusing and not just grotesque if a Parliament somewhere in the Communist world were to express solidarity and become indignant at the thwarted rights of our Members.

As regards Turkey, as I have said we are the accomplices of torturers and shameful and treacherous generals. As regards the existence of our Community, we are acting increasingly as a cover for other interests, and the fact that Mr Gaston Thorn is a courageous European is not enough. Even if he is Gaston Thorn, he has only been able to do as much as he was permitted to do. I say this frankly. His political views differ from mine but I respect his determination. I respect far less, Madam President, this Parliament which reduces us to the situation in which we now find ourselves.

President. — I call Mr Antoniozzi.

Mr Antoniozzi. — (*I*) Mr President-in-Office, I have been listening carefully to your speech and I am most

Antoniozzi

grateful for what you have told us. I trust you will allow me to say, with my usual candour and, of course, the great respect I have for you, that I would have appreciated it if some of your points about the future prospects for international political cooperation had been made rather more forcefully and convincingly.

You have pointed out that you are now in the last few days of your term of office and that your mandate will thus, at your own choice, be coming to an end. I do realize the effect that this will also have on the contribution you bring to this House. I say this not just on your account but also in connection with what was said about the President-in-Office of the Council during an earlier debate. Your mandate is in reality too short: six months, with all that can happen in six months and not forgetting the summer recess and holidays, really is too short a term in which to become involved in any programme which will bring tangible results.

I believe that this is one of the problems which we will have to face when we debate at greater length the problems arising from the roles of the institutions and the relations between them. Mr Tindemans gave us a very timely hint of that this morning when he reminded us of the many proposals still awaiting discussion in this House: his own report, the report of the 'three wise men' and many other very significant documents. I realize, Mr President-in-Office, that it is not easy to do these things and say them in a particular way, but I would have liked to see you a little more decisive about them, a little more explicit and a little stronger.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, Europe is in my view far stronger than it was in the past. Having heard speeches from various quarters, but particularly that of Mr Berlinguer, I was particularly satisfied to hear some of the things he said and I could not help thinking that had such a spirit prevailed at the time the treaties — including the Treaty of Rome — were approved, we would never have ended up in this situation. Even those who were basically against Europe are now convinced that Europe can and should lead us towards specific horizons.

I hope you will allow me a short digression on the problems of substance which have been discussed. Mr President-in-Office, if I may I will divide the present international problems into three categories, I would say that there are some situations which are extremely serious, unacceptable, where one country invades another with the intent of altering the international balance. Here I am referring to Afghanistan. There are others, likewise serious, where there is indirect intervention, supplies of military and strategic equipment, military advisers, and special encouragement of terrorist organizations and political training. Thirdly and lastly, there is the type of problem arising from the internal situation of individual countries amongst

which we find, for example, Turkey. It is my belief, Mr President-in-Office, that in this order of things our own initiatives should be limited to demands for international cooperation within Europe, and that this should in turn be sufficient.

As far as the Madrid Conference is more specifically concerned, in the meeting of the Political Affairs Committee held a few weeks ago, we asked Mr Thorn to stand firm on the subject of human rights. You honoured this request, Mr President-in-Office, and you or your successor will continue to do so because although the question of cooperation in Europe as it touches on détente and disarmament is of great importance, the question of human rights governs every area influenced by these policies and they should certainly be developed.

I therefore expect the promises given by the Turkish generals when they took over by force to be kept. The Army then declared that their own intervention was justified by the terrorism, by the paralysis of the legislative process and by the lack of agreement on the election of a President.

We now call on them to keep those promises and to bring about a gradual return to democracy: it is of direct concern to Europe, for Europe must ensure that it lives up to its own principles.

President. — I call Mr Capanna.

Mr Capanna. — (*I*) Madam President, the outrageous situation arising from the breach of Rule 28 means that I too have only a few seconds in which to speak.

Since I am in such a ridiculous, such an offensive position, I propose to say only one thing. We can go on thinking whatever we like here, but until the Palestinian resistance — the PLO — is recognized as the legitimate representative of their four million people, the shadow of war will still hang over the Middle East, no matter how the war between Iran and Iraq ends.

There was, as I recall, in the Senate of ancient Rome — where they were able to speak with a good deal more freedom than in this House — a senator called Cato who had the habit of closing his speeches — even when he was discussing something completely different — with the statement that in his opinion Carthage ought to be destroyed.

I shall henceforth be doing likewise: every time I speak in this house, even on something completely different, I shall conclude by repeating that the Nine must recognize the Palestinian resistance.

President. — I call Mrs Macciocchi.

Mrs Macciocchi. — (*F*) Madam President, the first part of my statement will be a procedural motion. I want to emphasize that Rule 28 has been infringed once again. I wish to tell you, Madam President, that we are tired of a Parliament in which, having waited three or four hours, we have finally the right to speak for one minute. I make a formal and definite protest by telling you that we no longer wish to participate in certain important debates such as that opened today by Mr Thorn's speech as long as we are placed in the present intellectually and politically humiliating situation, namely that we are unable to speak and comment seriously on what has been said. I wish to emphasize further that Rule 28 is being violated by the very fact that it stipulates that the President shall allocate speaking time to allow for a discussion on a debate, and not for a day of debate. We are thinking here in particular of the Technical Coordination Group. Well, for a whole day's debate, we have had one minute per person!

It is scandalous, it is disgraceful and in spite of the good offices which I have often employed within the various committees, and even within my own Group, because sometimes voices were raised too much, well today at the exhausting end of such a discussion where enormous problems remain, I find it necessary to tell you that we have no confidence in such management of Parliament's debates. In future, if Rule 28 is to be applied in this fashion, we will refuse to participate in Parliament's activities. To put it bluntly, I will leave the House and ask my colleagues to leave with me because there is permanent infringement of the Rules of Procedure! As regards Mr Thorn's statement I would like to tell him that having listened carefully — he spoke of a 'difficult' beginning to the Madrid Conference — I think it would be more appropriate to use some other term and to state quite plainly that the Madrid Conference has failed or is about to fail.

The third basket is at the root of this imminent failure in Madrid; there is not only the issue of human rights, there is also the question of Afghanistan. And I repeat, Mr Thorn, that the great problem of our age is this aggression on the part of a nation. And I want to see what it is going to say, this European Parliament which is constantly referred to as if it were a sort of 'good Samaritan' — and indeed you yourself are regarded as a 'good Samaritan', Mr Thorn, through your good offices. Is this Parliament going to say: let's show our good will towards the aggressors? I sometimes wonder if these aggressors do not, at the very moment of throwing their napalm bombs, of sending their armies, of arming themselves to the hilt, if they do not at that very moment appeal for aid to the good Samaritans, the do-gooders, the advocates of détente, peace and disarmament. And in the final analysis we will all be happy because a big conference, an interminable conference on disarmament will be opened in

Madrid. And we will also say that we have spent our day in doing good works. Well, then, I propose that perhaps you should bring your knitting here. We could knit socks for the fighters in Afghanistan and send them off; perhaps that would be more useful!

President. — I shall inform the next meeting of the Bureau of your remarks on the interpretation of Rule 28.

I call Mr Thorn.

Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Council — (*F*) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the hour is too late, the Chamber too full and I have been the subject of too many compliments from Members of this House for me to inflict another long speech on you. I shall therefore be very brief.

I should like first of all to thank all those honourable Members who have been kind enough to speak in this debate. It is not for me to reply to their comments and I shall confine myself to replying on a few points of fact.

I should like to say to my very good friend Mr Tindemans that, of course, what he put forward in his report is still, unfortunately, valid — unfortunately because it has still not been implemented.

We must apply ourselves in our various ways to ensuring that we finally put into effect — and I would like all the governments to remember this — what was planned in Copenhagen and what his report, which goes beyond Copenhagen, still envisages, since we lack that common foreign policy we are becoming increasingly conscious of the need for.

To Mr Penders and others my reply is that if I promised to be firm in Madrid and to expound certain principles I can now say, in the telegraphic style I must adopt, 'I have been firm' and ask you to read the speech I made. It was certainly one of the most uncompromising speeches made in Madrid. I said what I had promised to say and I hope that the line the Community has taken will be maintained.

I must, however, correct one little error. Many people think that in Helsinki Mr Moro was the only one to speak on behalf of the Nine. Each of the Heads of State or Government spoke there. The President-in-Office, Mr Moro, was thus not alone in making his contribution, even if he did at one point speak on behalf of the Nine. I too made a speech of behalf of the Nine, the text of which had been adopted jointly. I will not try to hide the fact that our work as a Community is perhaps not as intensive as it was for the Helsinki Conference, but I hope it will revive and that cooperation will become increasingly close in the course of this testing period in Madrid.

Thorn

As regards relations with the other countries in Europe, I would ask you to make a distinction between information and participation. It is normal for the countries of Western Europe to be interested in political cooperation. But being interested is not sufficient reason for being asked to take part. I too, as Foreign Minister, would be interested in taking part in certain meetings and knowing what is being said there, but if I am not a member of this or that body or this or that club, well, then I am not invited. A distinction must be made here. At present, we inform all our fellow members of the Council of Europe at ambassador level. As to holding a ministerial meeting with them, you will appreciate that with the number of links we have this is quite out of the question. And even taking part with, as it were, observer status would not be a good idea, for you know as well as I do that if there were too many meetings and we spent all our time like that you would be justified in accusing us in a sense of diluting the Community. There is a real problem here, and I pointed this out when I took my leave of my colleagues in the Council of Ministers, who will have to turn their attention to this at their next meeting. I think you must all join with us in giving some thought to one of the possible solutions. Is this not a task which the Council of Europe, where one often wonders about points to be put on the agenda, should assume in the future? That is where we, the Community, come together with the other non-member countries of Europe. Why not develop in that body not just an exchange of information but a dialogue?

On Turkey, I have nothing to add to what I have said. We condemn the coup d'état and the military takeover, indeed we can hardly do otherwise when a country passes from a democratic to a military regime.

What I am going to say now in no way alters that. However, as many of you have stressed, we must nonetheless see what Turkey was like before and as realists we must be capable of qualifying our attitude a little. We as governments — I am speaking for the Council — cannot simply condemn in the name of general morality. We have expressed our condemnation, but subsequently we have to face realities and say that if we take such and such an attitude the consequences will be such and such, while if we take a different attitude the consequences will then be correspondingly different. We have thus done some heart-searching. We have taken the view that to drop Turkey today would be worse than trying to influence it, and if the Council as such has not had an official session on Turkey do not imagine for all that, ladies and gentlemen, that the various Foreign Ministers in the Council have not tried to exert all their influence, including efforts at the last ministerial meeting of the Council of Europe.

Furthermore, in passing judgement on our attitude, which some people regard as ambiguous towards Turkey but which is not in fact, do not forget the importance of any gesture *vis-à-vis* Turkey at a time

when Greece is about to join the Community while Turkey is left outside. Not to mention the effect of any gesture in this field on the situation in Cyprus. All that is something a politician, who is bound to be a realist, must take account of, whether he likes it or not. Something must be done, Mr Pannella, to improve the situation in Cyprus, and if we break completely with these people we shall only complicate matters. I would not, for my part, like to take on the responsibility for interfering with any future resumption of the Cyprus dialogue.

Thirdly, when you take us to task for not having enough contact with Parliament in the field of political cooperation, allow me to assure you, in all sincerity, that you are mistaken. Do not forget that political cooperation is not something permanent like the foreign policy we have in each of our countries. Political cooperation means contacts between officials, it means an exchange of information on a large scale but at ministerial level. It is not a permanent reality, it is two meetings in each six-month presidency. That is to say that at ministerial level we have met twice for a few hours under my Presidency and then I have spent three and a half hours with the Political Affairs Committee on two occasions. In other words, I have spent more time talking to the European Parliament about political cooperation than the time taken by political cooperation at ministerial level. That is the point that is overlooked, and you will appreciate that if you held two political debates each month and asked me whether there was anything new I would have to reply 'No, there is nothing new.' Because there is only *one* meeting every three months, lasting three hours. That is the problem. That, to be honest, is the reality we should remember from time to time. You must understand that while we have done a great deal to improve relations with Parliament you will inevitably be frustrated if you ask us for news every fortnight. That is not possible from the Council's point of view.

Now the last point, the Middle East. Here too, I must correct an error. Mr Blumenfeld says we have allowed the PLO presidency to be brought forward. Firstly, it is not for us to decide on the rotation of the presidency among our partners in the dialogue, just as we would not allow the other side to decide when a particular country was to hold the presidency of our Community. This is laid down, and everyone knows it. It is a question of principle. Secondly, I think, Mr Blumenfeld, that you are making a mistake: the PLO presidency has not been brought forward but was liable to come up from one conference to the next. The order of precedence has not been changed. We have known for months that the PLO would assume the presidency.

For the Middle East in general, you must appreciate that things are said in committee which cannot be said

Thorn

in plenary session. I agree with you, Mr Blumenfeld, and with all the other speakers who have drawn attention to the changes there have been. We also know there has been an American election, but I think we are too much prejudging the intentions of the American administration, which we do not yet know. Let us try, as Mr Tindemans said, to forge closer links with our American friends — and this is much needed — but we should not, as of now, try and calculate what their policy will be, how far it will be inflexible on this or that point.

As regards the Middle East, then, the fact that there is a war between Iran and Iraq, the fact that there are now other flashpoints, is no reason for us to neglect the Middle Eastern question. I would suggest — and I would ask you to follow this through to its logical conclusion — that it might be better at a time, and here I agree with you, when the existence of the State of Israel has been shown not to be the only source of trouble in the Middle East — in other words when some of the heat has been taken out of the situation or when attention is perhaps no longer concentrated so exclusively on the PLO — would it not be better, would it not perhaps now more than ever be the time not to escalate our involvement, not to be hasty, but to continue to think the situation over? I agree with you that we should not take time off for reflection, but must, on the contrary, continue to think the situation over calmly, without excessive haste, and that it is preferable to try and deal with this problem coolly rather than acting always in the heat of the moment when we are under pressure to act quickly.

President. — I have received two motions for resolutions with request for early vote, pursuant to Rule 47 (5) of the Rules of Procedure, seeking to wind up the debate on the oral question (Doc. 1-507/80) on the situation in Turkey:

- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-605/80) by Mr de la Malène on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-606/80) by Mr Glinne on behalf of the Socialist Group.

These requests for an early vote will be put to the vote at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

The debate is closed.

The proceedings will now be suspended until 3 p.m.

The House will rise.

(The sitting was suspended at 1.25 p.m. and resumed at 3 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR: MR MØLLER

Vice-President

President. — The sitting is resumed.

6 *Decision on the adoption of the annual report on the economic situation in the Community*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-550/80), drawn up by Mr Moreau on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, on the

proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-517/80) for a draft decision adopting the annual report on the economic situation in the Community and laying down the economic policy for 1981.

I call Mr Moreau.

Mr Moreau, rapporteur. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, Parliament is examining the annual report on the economic situation at a difficult time for both the Community and the peoples we represent here. The economic crisis is continuing and spreading, whilst the construction of Europe is bogged down and seems unable to decide which way to turn. That is why public opinion is largely uncertain, and why it fears for the future. This in turn creates an unhealthy and dangerous atmosphere for the development of the values on which our Community is based, namely democracy, solidarity, freedom and responsibility.

It is up to Parliament to raise the alarm and speak out loud and clearly to those who run our countries. Are we prepared to play our part effectively? The discussion which took place in the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs urged me to caution as to what the future may hold. The report before you today was in fact adopted by 5 votes in favour and 11 abstentions, one of which was my own. Disregarding the clashes between ideas and interests which are unavoidable in any democratic and multi-party system, I see this as a sign of Europe's inability to reach a majority opinion on what has caused our present situation, and indeed on what means should be found and implemented in order to achieve the aims laid down for the Community by the Treaties. This situation is both dangerous and demoralizing for public opinion in our countries.

I also noted from the wide variety of appraisals made during our deliberations how difficult it is for us to gain control of the economic factors, both present and future. That is why my general attitude is one of rejecting any judgement which might be too hasty.

Moreau

Parliament exists in order to remind everyone that Europe is first and foremost the expression of a desire to live together, but with respect for our differences, in order to gain control over our future in the social, economic and political spheres. This amounts to rejecting any alleged inevitabilities or blind surrender to economic or political laws which it is suggested must be imposed.

However, the question really is, Mr President, whether our Parliament has the means to sway the decisions taken by the Community and its Member States. My committee is not entirely satisfied with the way in which we are consulted on economic and monetary cooperation, or to be more precise with the way in which the annual report on the economic situation is examined. Should we abide strictly by the Council decision of 18 February 1974 and not go beyond it, or should we go further and really involve Parliament in these decisions? The answer is not obvious, if one considers only the recent past and the haste with which Parliament's committee was forced to work. In addition, the budget debate is not very encouraging as regards the Council of Ministers' willingness to take account of the opinions of Parliament.

The economic, monetary and social situation in the Community is fraught with danger and uncertainty. If we read the document prepared by the Brussels Commission, then we are forced to admit that the economic situation is worsening, even if it is not as bad as it was in 1974 and 1975. Who today can say with any certainty what the repercussions of the present state of affairs in the Middle East will be on our short-term economic development? Let us, look at the employment question, for example. Commission forecasts, made in September 1980, predict a 6.8% unemployment rate, which means 8 million unemployed, this figure will mainly hit young people and women. It is several decades since a similar figure was reached in Europe. The Commission states that other economic factors such as the balance of payments deficit will improve in 1981, and that there will be a reduction in inflation rates.

Another feature of the worsening of our situation — and I think this is very important — is that the economies of the Member States continue to develop along diverging lines. According to the criteria applied in the report, there are three groups of countries existing side by side. The gap between them is constant and not narrowing. This is very detrimental to the further development of the European Monetary System, for example. It also increases the danger of Europe falling apart both economically and socially.

Up to now, it seems to us that the Council of Ministers has shown no resolve to remedy this situation and to take the necessary steps to set it right. In our opinion, we can only achieve this aim if action is taken simultaneously on several fronts. Inflation must be opposed, but not at all costs. All the causes of inflation must be

fought not just wages. In most of the Member States, we can see a slow-down in the rise in wages and staff overheads, but this has not necessarily led to any significant reduction in inflation rates. Inflation must be tackled in many ways, including in particular the granting of real priority to the fight against unemployment and the creation of new jobs. These are the prime objectives of any short-term economic policy. This is a very important question which, I must point out, has split the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs. Is creating new jobs the outcome of monetary and financial policy, or should it on the contrary be a priority objective, just like the fight against inflation or maintaining external trade balances?

I feel that the battle against unemployment and the creation of new jobs are just as necessary as fighting inflation or monetary measures. If we wish action to continue at European level and to be really supported by our peoples, then, contrary to what certain people think and what was said by some people in my Committee, we cannot have one policy based on reason and the other on the heart. The Community and the Member States must rapidly implement policies which fulfil the real daily needs of their citizens. No one here would deny that we need to give a new competitive edge to our economy and to business and industry in general. But, as I have already pointed out, the price we have to pay for this must not be higher for some than for others. We can all see that in the present difficult situation, the relationships between the two sides of industry is becoming strained, and managers are trying unilaterally to force their employees into making sacrifices. Collective bargaining is becoming more difficult. Naturally, this situation leads some people to think that the time is ripe for taking back the benefits won by, or granted to, workers. But a policy of this nature is very short-sighted.

Europe as a whole and our various countries are going through a very difficult period. Policy objectives and the means needed to achieve them can only be decided upon and applied with the help of the workers and their organizations, at least in the economic field. This is not mere sentimentality or wishful thinking: it is a need which must be met. To overcome this situation, which the Commission text refers to in its introduction, fundamental agreement must be reached between all concerned. It is quite intolerable that it should be the lowest-income or most dependent groups of workers who have to bear the brunt of our present difficulties.

The very real segregation which we can observe in all our countries, between those who have work and those who have not, between those whose purchasing power is increasing and those whose income is dropping, carries with it the seeds of dissent and a very real threat for the future. It is time for Europe to find ways of carrying out policies which more closely correspond to the interests of all Europeans. And in order to

Moreau

achieve this, it seems to me that we must meet three challenges.

First of all the challenge of the economy. The Community must quickly set up a system of industrial cooperation, to facilitate both the successful completion of coherent reorganization of the industrial infrastructure, and the implementation of joint measures in industry, technology and research. If energy policy is thought to be top priority, then it should be backed up by the Council of Ministers' real determination to act and not just by a few declarations of good intent. This is a complex problem because the prevailing situation varies widely from one country to another. The Commission has marked out some paths we could follow. But these are no more than a few steps in the right direction. Our deliberations on the budget have, up to now, merely shown that the Council of Ministers is reluctant to go too far towards more daring policies. But, if Europe does not make specific, and sometimes massive, investments in some sectors, then economic challenge now facing it will never be met and the promised jobs will not be created.

Next, there is the social challenge. I have already touched on this point during my last piece of explanation. It seems to me that, in Europe, all technical progress must be accompanied by progress in the social field. To meet this challenge we must in particular have faith, a dynamic employment policy, work sharing, and increased worker participation in everyday economic affairs.

There is a lot of talk about the relationship between shorter working hours and employment. Naturally, the relationship is a complex one, but the problems it poses should, nonetheless, not bring all progress to a halt. Our Committee recommends the implementation of a policy which combines various measures, leading simultaneously to a reduction and a redistribution of working hours, which would make the actual creation of new jobs easier.

I have already said that technological change must be accompanied by social progress. Many debates have been held in this House on the repercussions restructuring in various sectors of industry. I should like to remind you of the major role the European Social Fund should play in this connection and how important and significant it is, in our opinion, to adopt social plans for specific sectors of industry, above all for the steel industry.

Lastly, we have the political challenge. The crisis Europe is now undergoing requires the Commission and the Council of Ministers to exercise their imagination, both in order to provide the Community with the policies and resources it needs to correct the interplay of market forces whenever our development appears to be out of control, and also to enable it to play the major role which falls to it on the international scene. I am sorry that the Committee on Economic and Monetary

Affairs did not include in the proposed objectives the Community's participation on the setting up of a new international economic order. We all know that European union will only be a factor for progress in the world if it takes effective and determined steps towards the establishment of a new economic and monetary relationship between the industrialized countries and the developing countries. Arguments about what name to give this must not hide this basic necessity. If we do not make moves in this direction, world peace will continue to totter on the brink of the precipice.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, that is my conclusion. It is my wish that this debate make clear the determination of this House to tackle the problems Europe is now faced with and that we should truly take up the defence of the interests of the peoples of all the countries in Europe, and of all the groups which exist in our countries.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Ortoli.

Mr Ortoli, Vice-President of the Commission. — *(F)* Mr President, please allow me to make an introductory remark which I hope will be seen as that of a person who pins a great deal in this debate. We will have only a few minutes to present the annual report on the economic situation in the Community. This is one of the major acts of this Parliament, one of the achievements of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and of the Commission. It gives us an opportunity to decide whether we feel able to reach agreement on a Community programme which is laid down in some detail, or at least on its essentials. A time when we should be discussing our opposing points of view. There are many differences of opinion in this House on how Europe's affairs should be conducted, not just economic affairs but employment as well. I shall speak for only a few minutes.

You will no doubt understand me when I say that I personally feel truly frustrated, both for myself and for Parliament. I would like to see one day a real debate, once a year at least, on how we should deal with the main economic problems and questions of employment in conditions which would enable us to devote the necessary hours, and not just a few minutes to these questions.

As Mr Moreau reminded us, the economic situation is described in the report. In 1979, during the debate on this same subject, we were aware that the situation would not be good but we all felt that it would be less difficult than what we are faced with today. This is true for growth, for our balances of payments and also for inflation. In 1981 we expect the situation to be just as difficult, and this will have a particular effect on

Ortoli

employment, since we think that the unemployment rate will reach approximately 6.8 % of the working population in 1981. We expect inflation to slow down somewhat and balance of payment deficits to be reduced, but overall, we should expect, as Mr Moreau said — or rather we should be prepared for — unforeseeable events which might well alter the present picture for the worse.

Today, there are two types of positive factor. It would appear that our economies might slowly revive from the first six months of 1981 onwards and that inflation might well slow down somewhat. The first signs of this can already be seen in a certain number of countries. I shall not go further into the current situation or the outlook, Mr President, as I do not have time and I should like to say something about how we can work together.

I shall only refer to a very little of what we said in our report, and I shall keep to the basics.

The first fundamental point is that I think that coordinating policies in the way we have started to do must mean following a certain number of very basic common guidelines. The first of these is that, given the balance of payments situation we should try to avoid acting too hastily to correct a situation which is of necessity a long-term one, by this I mean that we would only increase the deflation which cannot be avoided in a situation such as that in which we are today. As a result, I feel that we must collectively avoid falling into the trap of correcting imbalances too soon. This means — and this is the first strictly Community factor — that we must do business together and show solidarity, to help us to shoulder our balance of payments deficits. This is the reason why you will shortly have to discuss a proposal aimed at considerably increasing the amounts, and qualifying the terms and conditions, of Community balance of payments loans.

My second point is that we all have budget policies which must be very strictly applied. But, if we apply our budget policies strictly — and this is particularly true for some countries — we must be aware that, should the situation be even less propitious, even more difficult than we thought it was, then the countries which have some leeway because of the general state of their public finances should accept the repercussions which a less favourable economic climate would have on their budget deficit.

This would be adopting a Community attitude on a problem such as the one I have just referred to; in my view it would be a grave error to undertake action which, because it is too rapid or too energetic might stimulate deflation beyond the level which is at present tolerable. Thirdly, we must set ourselves a number of common goals in foreign trade, and in particular for the recycling of capital, both in order to help in stabilizing this situation, and also to prevent international

trade from being affected more seriously than can be foreseen at present, that is to say a growth rate of 2 %. This is an area in which we can all take part in common measures. I shall not go over this point in detail, given the speaking time allotted to me, but I feel that this must be one of the guiding lights of our deliberations today.

Fourthly, the various types of discipline which we must decide upon and which Mr Moreau has referred to in his report should take into consideration a number of basic truths. We know, for example, that wages and salaries will be likely to progress much less favourably than they have in the past, and that this is a prerequisite for economic recovery. This does not mean that we should not bear in mind what is happening to the lessfavoured social categories, because we all belong to a society in which problems of this nature are an integral part of the goals we set ourselves and which we must therefore take account of when we state that we are prepared to accept some collective sacrifices.

The second basic point, is that where the overall policy we must pursue is concerned, I feel that we should all be aware — as I believe Mr Moreau said last year — that we can no longer simply make short-term projections. We must base our decisions on the medium term, and on longer periods of time. And medium-term projections should take account of the other countries in the world from the point of view of both energy constraints and the need to be competitive. On energy constraints, this means that energy policy in the Member States and at Community level is top priority.

The fact that this is one of our priorities is obvious everybody knows it and everybody is saying it. I would like to see this made a priority for action, that all things we do, in particular in the investment field, are geared to this objective. This is one of the reasons why, in a whole range of documents, we have put forward proposals in the economic and investment spheres which help to highlight that this is a collective goal at which we are aiming and that the Community is prepared to acknowledge this fact publicly and bring pressure to bear for this goal to be actually reached.

My next point concerns what I have called competitiveness. This means that in the medium term we must set up a policy which gives us the best possible chance of lasting growth geared to demand and future competition in foreign markets. But a policy of this kind must be conducted in such a precise and readily comprehensible manner as to lay bare its fundamental characteristic namely, that it is an employment policy. It is a policy aimed at creating jobs, establishing a dynamic economy suited to job creation, and not an economy which is on the defensive and which will gradually narrow its scope and no longer be able to meet the challenge of unemployment. It is along these lines that we must conduct the work we do together.

Ortoli

In conclusion, I should merely like to add that when we speak of a consensus and of the Community, this should above all mean that we have to share each others' views on our problems and objectives. It should also mean that we undertake common actions outside our Community. That we share responsibility for each other and that, in certain cases — Mr Moreau referred to some of them — we should pool our resources, in order to help towards finding the right solutions and actually applying them, whenever the Community seems to be the right institution to act. But we shall not succeed if we are unable to show, at both national and Community level, that this type of policy is not a policy of the intelligentsia or of technocrats or economists, but that it is a policy which is being pursued in order to fulfil the real needs of Europe, where unemployment is an obvious threat. In other words, what you called our consensus, or to be more precise our shared thinking on how we can work together, the challenge we must meet, common European measures, will not come to fruition if we cannot show that what we are doing is not doctrinaire or theoretical but has a specific objective which involves all the people in Europe. I should have liked to say more and go into more detail, but I bow to the need for restraint.

President. — The list of speakers is now closed.

I call Mr Ruffolo to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Ruffolo. — (*I*) Mr President, the rapporteur Mr Moreau stressed in his report and in his speech how serious the economic situation was, and Commissioner Ortoli backed up this view. There is certainly no point in going back over the facts in a few minutes, so I feel that I should use this time to highlight one point which unfortunately emerges from this analysis of our problems. Faced with this serious and difficult situation, there is no Community short-term economic policy as such. So much so that we ought to ask ourselves what the proposals which the Commission is now making to the Council, the decisions which the Council will be taking, and the opinion of this House are really worth.

And yet the need to coordinate short-term economic policies had become increasingly urgent between the first oil crisis and now. But the nine countries of the Community have up to now proved incapable of cushioning the effects of external economic difficulties by implementing a real, concerted economic policy. This fact has increased — not reduced — the disparities between national economies and is jeopardizing the European Monetary System itself. Parliament, in its resolution on the EMS, had already pointed out how precarious the system was because of internal tensions and external pressures. In the last few months the situation has become even more precarious. The tensions have intensified and forced the monetary authorities to intervene heavily in order to keep

exchange rates within the agreed margins of fluctuation.

Mr President, how long will this national intervention be compatible with the aim of achieving monetary equilibrium between the individual countries, given that no European monetary fund exists which would enable us to set up a common reserve and intervention mechanism? How and when will it be possible to set up a common monetary fund, if economic policies are not forced into some sort of coordination? These are purely rhetorical questions. We have not heard anything about the European Fund and Phase Two of the EMS, nor for a long time have we heard any more of the solemn promises made in their time by the European Council, and this embarrassed silence shows that the governments of Europe have, so to speak, shamefully neglected their common responsibilities.

The Moreau report is quite right in linking the difficulties of the short-term economic situation with the deeper, more structural aspects of the economy which would be involved in the setting up of a medium-term policy for the Community. Unfortunately, we have no grounds for excessive optimism in this respect either.

In the three most vulnerable aspects of its overall structure — the energy crisis, industrial reorganization and regional disparities — the Community has neither a common policy nor a common view. It has even given up work on the total review of structural problems under its 'medium-term programme'. As it has now almost reached the end of its term of office, the Commission has simply decided that there is no point in working out a new programme. This is a strange interpretation of continuity! As a result, we lack objectives which would allow us to give a clear direction to Community policies. The Moreau report refers to the three challenges — economic, social and political — which face our Community in the medium-term and to the fact that no answers have been found to these problems.

I should like to conclude my short speech, Mr President, by dwelling on a single issue which appears crucial to me. On 1 January 1981, Greece will be joining the Community. Spain and Portugal are to follow in the years to come. It is not being somewhat hopeful to think that the present so-called structural instruments of Community policy — the Regional Fund, the Social Fund, the Agricultural Guidance Fund — will be sufficient to cope with the major imbalances this will cause and which the Community is even now incapable of handling? Should this not be an opportunity to completely rethink both these policies and these instruments within the framework of a new view of growth, to unite the existing funds in one European Development Fund, and to set up a real European development body capable of managing this fund along Community lines, and not simply handing out disjointed subsidies?

Ruffolo

These are not just rhetorical questions, Mr President. My Group, the Socialist Group, is fully committed on this basic point, and we hope that the new Commission and the Council will now take their cue from this report in order to completely rethink this problem, so that future reports on the economic situation in the Community will not, as has unfortunately today been the case, merely be opportunities for ritual lamentations.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr von Bismarck to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democrat Group).

Mr von Bismarck. — *(D)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we are now engaged in throwing stones at the wrong person. We are lamenting like Jeremiah. I agree with all the speakers who have preceded me. The difference is that Jeremiah lamented to a single god and we lament to many. This has never meant success as far back as anyone can remember. I should like, therefore, to approach this subject today, from a different angle than that taken by the speakers who preceded me, and I may shock them all by this, but I shall do it nonetheless. I should like to talk about Europe's living lie.

In our opinion, the views, conclusions and pointers in the report which the Commission has forwarded to the Council, and which it has submitted to us for consultation, deserve our support. The basic premise of this report is that a social market economy, which is the very core of the Treaty of Rome, cannot function correctly without stable currencies, and in particular that a lasting success in fighting unemployment is impossible to achieve. The Commission therefore recommends that we continue to fight against inflation with vigour and perseverance. This view should be heartily approved.

We should also approve the view which states that economic policy within the European Community should be geared — as two speakers have already pointed out — to a lasting improvement in competitiveness in the best interests of all our citizens. This means that we should ensure that research, technical development and flexibility should be used to a greater degree in industry so that higher productivity may be achieved, and so that we may stop jeopardizing our future by living on our national product because of excessive consumer demand and also because of inflation, which is inevitably linked to this and which increases at the expense of the poorest of our inhabitants. Anyone who is well-intentioned towards Europe and its citizens must follow this basic precept and, in our opinion, give it energetic support whenever necessary and in particular in dealings with his own government.

I really wanted to say something different, something much more fundamental. Anyone who wishes to maintain — we ought unfortunately today to say save — prosperity, peace and freedom in Europe, ought to bring himself to face up to another much less unpleasant and much more serious truth. He must reject the living lie which is fatal to Europe. The lie according to which, one day, like the seed from the flower, so-called economic and monetary union will give birth to the political union which we are now striving for! This will not and cannot be the case. A social market economy — mark you not any market economy, such as we had in the last century — requires, according to the basic notion behind the Treaty of Rome, a strong central government. Do we have a central European government? Do we have one head? Does the car of Europe have a steering wheel? The answer is no! We are governed, as the German Federal Republic was, without a government and merely by the Federal Council. Stable currencies? Healthy competition? Both of these basic prerequisites for a social market economy, and in particular for social equality, are unthinkable without a strong centralized system of government. Anyone who is expecting to see political union develop from economic and monetary union is waiting in vain. Because even economic and monetary union cannot function without at least some sort of irrefutable central authority. Any continuation of the decision-making and executive power structures which now exist within the Community — and on this point I fully agree with the speaker who preceded me, the rapporteur Mr Moreau — would sooner or later inevitably destroy the Community as a result of the increasingly numerous and more serious crises.

It is not economic and monetary union which can produce the federal political union we are aiming at. As the proverb puts it, we must cut our cloth quite differently. Only by achieving gradual political union can we progress towards a social market economy, and thereby put ourselves in a position to achieve our social objectives, the foremost of which is full employment. It is only in this manner that social justice and competitiveness are possible in Europe. Only when we have political union will we have the strength, to guarantee our peace and freedom together with our federal partners and to do our duty to the Third World, which is extremely urgent and becoming more urgent every day. It should be noted in particular that only a free market economy pattern can be applied to the concept of a federal or confederal Europe. A decentralized system such as that which would exist in a federal Europe can only be linked with a decentralized decision-making structure such as that which we find in a market economy. The two systems complement each other. On the other hand a federal or confederal concept which would be able to maintain the cultural, spiritual and traditional identity of the peoples of Europe and of their States within their frontiers and maintain peace and security outside their frontiers, cannot be linked to a centralized administrative system.

Von Bismarck

It is the conviction of my Group that during the discussion of this annual economic report, as we stand at the threshold of 1981 and against the deadly serious world political background, it is our duty as the first directly-elected Members of the European Parliament to cease to be a party to spreading the dangerous fundamental misconception that all we need to do is to continue earnestly working forward and one day a Europe which is capable of functioning on a political level will result from economic and monetary union.

It is much rather, ladies and gentlemen, our highest duty to tell the plain, unvarnished truth to our fellow Members in this House, and above all to European public opinion, during this debate on what is for Europe a very significant topic, economic policy, which we in the Christian Democratic Group see as serving our overall political goals, but in particular our objectives in the field of social policy. It is our duty during this debate on those factors which are decisive for our future and, I repeat, also for our peace and freedom — or, in a nutshell, on Europe's chances for existing and surviving — it is our duty to finally tell the truth. If I have succeeded in so doing, I am extremely gratified.

(Applause)

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

Mr Hopper. — Mr President, we have to ask ourselves what is the proper role of the European Community as an organization where the management of the economies of the nine Member States is concerned. It is doubtful whether the Community has a direct role in this domain. The budget is too small and, furthermore, expenditure within the budget is, in many cases, under the control of national governments, and therefore a part of national economic policy. Where it is not, as under the common agricultural policy, its effects are frequently too random to form part of a coherent Community economic policy.

However, I believe that there is an important role for the Community. It is very well described on page 7 of the Annual Economic Report as defining a concerted framework for action by Member States. The Commission should prepare and publish just such a framework in the short, the medium and the long-term. And Ministers should meet with regularity — if I may coin a phrase — in economic cooperation, as they do now in political cooperation.

While companies in one Member State should compete vigorously across national borders, the Member States themselves should not conduct national economic policies that are in competition with one another. I refer in particular to what is known as 'dirty floating'. Certain Member States have from time

to time, and sometimes more often than from time to time, conducted an exchange rate policy which was highly favourable to their own national economy and correspondingly unfavourable to the national economies of other Member States. Indeed, it is no exaggeration to say that 'dirty floating' has been the single greatest non-tariff barrier to trade in the European Community.

This is too large a subject to develop in a brief speech. The European Monetary System was not particularly well thought out in the first place. It has never been clear to what extent its objectives were political or economic, or by what means they were supposed to be achieved. Furthermore, the rules of the EMS, insofar as we know them, appear to be more honoured in the breach than in the observance. There are no published statistics, but one has the impression that intervention by central banks within the margins is widely practised, although it is supposed not to occur. These suspicions were voiced in the explanatory memorandum contained in the excellent Ruffolo report which this Parliament considered earlier this year. Mr Moreau is right to describe the present system as precarious.

Mr President, the European Monetary System needs to be cast in a new mould. It requires a central supervisory mechanism, possibly within the framework of the Council of Ministers. There should be less emphasis on keeping currencies within narrow bands of fluctuation, which sometimes have little to do with current economic realities. There should be more emphasis on good monetary citizenship within the Community. It should be made difficult for one Member State to export unemployment to other Member States by exchange rate manipulations.

There are only two conditions under which a market in goods and services can freely operate across national borders. One is a system of clean floating. The other is full monetary union, EMU. The first should be our medium-term objective in a reconstituted EMS, the second must be our long-term aim. I would ask Mr Ortoli, who is listening so attentively to us, if the Commission will publish and prepare an analysis of the critical path which will take the European Community from its present point of development in monetary affairs to full economic and monetary union. The European Democratic Group believes strongly in EMU and has therefore moved an amendment to Article 6 of Mr Moreau's report with this in mind.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Fernandez to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Fernandez. — (*F*) Mr President, there are now seven million unemployed in the Community. Inflation is increasing at an estimated average annual rate of between 12 and 13 %. Growth is stagnating at around 1 % and the balance of payments deficit is rising, amounting to 51 thousand million francs for France alone.

Everyone in this House is talking about the crisis. However, I can remember a time, only a few years ago, when the hard truth of this crisis was not openly admitted by all the political groups in this House.

Yesterday, Mr Deleau even said, when talking about the steel industry, that the crisis was predictable. Yes, it was predictable, yesterday and even today, and as a result we can define its true causes and root them out by denouncing those people who are really responsible for the serious situation we are now in.

It is, however, strange to note that, here as elsewhere, everyone is talking about the increasing seriousness of unemployment, lasting stagnation in growth, the rise in inflation, and no one mentions that it is above all the policies applied by each Member State and by the Community which have brought us to this pass. Those policies cannot in fact be termed failures because they were deliberately chosen, and for us, the French Communists and our Allies, they are quite unacceptable. Moreover, there is no point in claiming that we can solve this crisis if we apply the same policies, the same principles, and stick to a determination to reject the needs and justified demands of the mass of workers and the population of our countries.

In this matter, the workers are not being told the truth, and it is far too easy to seek the basic causes of this crisis elsewhere. The Commission report one again blames oil, but the same report stresses that the oil bill will only account for 1.6 % of the gross domestic product of the Community in 1980. So you cannot put this crisis down to the alleged oil shock, and it is economically absurd to claim that such a deep structural crisis in the economy can be caused by a product whose cost represents such a small part of our economies. The Commission report itself puts forward a different explanation: 'The Community has entered a phase of decline in demand and economic activity'.

Yes, there is a crisis in demand, but you cannot approve and deliberately apply austerity policies which maintain economic growth at a low level, and at the same time complain that workers and ordinary people are consuming and buying less and less.

As Communists, we condemn these austerity policies, which are, moreover, the root cause of our present crisis and of its worsening.

Lastly, this House asserts that investment is essential and profits must be made. This, according to you, is the only way of solving the problems of unemploy-

ment and inflation. Here again, the truth is not being told.

In France, private-sector investment has dropped by 13.5 % since 1973, whereas profits over the same period have constantly increased. Since 1974 profits have doubled, while the number of unemployed has trebled. In France today there are 1.7 million unemployed, roughly one in every two of whom does not receive any unemployment benefit.

We also know that the policies now being pursued in France will inflict the terrible burden of 2 ½ or 3 million unemployed on the country in the next few years.

Investment must, however, be made. We must invest, foster French industry and create jobs. But at the moment the multinationals, whose representatives you are, prefer to invest in other countries, even in the United States. This policy has meant that 600 000 to 700 000 jobs have been lost in French industry since 1974.

It should also be noted that only the large nationalized enterprises such as SNCF, RATP, Air France, EDF, Renault and others like them have increased the volume of their investment from an index of 105 to 180 in five years. So it is the public sector which has prevented the crisis from worsening, and it is this sector which Community policies, as well as those of the French Government, aim at gradually dismantling, starting with transport.

In conclusion, Mr President, the French Communists and their Allies cannot agree to the Commission of the European Communities, in its report imposing directives on France, directives which are all aimed at putting pressure on workers' wages and on expenditure for nationalized industry or social policy in Member States. Mr President, we shall not accept either austerity or supranational policies.

President. — I call Mr De Clercq to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr De Clercq. — (*NL*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, Mr Moreau's report — along with a number of other sources — reminds us of the major problems — and their causes — facing us in 1980 and 1981. May I very quickly enumerate these problems before going on to make certain suggestions. This year and next year, economic growth in the European Community will be very low. In fact, we are justified in referring to a recession, and I am sure that everyone is acquainted with the main reasons for this state of affairs: the very sharp rise in the price of oil and the restrictive monetary and budgetary policies pursued in the various Member States. Clearly, these factors are bound to generate a high level of unemployment. The

De Clercq

forecasts are for 7½ million people unemployed next year, amounting to something like 7 % of the active population of the Member States. The main cause for concern is the prospects for the next five years, and especially the problem of unemployment among young people. There is every indication that this situation as regards youth unemployment in particular will give cause for great concern in the future. In the final analysis, of course, the main reason for this sharp rise in unemployment is the low level of economic growth, and clearly, if we want to do something concrete, effective and lasting about unemployment, we must first of all take steps to stimulate economic growth.

The high rate of inflation is a third factor, and despite the slight improvement we can expect, the European economy will remain in a strongly inflationary climate both this and next year.

Taking an average for the European Community as a whole, our balance of payments deficit in 1980 will amount to 43 000 million dollars, and there is no sign of the situation improving next year.

The inadequate level of capital investment is a phenomenon which gives great cause for concern. Since 1974, the propensity to invest in the European Community has fallen consistently. The reasons for this phenomenon are well known: exorbitant pay rises, a taxation system which in many respects is inappropriate, the reduced level of saving and — let us admit — budgetary and monetary mismanagement in many Member States. Another factor is the continuing lack of economic convergence, which is most spectacularly reflected in the wide range of inflation rates in the Community — from 5 % to 20 %.

I should like to suggest a few possible solutions. In the first place, we should upgrade the market economy. I sincerely believe that it is no coincidence that the serious slow-down in economic growth over the last few years has gone hand-in-hand with an increased level of government interference in the Member States of the Community. Nor do I think it a sheer coincidence that those countries which have remained most loyal to the principles of the market economy now have the best balance and have produced the best economic results. I believe that government intervention should be drastically cut back wherever it has reached an excessive level and wherever it has upset a healthy balance, especially in those Member States where interference is most rife, and especially in those sectors where the market has been most seriously disrupted. I am thinking here particularly of the subsidies granted to what are often virtually bankrupt businesses. Of course, cutting back on excessive government interference is not only a financial matter, but also a question of doing away with all manner of useless bureaucratic rules and regulations.

That, then, could be a first course of action — a fairly wide-ranging matter and — I would freely admit — a

controversial one, not in our own eyes so much as in the eyes of others here today. Another thing we need is a disciplined economic policy — or should I say, a disciplined common economic policy — covering a number of factors such as monetary policy, budgetary policy and energy policy. I could add to this list, but I shall confine myself to the strict minimum. I believe that it has been all too often forgotten recently that the development of the money supply is the crucial element in monetary policy. It is extremely difficult to control the growth of the money supply, let alone manipulate it. However, we must proceed on the assumption that the growth of the money supply should not be too rapid if the aim is to maintain a satisfactory price level; on the other hand, there should not be too little growth, otherwise deflationary effects will make themselves felt.

It is up to the national monetary authorities to keep developments firmly in hand. More specifically, governments must reconcile their monetary financing requirements with the growth in the money supply. The Member States must also do more than they have so far to seek to harmonize these objectives and thus to strengthen the European Monetary System, which has clearly been a success.

We in the Community must also formulate a common dollar policy, something which is conspicuously lacking at the moment. Another point is that budgetary policy must be linked directly to monetary policy and the requirements of monetary policy because of the important question which arises everywhere — especially in my country but, as I said, in effect everywhere — of what can and should be regarded as a reasonable public sector deficit. In this respect, we should bear in mind the monetary objectives I reminded you of just now. The upshot of this at the present time is that most of the Member States should severely limit their budgetary shortfall. And any limitation must be very clearly effected by imposing restrictions on the amount of money spent by governments and not by forcing up taxation which — in most Member States, and certainly in Belgium — has already reached a level which should really not be pushed up any further. What I have in mind then is cutting expenditure rather than increasing the burden of taxation. By thus restricting expenditure, we shall at the same time lighten the load of taxation substantially, as regards both business and private persons.

As regards a policy on revenue clearly all forms must be taken into consideration, since the problem extends to all forms. Nevertheless, it is my opinion that any such policy — whether one likes it or not — must be directed mainly at prices and wages. On the prices front, there are grounds for advocating total liberalization and the removal of price controls, but only on the one express condition that effective — not theoretical, but effective — competition should be made possible by doing away with price cartels and price-fixing agreements of any nature.

De Clercq

As regards incomes, I believe that the principle of free bargaining must be respected. Employers and employees should be left to negotiate freely and collectively on working and pay conditions. The government must merely ensure that pay negotiations are really free, that is to say, that both sides are placed on an equal footing. However, there must be no agreements between the two sides to the detriment of the government — in other words, of society as a whole — or of other sectors. Another important factor is that both sides must be truly representative and — let us not forget — mobility of labour must be encouraged. It is important that certain taboos on this point be resolutely abandoned.

Finally, discipline must be brought to the last aspect of economic policy — energy policy — if we are ever to get out of the rut. As economic growth in Europe depends to a great extent — not exclusively, but to a great extent — on the price of oil, it is self-evident that our oil imports must be substantially reduced.

I am pleased to note that there are a number of praiseworthy national plans and attempts to arrive at a common energy policy. However, we have so far unfortunately seen no trace of a Community energy policy, while the energy policies pursued by the various Member States do not seem to me to be exactly effective. Perhaps too little use is being made of an instrument which I feel could be well suited to the job at hand, namely the price of the commodity — the price of oil. In my opinion, the price mechanism should play an important part in national and supra-national energy policy.

I have tried, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, to give not only an analysis of the current situation and its causes, but also a few concrete suggestions for an effective policy and for the background to any such policy, namely, the upgrading of the principles of a free, socially-orientated market economy.

The problems facing us are enormous, the challenges are many and varied, and we have certainly not got out of the worst yet, but we must play Europe's trump cards with more common sense and more political will. The fact is that we have not yet made use of our full potential. Let me conclude by saying that the difficulties facing us are great, but we also have great potential if only we act jointly and sensibly to realize it.

President. — I call Mr Deleau to speak on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

Mr Deleau — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like first of all to pay tribute to our rapporteur, Mr Moreau, for the skill and perseverance he has shown in defending his views before the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs.

The Commission is submitting this report on economic prospects to the Council and our discussion of it is an opportunity to take stock of the Community's economic policies. Because practices vary from one country to another, there are, despite Member States' protestations of a desire for convergence, a number of economic policies within this Community. We raised long ago the right to be different in terms of policy instruments, particularly because there are in our view differences of basic situations, mineral wealth and of culture.

We can, however, only regret that the Community has not set identical objectives, — aimed at protecting Community products — in particular to counter the bitter competition from certain non-member countries. If we want to safeguard employment and protect tomorrow's jobs we must first of all safeguard the Community's economic potential and traditional industries, by such means as we can find.

In the same way we must emphasize the serious effect of the high level of imports to which some Member States have become accustomed. Imports from third countries, apart from immediately making us poorer, represent a serious threat for the future. Of course, choices will have to be made. That is why we have always insisted on the need for serious medium term economic planning amongst the Member States. Such planning is the only way of dealing with the current investment anarchy. I am sure I have no need to remind you that it is investment which is the main driving force for growth and which safeguards employment. Now, there is not enough investment within the Community and the main reason for that is the lack of selectivity. That is why Member States must plan development in a few major economic sectors. They must first of all encourage investment in the energy sector, with a policy aimed at greater energy savings. And then the next choice must be high technology — telematics and informatics, which must be extended throughout industry.

A determined, dynamic attitude such as this should be reflected in more sustained exports, and the Commission must lay more importance on this within the general balance of economic growth. That is a point which we would like to add to Mr Moreau's report. In the same way, it is our view that we must help small and medium-sized undertakings to create new jobs, by giving them tax incentives to invest and loans from the EIB and other Community sources at special rates. Incidentally, on the problem of reducing working hours whilst maintaining living standards — which is a very reasonable ambition — I also wonder about increases in production costs. Of course, investment is expensive. Could we not perhaps look towards the pool of Euro-dollars and try diverting them towards productive investment, rather than encouraging inflation as they do today?

Deleau

However, that should not surprise us, since we haven't yet considered reconstructing the international monetary system. Our trade policy still depends largely on fluctuations in the dollar, and that is why the inflationary trends in the world economy are still dominant. There is proof enough of that in the turn in the monetary tide which we have seen during these last few days: the weakness of the Deutschmark is a result of the rapid rise in the dollar caused by spiralling interest rates.

I am sure we could all speak a great length on the various monetarist theories, and all say that the European Monetary System has not played its expected stabilizing role to the full. Look at the continuing rises in interest rates. Indeed, the analysis made by Community leaders has until now undoubtedly been far too monetarist. Reviving all the productive forces in the economy factors is now one of the essential conditions for reestablishing real economic growth, which we would like to see as great as possible so that we can eliminate unemployment at all levels of society, particularly amongst the young. That is one of the reasons why we are tabling an amendment to add a new clause after paragraph 1 of the resolution, pointing out the need to stimulate growth in order as a matter of priority to combat inflation, to coordinate the measures taken by the Member States to put a stop to the dizzying spiral of interest rates, to permit the investment necessary for the growth of exports and to reorganize the economy taking account of the need for social harmony, energy savings and environmental requirements. That is an ambitious programme, and we believe that Europe can and must follow it. I will therefore repeat the closing words I used yesterday in my speech on the steel industry: this is the price which Europe must pay to be credible and to remain a hope into the future.

President. — I call Sir Basil de Ferranti.

Sir Basil de Ferranti. — I want to speak out on one subject only: I want to speak out for more training and during the coming months when the Commission have their mandate to reconsider the budget of the Community I hope they will bear in mind the Social Fund and adaptations, perhaps, of the Social Fund, with a view to improving training throughout the Community.

After all, there are two great things about human nature: one is our human inventiveness, which has enabled us to raise the standard of living; the other, and perhaps more important, is our sense of social responsibility. Our sense of social responsibility now in the economic situation that the Commissioner has described to us must call for more training.

We must see our faces at this difficult time against propping up uneconomic jobs; we must recognize that

it is over-manning that destroys jobs more than anything else. The Community faces a massive readaptation to our new economic circumstances. We face massive restructuring. We must carry this through. We must not be so afraid of it that we do not get on with it. It is not just any longer people moving out of agriculture into industry. Not any longer people moving out of industry to the services. It is beyond that — it is services into totally new kinds of jobs.

Readaptation is the big challenge that we face. There should, after all, be no shortage of new jobs if we are able to meet our new challenges. We have got the whole of the energy situation where we must make massive investments. We have got many poorer regions still in the Community where we want to raise the standard of living. We have got the new countries that are joining us, Greece, Spain and Portugal. We have the whole of the rest of the world where 800 million people as we know from our famine debate, go to bed hungry every night. There cannot be a shortage of jobs. If Europe pulls together, which is why we are all here, there cannot be a shortage of jobs. But we cannot meet this challenge without training.

I would just leave one thought in our minds: we have debated already this week Music Year. We know we have the very desirable possibility of a year for the disabled. Let us make 1981, the year of the Commission mandate, retraining year. Let us make our plans so that we improve job mobility and in that way really add social responsibility to human inventiveness in a meaningful way.

President. — I call Mr Wagner.

Mr Wagner. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, Mr Ortoli is right when he says that the Community must take action. But I should like to make one critical remark. You also said, Mr Ortoli, that diagnoses should naturally continue to precede action. Of course, it will be necessary to take into account the large number of surveys and diagnoses which have been drawn up not just by the Community but also by the Member States and the OCED, and these surveys should be updated in order to draw consequences from them. However, I should like to stress one thing — something must be done. The European Community is now facing what is probably its biggest challenge, which will show whether it is capable of tackling the high and still rising level of unemployment and of taking the necessary effective measures and action. Moreover, the Community must prepare itself for the medium-term economic development which can be expected until the middle of the 80s. Experts now expect — other things being equal — that unemployment will reach more than 10 million in the EEC Member States, and that young people and women will be the hardest hit.

Wagner

To achieve this, we shall undoubtedly have to depart from the customs and practices which we have had up to now. We must not continue to pass too many resolutions and convert too few of them into practical common policies. I should like to warn against something Mr von Bismarck just said. We must not now start complaining that there is not yet any European Government, that there is no political union, but we ought rather, in the struggle to achieve a realistic and gradual policy which will lead us to greater cohesion in Europe, not forget to take action and live up to our responsibilities in the social field. I stress this above all with regard to young people who place their faith in Europe and in its ability to deal with problems and to progress towards a 'social' Europe. It is our job to convince them of this, and we bear a particular responsibility in this respect.

Given the short speaking time which we have available today, I should just like briefly to cover two points, as I am sure that the discussions will be continued in the Committee for Economic and Monetary Affairs and elsewhere.

At the meetings of the Committee on Economic and Monetary affairs, Mr Moreau was exemplary in his efforts to ensure that, in our opinion and in our report on what the Commission had put before us, we found solutions which enabled us to make concrete progress. The Socialist Group again tabled four important amendments, which were not supported by the majority during voting in committee. I should like to ask the other groups to vote in favour of these amendments. We cannot permit — as also happens now and again at home in Germany — ultra-reactionary officials in employers' organizations or some retrograde politicians to put the onus for cleaning up the economic mess we are in in Europe on the workers. We will not accept this policy, and my Group and the parties represented in it will use all the means available to fight against it.

(Applause)

Purchasing power must be maintained across the board for the low-income groups in particular, and for employees in general, purchasing power must be reinforced, and we should remember that — as one or two other Members have already stated — wages and salaries are also components of demand. Those in the Community who have tried to cope with, or even just to tackle, inflation by consciously accepting a high and increasing rate of unemployment have met their comeuppance. That is why I must also warn against meekly accepting such an approach and such demands either outside or inside this House. This is the wrong road to follow and we should under no circumstances be taking it. There are examples in the European Community which show that, by maintaining purchasing power, by maintaining and safeguarding the existing social security systems, and progressively reducing the total working life, we can make better progress. In

addition, we need national financial and budgetary policies aimed at saving jobs right now, because private investment is already showing signs of being unable to cope. This is how we should contribute to saving and creating jobs.

In conclusion, please allow me to address a personal request to you, Mr Ortoli, and also to the future President of the new Commission.

If we want to join in solving the growing economic and social problems currently facing the European Community, if Europe is to play its role in the world and throw its weight into the balance of world power, as a mediator between the two blocs and to speak up for more humanity and solidarity towards the Third World and other countries, we in this House must take all the necessary steps to ensure that the economic and social tripartite conference between representatives of the national governments, the Commission, employers and trade unions gets down to some serious work at last. I should like to hear something definite on this from you both. What we support fervently in Poland — strong and independent trade unions — we should also work hard towards achieving in the European Community. In addition, we should ensure that the ideas and objectives which the European Confederation of Trade Unions has repeatedly put to the Commission and to the national governments are taken seriously, so that those who are responsible for the political and economic policies now being applied assume that responsibility and stand by it. We must act to achieve the aims of safeguarding full employment, reinforcing Europe in the social and political fields and achieving closer cohesion in Europe.

President. — I call Mr Beumer.

Mr Beumer. — *(NL)* Mr President, I have a few remarks to make on Part 2 of the Commission's report, the first sentence of which says that the medium-term objectives must be to create more jobs in a climate of greater price stability and improved competitiveness. The report goes on to specify possible lines of approach, such as fighting inflation, limiting deflation, encouraging growth industries and reducing the present level of unemployment. What these objectives all boil down to — whether long or short-term, national or Community policy — is limiting inflation and preventing deflation. This just goes to show how narrow the room for manoeuvre is and how desirable it is that we should pursue this policy as decisively as possible. With reference to paragraph 3 of Mr Moreau's report, there are three questions I should like to ask.

Given the Commission's current room for manoeuvre, what effective contribution can it make towards achieving the aim formulated in the first sentence of its

Beumer

report? Secondly, does the Commission need additional resources to enable it to tackle the problem more effectively, and if so, what? Thirdly, to what extent will the objectives formulated in the report be adversely affected by acceptance of the Council's draft budget? After all, let us not forget that there are two sides to this policy of shifting resources from consumption to investment. There is the defensive aspect — as the Member of the Commission pointed out — comprising cost-rationalization, spending cuts and improving the climate for investment; then there is the offensive aspect, amounting to forward-looking specialization and innovation. Community projects and operations can provide a bonus here, and to what extent does the Commission actually feel able to achieve this bonus effect? Let me give you one specific example. The Commission has, on a number of occasions, pointed out the need for energy-saving measures, with the attendant benefits of more jobs and a reduction in costs and inflation. The Commission has two things to say in its report on this count: firstly, there is wide scope for investment and employment and, secondly, the actual volume of investment is too small compared with the opportunities. What bottlenecks is the Commission confronted with and what is it doing to remedy the situation? An essential element in any successful policy, Mr President, is a consensus-making policy, something which can only be achieved by way of a Community policy supported at Community level by both sides of industry; without this, economic convergence is out of the question. What we need is a better policy on jobs, more training and better organization and redistribution of the available work. The joint committees have proved their worth in the agricultural and steel sectors, and it may safely be assumed that communications between the two sides of industry across national frontiers will play an increasingly important role in the future. That being so, what are the chances of extending the work of committees of this kind to other important sectors? Is anything being done in this respect?

Mr President, on reading the Commission's report and its objectives, it seems to me that there is a very close connection between labour questions, and macroeconomic policy. Would it not be sensible to urge the Council — and there is nothing to stop us doing this — to convene not only the Standing Committee on Employment and preferably the Ministers for Social Affairs, but also the Economics and Finance Ministers to hold joint consultations to ensure that no contradictory decisions are taken? Would a search for a consensus-making policy not help to bring about the kind of policy formulated by the Commission in its report? What does the Commission see as desirable in this respect, and what are the current prospects?

President. — I call Mr Purvis.

Mr Purvis. — Mr President, in the Fife and Tayside, Strathclyde and Central Regions of Scotland, parts of

which I represent, there are worried people and worried companies. Some have found themselves out of work, other are very concerned for the immediate future. The same concern is reproduced over the length and breadth of Europe, to varying degrees. But in Mid-Scotland we are going to make a virtue of the difficulties: our industries are restructuring positively, and the emphasis is on high technology, high value-added products, unique products such as advanced electronics and energy industry products, and, above all, higher productivity. Certainly we welcome help, but the best help is helping ourselves.

Unemployment is tragic: it is the major economic and social problem facing Europe today and in 1981. Certainly we must find solutions, but we shall not solve it by measures which in effect just conceal it; and this is why we have to find positive solutions and not just negative palliatives. I therefore see little merit in suggestions to share out work so that all those who share are worse off, both because their earnings are shared and because the enterprise they work for is faced with lower profitability and therefore less ability to compete. The result could well be that there is nothing left to share.

I greatly dislike systematic overtime working; it is neither in the employee's real interest nor that of his employer, if it is just a fiction to cover low earnings or low productivity. I therefore strongly advocate the amendment which has my name on it — No 10, to paragraph 17 — because it directs us to the positive solutions. These are based on making European industry competitive by encouraging productivity, high technology, job mobility, the reduction of overtime consistent with increasing productivity and maintained real incomes, and the utilization of the special skills of married women and others who can only contemplate part-time working or flexible working hours.

Above all, we do the employed and the unemployed of Europe no favour by hamstringing our industries, those which are surviving the difficulties, even expanding despite the difficulties, and adjusting satisfactorily to changing circumstances: we provide them no help if we burden them with social costs. We must help business of all types — large and small, manufacturing and service — to create new job opportunities. Our task is not to interfere in commercial decisions, but to set up the most attractive economic, fiscal and trade environment in which business can prosper. So let us concentrate on the areas we are responsible for: the Common Market of 20 million consumers, the infrastructure of the Community, the proper balance of priorities in our budget, trade relations with other countries and, within our budgetary limits, some financial assistance to those citizens and industries in temporary difficulty. But let it not be said that we are impeding industry's progress and the real jobs that only successful industry and commerce can provide.

Purvis

I would suggest to the Commission, and to its successor, that perhaps a discussion document setting out an idea of the environment we are to work in in the 80s would be desirable. Let us say we entitle it 'An Environment for European Industry in the 80s'.

President. — I call Mr Herman.

Mr Herman. — (*F*) Mr President, I greatly appreciated the masterly and concise analysis made by Mr Ortoli, and it is on the basis of this analysis that I shall make a very brief speech.

The burden of oil prices, which can now involve tens of thousands of millions of dollars, will call for a considerable effort on our part to reduce our dependence on oil. But you also spoke of the other constraint — that of competitiveness — which will also require us to find hundreds of millions of dollars for investments.

The phenomenon is a very simple one, and unfortunately the figures are implacable. We shall never be able to make this effort without reducing overall consumption in our countries. There is no way of finding 300 of 400 million dollars in the nine countries of the Community without reducing the level of consumption. It goes without saying that we must try and spread the burden in such a way that the least well off do not have to pay, but to think that the recovery aims you have sketched out can be achieved without reducing the standard of living in the Community is purely illusory.

This has to be said! It is perhaps not said often enough. And in my view this means that the Commission must concern itself with something other than short-term trends. It means basically that we must safeguard our prospects for the future — essentially our industrial future — by making massive investments in advanced technology and every kind of technical progress. This is something which we must do together.

The point I am leading up to is this — that the industrial policy which the Commission is trying to create has so far not found enough consensus among the Member States, and although they may reluctantly agree from time to time to make an effort on a point-by-point basis, the powers that delegate to the Commission are too often rendered ineffective by the obligation to submit its proposals to committees or councils where unanimity is required. This means that the delegation of powers to the Commission is totally vitiated, contrary to what was intended in the Treaty of Rome. This in turn means that we are destroying our only chance of taking action for the medium and long term. This is the crux of the message which Parliament must ask the Commission to pass on to the Council.

President. — I call Mr Bonde.

Mr Bonde. — (*DK*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the EEC economic directives tell Danish wage earners exercise restraint in forthcoming wage negotiations. This advice comes from Commissioners who earn more each month than many Danish wage earners have to manage on for a whole year. This advice on wage restraint is supported by this House, whose group chairmen have proposed the trebling of the salaries of Danish Members of the European Parliament. I admit of course that this wage claim is in line with the promises made to the people before the referendum on the EEC in 1972 when they were told to vote for the EEC for the sake of their pay packets! But I also know that this promise was fulfilled only for a very small proportion of the population.

If we compare the development of productivity with that of real wages, then Danish wage earners during the years since we joined the EEC have had increases of 13.9 % deferred.

If one also allows for the reduction in working time, then the deferred increase is 19.6 % and taking account of tax it is 17.2 %. Civil servants are due even more since their deferred wage increase is 26 %, if tax is also considered civil servants' deferred wage increase was 30.5 % in 1979.

Has the wage restraint which the EEC is again recommending led to more jobs? In 1973 we had 21 000 unemployed in Denmark, while this winter we have 200 000. In the same period Denmark's foreign debt have increased from 17 to almost 100 million kroner. Thus to the extent that the EEC directives have achieved anything, we must observe that they have not solved any problems for us. For this reason, the representatives of the People's Movement will oppose any plans to transform the Community into an economic and monetary union.

President. — Mr Bonde, for the record I should like to point out that there has been no proposal from the chairmen of the groups to increase Members' salaries.

I call Mr Delors.

Mr Delors, *chairman of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs.* — (*F*) Mr President, I would first like to echo the disappointment expressed by Mr Ortoli, who has had to take a day away from his pressing tasks in order to be present at a debate lasting only two and a half hours. By cutting to a minimum the time given to a debate on the economic situation which relates to the everyday life of Europeans and covers such important questions, Parliament is setting a trend which I regret — that of pushing into the background the matters covered by the Treaty while still calling for more and more powers. Believe me, it is

Delors

easier to draw up every morning an urgent motion for a resolution on something which is wrong in the world than to make a detailed analysis of the obstacles to European integration.

(Applause)

That said, I shall content myself, in this debate which has nevertheless been very worthwhile, with expressing my fear on the point and my regret on another.

My fear is this: I am fully aware of the difficulty of analysing and mastering current economic phenomena. Everywhere, even among those who govern us, there is a certain confusion which is understandable: The future has become difficult to interpret. But I think that in this sphere there is one temptation which must be resisted — that of relying, either for doctrinal reasons or more often resignedly, on a single instrument of economic policy to put the house in order again. I refer to monetary policy.

I am well aware that monetary policy is one of the essential elements in a policy of attempting to steer and control economic and social developments. But when it is used on its own and to a considerable extent — rather like the addict who ends up drinking meths instead of whisky and soda — when it is used as intensively as this, the result is an escalation of interest rates throughout the world which disrupts the most stable positions. Moreover, there is no certainty that one will achieve the results one wants. The present fluctuations in the American economy show this well. Of course, the alternative to this monetary policy is a policy which would make more subtle use of all the instruments of economic policy — taxation, the budget, employment policy, financial policy and social security contributions. That policy seems to me to correspond better to the wishes expressed by Mr Ortoli, who, like me, would avoid like the plague any excessively sudden measures which would only make our problems worse. And that is why I hope consideration will be given to returning to these mixed policies.

But these mixed policies also include an element which is singularly lacking today. It is true that tripartite consultation no longer has a good press in our countries. Indeed, the balance of forces is sometimes so favourable to the Right or to the employers that the latter no longer consider such consultation. I would like to warn them that tripartite consultation, i.e. the involvement of all the active elements in the economy in the discussion and analysis of conditions for economic development, provides an additional guarantee for the achieving the aims we set ourselves. There is a close correlation between on the one hand using all the instruments of economic policy and on the other involving all the active elements of a nation in a process of consultation on the matter, the extent of which will vary from country to country. Moreover, one should not forget the educational aspect of such a policy. And I fear that, if the good sense which I have

just been advocating does not prevail, there may in some of our countries be a kind of logic of confrontation which will carry the day and thus make it even more difficult to solve the problems.

The cause for regret is related to the gradualist strategy, which I have always regarded as the only possible one. As a recent Commission report which we have not yet examined — that of 15 October 1980 on energy and economic policy — rightly says, the aim of this strategy, in absence of economic convergence, is that in our highly integrated economy isolated, even contradictory actions should have an overall effect on the growth possibilities of the economy as a whole. In other words, what we are aiming at here is less than convergence, but is sound and reasonable in present conditions.

It was in this spirit that, as you may remember, I pleaded last year in favour of Community loans. I saw three advantages in large-scale recourse to Community loans. Firstly, they offer an opportunity of supporting economic activity throughout the Community and thereby avoiding economic decline, particularly in the countries with the weakest economies. One can see today how right that is proving to be, even if it is still easy to recycle dollars. Secondly, I saw in them a way of reinforcing the mechanisms of the EMS *vis-à-vis* its own institutions. The EMS is currently threatened by the monetary policy of the United States, and there is the paradox that the most sensible and powerful country in the Community, the one which is best at combating inflation, now sees its currency threatened. Finally, the third advantage that I saw was, that of shoving up, as it were the fragile house of cards represented by the recycling by private banks of the oil-producing countries' surplus capital. I know that we have before us a proposal to modify these Community loans and increase their amount. It is my ardent hope that the Community will without delay take another small step by providing itself with these instruments, or rather by resorting to them once more — a step which would certainly help it, albeit to a modest extent, to meet more effectively the terrible challenges confronting it.

President. — I call Mr Ortoli.

Mr Ortoli, Vice President of the Commission. — *(F)* I must tell you, Mr President, that this debate has been too short, and I regret it deeply, because we have been touching on the four or five vitally important questions which this House ought to consider.

Firstly a debate on the European Monetary System and its effects, its future, its links with the international monetary system, the constraints and penalties which govern it and, as a result, the reality of this movement towards the economic and monetary union

Ortoli

which we so often talk about: that is a debate which really should be held.

Then there is a second debate, on the 1980s and the industrial climate, which in the last analysis means a number of constraints and — I don't want to overuse the word constraint — factors which we are obliged to take into consideration if we are to act responsibly, that is to say when drawing up policies. Policies are made of great hopes and great deeds and also — and this is my third point — of the search for policies which are shared by everyone. Here is the subject for a third debate, on the 'consensus' — what could be called the 'common belief' that a particular line which each country follows in its own way, with a great deal of determination and with everybody taking part in view of the constraints and despite the penalties, is a way of making progress. In other words, the common belief that Europe is not faced with the inevitable disaster — we may be faced with difficulties, we may be faced with obligations but we are not faced with disaster. That then, is another debate which should be launched: a debate on the fact that we are not victims of fate but that we are involved in a great combat in which we can emerge the winners.

The last debate of which I would like to remind you — although there are others — relates to the Community's contribution. For we need to think much harder about what we call the role of the Community; this may be in an institutional mould, but it also means thinking about practical, concrete questions. What do you mean by a common energy policy or a common industrial policy? That is what we should be talking about, instead of merely chanting incessantly 'O Lord show us the common policy and what it ought to be!' Let's talk about it and look at what we really have to do. And if we look at that we shall see also some of the European dreams — and in these particular areas they are wishful thinking. Because in the last analysis, there are a number of things which we proclaim in words which Europe cannot do. On the other hand there is a very great deal to be done in certain areas, and certain direct responsibilities ought to be more broadly and better exercised.

That is probably the sort of debate, Mr President, which we should undertake next time an opportunity like today's arises, because otherwise we will simply be talking about isolated instances. Defining policy means considering and describing a whole range of things which one wants to see done, and then describing the means of doing them; that is what I would call European policy and that is the sort of debate I would like to see held next year, either in stages or at a single session like this. If not, we — or rather you — will have done no more than deliver an opinion on a report. The European Parliament was not elected by universal suffrage just to give its opinion on reports. Rather it should undertake within its ranks — even at the cost of internal conflict — a debate on the way to resolve those problems which, though they are the

most serious problems we face today, are also so many opportunities for Europe to grasp.

President. — As regards your remark about the lack of time available to Parliament, I should like to say that this annoys the Members of Parliament just as much as it annoys the Members of the Commission. However, the alternative would be to have a Parliament in permanent session to which the Members of the Commission would have to come every day. Whether this would be preferable from the Commission's point of view is not for me to say.

The debate is closed.

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

7. *Seat of the European Parliament*

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-500/80), tabled by Mr Glinne on behalf of the Socialist Group, Mr Klepsch on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group), Mr Scott-Hopkins on behalf of the European Democratic Group, Mr Fanti and Mr Gouthier, Mr Bange-mann and Mr Nord on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, Mr de la Malène on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats and Mr Pannella, on the seat of the European Parliament.

I call Mr Seefeld to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Seefeld. — (*D*) Mr President, my Group has asked me to make a few introductory remarks. We feel that this debate is necessary. We were co-signatories to this motion for a resolution and would be extremely glad if its demands were not just approved by the majority of this House, but also noted and put into practice by the Council and the national governments.

We feel that a question has been raised which concerns the work of this Parliament, which we should like to carry out as well as possible for the benefit of our peoples.

The European Parliament is directly elected, and this has given it a new significance, a new quality. This House must now — in our opinion — settle its own affairs in its own best interests, because specific problems which face Parliament could not be solved before now. I do not think we can wait until the national governments get round to doing something. Our disappointment at what has not been done up to now is great enough. In a motion for a resolution which my Group tabled in January 1980 and which was discussed at the time in the Political Affairs Commit-

Seefeld

tee, we pointed out that Article 216 of the EEC Treaty states 'the seat of the institutions of the Community shall be determined by common accord of the Governments of the Member States'. It is our view that this article contains a legal right to a single seat for the institutions of the Community, and above all for the European Parliament. For 20 years now, as you all know, the national governments have not managed to come to any decision on this question. They have, in our opinion, violated this article and the legal right deriving from it.

The seat is the place at which the institution in question may permanently come together to hold its meetings. However, the Member State Governments have up to now not taken any decision on the final seat of the institutions. Up to now, they were not in a position to determine these seats. Therefore they designated provisional places of work. We think that we should now make an end of provisional places of work and come to a decision on the final and definitive place of work.

We wish to know clearly where we, duly elected Members of the European Parliament, will regularly be meeting in the future. We wish to be treated like a normal parliament. We wish to be able to work like a normal parliament. Furthermore, no national parliament in the European Community or in Europe and I think I am able to say in the whole world would put up with working conditions of the type which we have to bear. No national parliament would allow the ruling government to lay down where it should sit. In Germany, it would never occur to any reasonable person that the central government should be firmly established in Bonn, but that the Germany Federal Parliament should sit sometimes in Bonn, sometimes in Flensburg, sometimes in Passau or even sometimes somewhere else. We are not asking for any exceptional treatment but just for our rights. This is why we demand that, as the motion for a resolution states, by the middle of June 1981 a decision be taken on the seat of the institutions of the Community. On this point, I can accept paragraph 2 of the draft amendment tabled by the Committee on Political Affairs. It seems quite logical to me that we should not be referring here to a hearing, because a hearing is not the same thing as concertation. We wish to be involved in the taking of this decision, because we are involved in its outcome. Members of this Parliament complain in many ways about the increasing burden placed on Parliament. They rightly referred to the extravagant cost of overheads. They are annoyed at the way in which cooperation between the Community institutions is impeded, and they also feel that contact between the Parliament and the general public is impaired by the fact that we sometimes meet in one place and sometimes in another. And, last but not least, we have a heavy responsibility towards the taxpayer, and are convinced that the Members of the European Parliament must meet the expectations of those who elected them and thereby imposed certain

duties on them. We can only fulfil these duties in the long run if our work is carried out in one single place.

This House is referred to in a somewhat derogatory manner as a travelling circus. In fact, having three places of work causes difficulties not just to the Members themselves. All the officials working for the European Parliament are just as hampered by these difficulties as we are. And the journalists too who report on our activities to the general public and that means to our electors as well, suffer just as much as we do from these working conditions.

We need to be more effective and we can achieve this by cutting costs and saving time. The quality of the European Parliament can, and doubtless will, improve once we have a single seat. Therefore, we must come to grips with the nine Governments. We owe this not just to ourselves but also to the citizens of the Nine who elected us, because during the 1979 election campaign no doubt many of you, as I did, spoke about the problem of Parliament's seat, and at that time we no doubt referred to thrift and our good reputation. I feel we ought to think about the next elections. Time is passing more quickly than we think. This is why we cannot wait any longer and must strive to achieve what is contained in the resolution, if the nine Governments do not do it.

Please allow me to make one last remark, or rather to express a suspicion I have. Some people would perhaps be quite willing not to make a decision, because they do not attribute to the European Parliament the significance which it, in my opinion, ought to have. There may be governments who treat this affair according to the maxim that the Members of the European Parliament ought to be kept busy with their personal and administrative problems, and in that way they will not have very much time to bother themselves with politics. I should like to give a warning to people who think this way. They should remember that nine Governments wanted the first direct elections to the European Parliament in 1979, and they knew when they agreed to this that this House would want to, and would in fact, fight to obtain its own scope of authority and rights. The problem of Parliament's seat is one of these rights.

One final word to those who are perhaps afraid that cities which have — as I am willing to admit — made great efforts for the European Parliament will be ruled out as seats for Parliament. They might perhaps think that the aim of this debate is to place one city or another outside the mainstream of European thought or even to prevent it from taking on European significance. I should like to explain that there is no question today of deciding on where the seat should be. And anyway suitable compensation must be found for any city which is not able to become the seat of Parliament.

Seefeld

All those people who really want European integration and do not just wish to evoke it continually in resolutions and justifications, should cooperate in carrying out a rational distribution of European responsibilities between the places which have up to now supported European integration. We must see to it that this Parliament takes on a new dimension which corresponds more closely to its true significance. We want one single seat. Therefore, we welcome this resolution and hereby state that we shall vote in favour of it. We hope to see the European Parliament have that quality to which it is entitled conferred upon it at the latest by June 1981 by the nine Member State governments.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MR B. FRIEDRICH

Vice-President

President. — I call Mr Klepsch to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democrat Group).

Mr Klepsch. — *(D)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, there is a saying which goes: there is nothing so permanent as a temporary solution. This is the subject of our debate today. Of course, the problem of the seats of the various European institutions has been settled in a temporary manner. Our House has today made quite clear by its motion for a resolution the single-minded expectation of the majority of the Members of this House, to hear a clear expression of its point of view from the institution of the Communities which is charged with solving this problem, that is the Council. Of course, one might well say that there are two conflicting principles in play here. These two principles must be placed in perspective. On the one hand, in a Community which is so extensive there is the question of whether the seat of the Community institutions should be decided upon according to a principle of centralization or whether we ought to set our sights on a more federal principle. It is not our job to decide today in this debate on which principle should be used, but rather to make clear that we expect the Council, which is charged with making this decision, to come to some decision on the direction it wishes to follow. Nonetheless, we also expect Parliament to be suitably involved in the deliberations of the Council. In my opinion, this point is quite tellingly made in the additional draft amendment tabled by the Committee on Political Affairs — and we shall not complain about the exact wording used, even though we are aware that the word 'concertation' is not the ideal way to express what is required. It is our opinion — and I should like to address my remarks here to the

Council — that a Parliament cannot be consulted on such a wide-ranging decision as this in a hearing, but that what is needed is for an 'agreement', an exchange of views to be carried out with Parliament on the subject of its own seat. I think that the Council has clearly understood that this is our attitude and that here there is no question of considering our views according to the notion of concertation as it is used in technical budgetary terminology. So, it must be decided what principles the Council would like to give priority to, because a lot of things depend upon this.

I can go on to say, with the full backing of my Group, that we do not expect any decision of the sort which Alexander the Great made, when he cut through the Gordian knot, that is we do not expect a mighty swipe of the sword which will do away with the problem once and for all. The previous speaker has already shown that a whole range of problems are linked to the surmounting of the problem of Parliament's seat. The fate of many thousands of the Communities' employees, and of Parliament's, is involved, but there are also economic, social and political circumstances which must be considered in this respect. We are therefore all aware that — whatever the outcome of this decision — some interim solutions will be necessary. We feel that this Parliament and the Community has a right to ask that this question be brought to a solution. Therefore, members of the Council, you should take seriously the fact that this whole House expects the Council to have found such a solution by 15 June of next year. For I should like to lay heavy emphasis on the fact that if the Council feels that it is not in a position to progress on this matter, then this House must decide for itself on something which concerns its own affairs.

(Applause from some quarters)

We wish to make this clear in our motion for a resolution and I am sure that the House will approve it.

I should like to add two more remarks. We are fully aware that the European Community is an organization which is in the course of developing — at least that is our fervent desire — and of developing towards a goal which in the words of the Council and of the heads of State and Government will consist of bringing into effect political union between European States. On the road towards this sort of goal, there are a whole host of protruding cobblestones which have to be stamped back into place, and even some which need to be dug up, we all know this very well. But the question of Parliament's seat has in the meantime become highlighted in the eyes of the public to an extent which it hardly deserves. It is an important, but it is not the main, element in the construction of the European Community. Therefore we should work on the basis, which the Council also recognizes, that this annoyance should be brought out into the open for public discussion and that for us it is a matter of reaching a solution.

Klepsch

I should like to sum up on behalf of my Group. We want the Council to shed light on how it intends to settle the problem of the organization of the European Communities with regard to the problem of the seats of the various institutions. We should like this to be settled as far as the European Parliament is concerned in close collaboration with this House, and naturally we also hope that this will not be a half baked decision but on the contrary a decision which we will all be able to assume together. Our aim consists of making the European Community less unwieldy and more effective. The previous speaker referred to a whole range of problems which arise for this House with reference to this question. But believe us: it is our firm determination to do something positive for the Community together with the Council and it is in this sense that we have drawn up this motion for a resolution.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Scott-Hopkins to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — Mr President, the motion before the House today has been explained very well by the two honourable gentlemen who have just spoken, but it is in reality an ultimatum given by this Parliament to Member Governments.

Mark you, it is not the first time that this has happened, as undoubtedly everybody knows. We are all of us, I think, aware of the chain of historical circumstances and political compromise which is the background to the unhappy state in which this Parliament now finds itself. A lot of it was said by Mr Seefeld when he was talking just now.

But no one can deny that in almost a quarter of a century the governments — and I underline here the governments, not the Council — the governments of Member States have had every opportunity to settle this matter. No one challenges, and this motion does not challenge, their right to take the final decision on the seat of the Institutions. But this right is also a responsibility which has been shirked now for 20 years by Member Governments. And it is this responsibility which we are today requiring the governments to discharge. We have tried this in the past; in 1960 in the previous Parliament, and in 1959 as well. No action was taken following Parliament's resolutions.

Now is it wrong, Mr President, to suppose that when the Heads of Government decided to hold direct elections, they were sincere in wanting a European Parliament which would add strength to the Community's institutions? And is it wrong to assume that the 111 million people who voted in last year's European elections wanted a Parliament which could do its job effectively?

This issue is not only a test of governments' good faith. It is crucial also to our credibility as an Institution and, what is more, to people's faith in the Community. And, my goodness, there are doubts about that in some countries in the Community.

But why should Europe's Parliament be the only one in the world, as Mr Seefeld said, to lack a permanent site? And what authority can such a Parliament expect to secure? What pride can any of us feel, Mr President, in being members of an Institution condemned to work in this absurd fashion like gypsies? Europe can no longer afford the luxury of governments' indecision.

And now I turn quickly to another point. The Treaty states quite clearly that it is the duty of member governments to decide not only Parliament's seat, but also that of the institutions. Now does this not mean that Council and Commission, and even the other organs of the Community, will have to be included in this decision? So let us be quite clear what this resolution will mean and what a government's duty is.

But can you imagine, honourable Members, the Council or the Commission leaving their cosy nook in Brussels? Both are well placed; their staffs are well ensconced and content. But not us, oh no, we are going to be the ones who are going to be condemned, as I have said. We may well be asked to settle six hundred kilometres or more from the Community's civil service and the decision-making Council of Ministers where they work. Does anyone really think that this would lead to the efficient working of our Parliament? I do not think so.

Might I make one very simple point, Mr President? One that is seldom raised when we discuss these matters. Between now and 1984 the Community of Nine will become ten and may even be twelve. From January 1981 we shall be expecting our Greek friends to travel 2 000 kilometres from Athens to Brussels for committee meetings, 4 000 kilometres round journey for a meeting which might last a total of 7 hours. The Community is becoming a bigger place and the distances are getting longer and the need for a place where we parliamentarians can establish ourselves is accordingly made even more urgent.

Parliament's case for seeking a solution does not rest on grounds of principle alone. I should like to add a few words, if I may, concerning the truly appalling costs of the existing arrangements. My honourable friend, Robert Jackson, pointed out in his report last year on Parliament's budget that nearly 10 % of our staff costs and over 10 % of our annual budget can be attributed to the fact of our not having one working place. In 1981 Parliament will be renting no fewer than 30 buildings, Mr President, and rents have tripled in two years from 5 million to over 15 million European units of account.

Scott-Hopkins

Cost escalations on this scale cannot be allowed to continue. Already the Council understandably is beginning to look askance at Parliament's budget.

Well, a great part of the remedy is in their hands, member governments' hands. Give us a single working place, gentlemen, and these costs can be brought under control.

(Applause)

I should like to emphasize, if I may, how much importance we attach to the need to consult Parliament before any final decision is taken. That point was made by the honourable Member, Mr Klepsch, speaking just now. For my group it is a fundamental principle that this Parliament must be consulted on everything which affects the life of this Community and *a fortiori* on everything which affects the conditions within which we are obliged to live and work. May I say also how much I hope that within Parliament we shall have the fullest consultations with our own staff on this matter.

We want the governments' decision to be a practical one as well as a political one and I am sure you will agree, Mr President, that here in this House amongst parliamentarians we have the right to expect that. We cannot yet be properly proud — I wish we could — of our Parliament because we are, as I have said, a nomadic Assembly.

The argument for Council and Member States is straightforward. Only the cynical want a European Parliament that seems to function but cannot do its job. Only the enemies of the Community want to destroy the European Parliament. Only by working in one place near the other institutions can we the elected Members of the European Parliament carry out the advisory and supervisory powers with which we are endowed by this Treaty.

This motion for a resolution speaks not only for those who signed it, not just for the political groups, not just for all those who work for the European Parliament, or the parliamentarians themselves. This motion states what should be a self-evident truth, that a cost-effective, and practical Parliament must work in one place and will do so. If member governments will not decide we shall, come September next year.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Gouthier to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Gouthier. — *(I)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we in the Italian Communists and Allies Group also support this motion for a resolution and are, of course, in full agreement with both its content and aims.

We feel that the problem of the seat of Parliament has now assumed such prime importance that it must be resolved without delay. Public opinion is naturally somewhat concerned about the disruption and the waste of time and money caused by the present organization of Parliament's work. We can not ignore this concern and the mounting criticism from public opinion in our countries.

I am sure, however, that we are all fully aware today of the predominantly political importance of a problem which could be termed a purely technical one. The Parliament today is a Parliament elected by direct universal suffrage a Parliament which is justified in its desire to take its rightful place among the other Community institutions and fulfil its proper role which is one of initiative and democratic control. Our present disorganized, disjointed manner of working can only prevent the Parliament and the political forces within it from giving full play to their political initiative. And so we feel that the time has come to give the European Parliament the opportunity to give full rein to its enormous political potential.

We believe therefore that the new seat of Parliament should be chosen with a view to enabling it to work in close contact with the other Community institutions. This is why we feel that there should in short be one location for all the Community institutions, and we believe of course — in view of the political importance of this problem — that the Council should not only give some careful thought to the question but also give the Parliament the opportunity to express its opinion on such an important matter, as it has indeed, so clearly, in this motion for a resolution.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Nord to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Nord. — *(NL)* Mr President, when, at the end of September, our group took the initiative which led to this motion for a resolution and to the urgent debate, we based our arguments on the following points.

First of all, something has got to be done. The present situation is unacceptable, especially for Parliament, which is the most seriously affected. Our institution cannot continue this nomadic existence.

Secondly, we were delighted at the French Government's proposal to apply, at last, the provisions in the Treaty, and we want to back them in this.

Thirdly, since of all the Institutions Parliament stands to gain the most from a sensible solution, it seems to us unthinkable that the governments should come to a decision without consulting the Parliament. The reso-

Nord

lution therefore requests that Parliament should be consulted. The Political Affairs Committee proposes to change this to a request for proper consultations and we support this proposal.

Fourthly, a time limit should be set. It is often the case in the Community that there is no chance of success unless the governments set themselves a time limit. Experience has unfortunately shown that, often, no decision is ever made unless there is a real deadline. If by some unfortunate chance this time limit were exceeded, Parliament would have no option in view of the effect this would have on its own working conditions, but to take the necessary steps.

Our fifth and last premise, and perhaps in relation to tonight's debate also the most important, was that we wanted a resolution which would only deal with procedure, and not with the problem as such. At this juncture, therefore, we should now be deciding on the form we want the solution to take. There will be time for that later.

We therefore chose a strategy that would make it possible for virtually all the groups in this Parliament to vote in favour of the motion, so putting the greatest possible pressure on the governments. The aim of this resolution is to set the ball rolling, to ensure that a decision will now be taken within a reasonable time limit, and that Parliament will be given ample opportunity to voice its opinion.

We shall therefore vote for the motion, and for the amendment proposed by the Political Affairs Committee. But we shall vote against the other two amendments, because they are counter to the strategy behind this motion, in that they want to lead Parliament to pronounce on the problem itself at this stage. Tonight is not the time for that debate: it will have to come later.

President. — I call Mr Nyborg to speak on behalf of the European Progressive Democrats.

Mr Nyborg. — *(DK)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen we can all rightly be described as Europe's political gypsies. We are living out of a suitcase, travelling around from place to place, being in fact subject to unreasonable working conditions. When we have plenary sessions they are from 9 in the morning to 7 in the evening with group meetings before, after or in between. Those are not reasonable working conditions either for the Members or for our staff.

Unfortunately, also, the fact is that in this directly elected Parliament we have got to the stage that we cannot have a reasonable democratic debate on various important subjects which come up. We cannot initiate a proper dialogue because there isn't time. Everybody makes the point that we need a single place

of work. I would emphasize the 'single' aspect, so that we can hold committee and group meetings in the morning and plenary sessions in the afternoon. That is the only way we can have really acceptable working conditions for this Parliament.

I understand that today's debate is not to touch upon the question of where this seat is to be, and so I will likewise refrain from discussing this. I will just join with the other speakers who have so strongly urged the Council to come to an agreement as soon as possible. The governments must reach agreement on whether Parliament is entitled to one seat, one place of work.

President. — According to the agenda, we should now interrupt the debate for Question Time. However, because of the importance of the subject we are dealing with in the debate, I feel that we could carry on for another quarter of an hour.

I call Mr Coppieters to speak on behalf of the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members.

Mr Coppieters. — *(NL)* Mr President, I believe that our thanks are due to those Members who took the initiative in tabling this motion for a resolution and thus getting things moving. I must point out, though, that I am, together with Mr Pannella, the co-signatory to an amendment which Mr Nord thought too far-reaching, but which I should like to stick up for. In my opinion, the text is rather too weakly formulated if all it says is that, if no decision is taken, we should take the necessary steps ourselves. I think that the most important element is missing from this text, which is that, if the Council fails to reach a decision, it will be up to this House to choose its place of work and to take the necessary steps to implement this decision.

As you know, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the fact that we have three places where we conduct our business costs us a cool three thousand million Belgian francs, and we could save two thousand million of that a year by having a single seat. In other words, we could save a quarter of Parliament's total administrative expenses. I believe that the logical choice of location is reflected in Mr De Goede's amendment. It is based on a logical and democratic principle. If I may be allowed for a moment to speak as a Fleming, it would undoubtedly be an interesting development for Parliament to put down roots in the bilingual capital of a country where regional development has been taken further than anywhere else in the Community. The city of Brussels would then be well placed to become the heart of a Europe of peoples.

Coppieters

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

Mr Seal. — I accept what you said, Mr President, about this being an important debate, but could I ask that amount of time which we overrun into Question Time be added on to the end? I feel Question Time is also very important and I feel that we should not cut it short time and time again, so I would request that you add any time lost at the beginning on to the end of Question Time.

President. — If the House cannot stick to the agreed speaking times, the President must be free to make minor changes to see the agenda through.

I would ask for your understanding in this matter, especially as the point is to enable the smallest groups to speak in this debate too.

I call Mr De Goede.

Mr De Goede. — (NL) Thank you, Mr President, especially for your latter remarks. I too shall be very brief. Mr President, the seven group chairmen have quite properly tried to achieve a consensus on what is a matter of great importance for this House; unfortunately, what they have managed to achieve is, in my opinion, extremely feeble. This House has very few powers, and can do very little, but one thing it can do is to decide on its own seat, its own place of business. It is, in my opinion, a major shortcoming in the motion for a resolution before us now that it merely calls on the governments of the Member States to reach a decision by 15 June at the latest. But I ask you, Mr President, what will happen in the Council when this matter comes up for discussion? The response is bound to be that Parliament does not know itself what it wants. Parliament has failed even to give any hint of what sort of decision we should be aiming for. Admittedly, as Mr Nord said, today's debate is simply a procedural one. Proper consultation will follow — at least, we are asking that it should — but we have received no assurances on this point. Perhaps Mr Thorn can give us the necessary assurances, but I doubt it. Perhaps there will be consultation between this House's Political Affairs Committee and the Council. In my opinion, no decision can be taken and no conclusion reached by a Political Affairs Committee which comprises only a small minority of the whole House. I believe that the decision must be reached here in this chamber in full view of the press and the people of Europe, rather than behind closed doors. And in view of the situation throughout the world, where governments and parliaments — with one exception: South Africa — have the same place of work, I think the least this House should do is to say that Parliament must have its seat in the same place as the executive. There is a rumour going around that Brussels may be designated Parliament's formal seat, but that Strasbourg would remain

our meeting place. That would imply that the Secretariat-General would be moved from Luxembourg to Brussels and that we would continue to meet here.

Mr President, that would, in my opinion, be a deplorable solution, unworthy of the name 'solution'. The fact is that Parliament's officials would then have to travel twice as far from Brussels to Strasbourg as from Luxembourg to Strasbourg. Nor would it be any great improvement from our point of view, because our committee meetings would continue to take place in Brussels and our plenary sessions in Strasbourg. We have had some straight talking from Messrs Klepsch, Seefeld, Scott-Hopkins and Nord, but what they had to say was not in accordance with the text of the motion for a resolution. That is why I have tried, by way of my amendment, to get an assurance at least that this House — like all parliaments — would be located at the same place as the Community executive. That may mean Brussels; it may be some other place. But we must be prepared to commit ourselves and take a decision today.

President. — I call Mrs Flesch.

Mrs Flesch. — (F) Mr President, as Mr Nord has so rightly said, the motion for a resolution which has been tabled does not deal with the problems as such but rather with procedure, and I feel that this is the right approach at the present time. This is why the two amendments which have been tabled seem to me to go much further than the authors of the resolution intended.

I feel, Mr President, that the time has come to ask not the Council but the governments of the Member States, who have the authority according to the Treaties, to shoulder their own responsibilities and to make a decision in this matter. Personally I feel that the word 'consultation' is preferable to 'conciliation' in the resolution in view of the significance of the idea of conciliation in Community terminology, but I don't think that this will be of any real importance within the general context of the resolution. These, Mr President, are my feelings on the resolution as it now stands.

Allow me quickly to make two rather more general remarks: firstly, the history of the European Communities does not begin in 1980 and the question of places of work for Parliament and the other institutions is not being debated for the first time on 19 November 1980. I do not think we can at one fell swoop change or erase the past, the investments made in the different locations and the decisions taken by our institution itself over the years. I do not think, Mr President that we can at one fell swoop erase or ignore the hundreds of thousands of individual decisions taken by the officials who work so ably and with such dedication for our institution.

Flesch

Secondly, Mr President, the 1965 solution involving three places of work was the result not only of financial considerations but also of the refusal to designate one capital for the European Communities and to reduce to a reasonably acceptable minimum the disadvantages of the work being divided among several centres. Have these circumstances changed? Are we any nearer now than we were in 1965 to a federal solution, to a solution which will really bring Europe together? And I would like to reiterate the fundamental question put by Mr Klepsch just a few minutes ago. I feel, and I would like to end with these words, Mr President, that the real problem is to know how to improve the structure and organization of the Community, how to increase the efficiency of the institutions and how to maintain legitimate rights, while at the same time coping with the demands of the inter-institutional cooperation which is so vital.

(Applause)

President. — The debate is closed.

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

8. Question Time

President. — The next question is the second part of Question Time (Doc. 1-570/80). We begin with the Questions to the Council.

Question No 48 by Mr Seal (H-270/80):

Has the Council discussed or does it intend to discuss, the question of compulsory origin marking for consumer goods, in particular textile and clothing products?

Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Council. — *(F)* A proposal for a Directive on the approximation of the laws of the Member States on the designation of origin of certain textile and clothing products, about which the honourable Member is concerned, has recently been submitted to the Council by the Commission.

The purpose of this proposal, which is designed to allay misgivings expressed as regards consumer protection and the continued smooth running of the Community market, is to ensure that whenever private operators make use of the designation of origin at the final consumption stage of the products, this complies with the same criteria within the Community. The European Parliament was consulted on 16 October 1980 on this proposal, which is one of a series of proposals which were announced last March in a Commission Communication concerning textile problems with a bearing on origin marking and submitted

in the context of research carried out in an endeavour to strengthen the Community's hand in its fight against fraudulent practices in the area of textile product origin. A initial proposal for a Regulation particularly designed to amend and supplement Council Regulation No 616/78 of 20 March 1978 on the proof of origin for certain textile products was forwarded to the Council at the end of July and is now being examined. A third proposal, on economic outward processing, is awaited.

Mr Seal. — Would the Council not agree that one of the main reasons for labels indicating the country of origin is to allow the consumer, when purchasing an article, greater freedom of choice?

The labelling suggested by the Commission with the marking 'Made in the EEC' will not, in fact, do this. Should not therefore the individual name of the Member State be used on the label? And is the Council aware that in some countries outside the EEC not only are misleading labels being used but in some cases false labels bearing the name of a country in which the article did not originate, and could the Council formulate plans to combat this procedure?

Mr Thorn. — *(F)* The Commission intends to introduce a system of labelling for certain textile and clothing products indicating their origin, but only at the retail sale stage and not at the import stage so as to avoid the need for border checks. It intends that the ways in which the origin is indicated should be flexible and does not intend to make the marking compulsory in the Community. Certain Member States may, however, make it compulsory provided they comply with the provisions of the directive and it was in fact on this subject that your Assembly was consulted on 16 October 1980 in connection with the Commission proposal which is based on Article 100. It is, I think, when Parliament comes to discuss this that it should make the points you have just made and draw the attention of the Commission and the Council to your preoccupations so that the Council can, I hope, take account of them.

President. — I call Question No 49 by Mr Hutton (H-329/80):

Does the Council feel that the European Parliament has had a significant influence on decisions of the Council and if so, could it send me a list of these decisions?

I might point out that this Question is not entirely in accordance with the guidelines, which do not permit members to request statistical data in the context of Question Time.

Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Council. — *(F)* I have an answer but no statistics.

Thorn

The Council would first point out that it is for the Commission in the first place to decide whether to accept any proposed amendments adopted by the European Parliament. For its part, and as I said in answer to Question No H-265/80 by Miss Hooper, the Council has adopted procedures aimed at ensuring that greater account is taken of the European Parliament's opinions. For all Opinions, it is the intention that the reports drawn up at every stage in the Council's proceedings should reflect any differences between the approach envisaged and the Opinion of the European Parliament. Over and above the actual wording of the European Parliament's proposed amendments, these procedures would enable the Council, when considering the general substance of its text, to take account of the reasons for which the European Parliament adopted its proposed amendments.

Mr Hutton. — The President-in-Office's answer hardly seems satisfactory as a reason why the Council has not followed more closely the opinions and resolutions of Parliament. Would the President-in-Office not agree that many of the 110 million Europeans who voted in direct elections might not have bothered to do so if they had not wished the views of this Parliament to be taken seriously by the Council?

Mr Thorn. — (*F*) This was a different question, not a supplementary.

I cannot comment on the possible intentions of the European electorate at the time of the election of the European Parliament by direct universal suffrage, but, to return to the basic question, I will say that the Council takes account of the opinions of Parliament, which is not to say that it simply takes them over lock, stock and barrel and changes all its decisions according to what Parliament thinks. It studies Parliament's opinion and takes its decision on its own responsibility.

Personally, both myself and my predecessor have done what we could to improve the procedures. I know that the situation is perhaps still not satisfactory, but — as I am sure you will understand, Mr Hutton — all I can say is that the Council has its wishes, the Parliament has its opinions, the Council consults the opinion of Parliament and takes account of them in its final decision. I think I am perhaps anticipating your wishes in that I have requested that in the future the questions of the nature of Parliament's opinion and the reasons for the view adopted by the Council should be made more clear and more transparent so that it will at least be possible to see why the Council reached a particular decision. However, I do not think every Council decision should be turned into a confrontation, hence causing a permanent battle between the opinions of this Parliament and the decisions of the Council.

Mr Israël. — (*F*) Mr President of the Council, your reply struck me as very satisfactory, particularly as regards the theoretical aspect, and I should like to thank you on behalf of Mr Hutton.

Could you, by way of example, tell us in what way the resolution adopted by this Parliament on 15 October on the Madrid Conference influenced the Council? This would be an excellent illustration of your theoretical analysis.

President. — I must ask the honourable Members to adhere to the guidelines laid down for the conducting of Question Time when putting questions to the President of the Council. This question was too general to permit any individual specific questions to be put on the basis of it. The guidelines require very precise and correct questions, and supplementaries must have a very direct bearing on the original question.

Mr Thorn. — (*F*) Mr Israël's question relates to a matter concerning political cooperation. I am sure this has not escaped the notice of the honourable Members, but I should nevertheless like to remind you of this fact. Having said this, I think I have made matters easier for myself since, when we went to Madrid, as I said to your Political Affairs Committee, we were inspired by the position adopted by the European Parliament. I do not say that everyone had Parliament's opinion in mind right from the outset, but, after the last meeting, I saw to it that everyone was familiar with Parliament's views on this matter and I honoured my commitments when addressing the conference in Madrid on behalf of the Council of the European Communities when I took account of the views of this Parliament.

President. — I have four further speakers down who I will call in turn, after which, Mr President, I should be grateful if you would answer them jointly. This is permitted under the rules of procedure and, in my view, is necessary if we are to be able to deal with other questions too during this Question Time.

Mr Penders. — (*NL*) In view of the fact that the President of the Council is nearly at the end of this term of office, and since the British have come in for so much criticism for showing so little European spirit and in view of the fact that a British Member of Parliament has now finally said something positive about Community relations, I should like to ask the President of the Council whether or not it would be possible to put Parliament in a position where it could judge for itself what influence it has on Council decisions, by telling us the reasons why the Council's attitude differs in important respects from the views of Parliament.

Mr Adam. — I think my question is very similar to one that has already been asked by Mr Penders. Would the President-in-Office or the Council impress on his colleagues the fact that a lot of people hold the view that the Council of Ministers sits down and decides how it can thwart the opinions of this Parliament, and would it be possible for the Council to set down in writing from time to time how it has reacted to the views of Parliament? That, I think, would be extremely helpful to us.

Mr Seeler. — (D) Mr President of the Council, I was very pleased to hear your answer to the original question. However, I should like to ask whether you are aware that certain opinions of the European Parliament concerning draft directives submitted by the Commission have been before the Council for more than ten years — I might mention, for example, those concerning questions of harmonization of taxation — and have as yet not been discussed by the Council. This is a concrete example of the opposite of what you said in your answer.

Mr Curry. — Would the President-in-Office not agree that, following the decision of the European Court in the isoglucose case, the only way this Parliament can effectively prevent the Council from doing something is in fact to deliver no opinion whatsoever upon it, and would he not also agree that if he were to publish the minutes of the Council relating to those matters on which Parliament had delivered an opinion, we should all be in a much better position to know what influence we had had?

Mr Thorn. — (F) Quite frankly, it is difficult to regard all these remarks as questions and to think that the speakers really expect me to give objective answers. They were more criticisms of the way the Council works and I can understand why these criticisms should be made — indeed, I will not even claim they are not justified.

However, do you really want a President-in-Office of the Council — and this is why the phrase 'in Office' is included in his title — to reply to these criticisms, particularly 48 hours before the end of his term of office? It would be too easy for me to say, 'Ah, if I was staying, you know, and if it only depended on me, we'd do this and that.' That would be too easy. Let us not fall into this trap. After all, you have voiced these criticisms here, and I think and hope that my colleagues will take note of them just as much as I do — which of course is why the representative is here. However, I am sure you will realize that, as I said just now, we cannot start pushing more paper around as too much of this already goes on in the Community. What is the point, when an opinion has been issued, of asking the Council to reply in writing to Parliament saying, 'This is why we have taken account of your

opinion or, this is why we have not taken account of it'. You are perfectly familiar with how opinions are arrived at by the nine or ten countries at the level of the officials. You would be waiting for months for the reply to your opinion to appear in the Official Journal whereas you know perfectly well by the following day why the Council has not in some cases acted in accordance with your opinions. All you have to do is the same as the Council and the Commission do, that is to say, read the *Agence Europe* in the morning to find out the reasons why one government or another took a particular decision. If one reads the papers and the press agencies, one can find out what the reasons were. Why put a further burden on this Community by introducing written opinions in which the Council could take refuge in words as I am obliged to do here speaking on behalf of the Nine?

As regards Mr Seeler's question in which he said 'We said such and such a thing, and nothing has happened since', you must realize that if an opinion contains a specific request, this does not mean that the Council is under an obligation to act upon it within a certain time. When I was still a member of this Parliament, we requested certain things in our opinions which have not as yet come about, and which I know will not come about for a while yet. Examples include the harmonization of taxes on which we issued well-founded opinions. However, nothing has as yet been done.

Thus the dialogue between this Parliament and the Council which is to a considerable extent unsatisfactory, is governed by certain procedural rules and I personally would be pleased if not only the President of the Council were to appear before the House but if on each occasion, or at least once or twice each session, he were to be accompanied by representatives of the governments of other Member States, at ministerial level or at least at the level of secretaries of state, so that they too would have to face criticisms, since it is an imperfect system whereby somebody appears before you every six months and tries to negotiate the difficult passage of these six months and who, when the presidency returns to his country, will almost certainly have changed his portfolio with the result that you will have to go to all the trouble of teaching someone else the lessons you have taught him.

President. — Question No 50 will not be called as this subject is included on the agenda for this part-session.

I call Question No 51 by Mr Adam (H-434/80):

Will the Council immediately call for a detailed report on the comparison of the regional policies of the Member States with particular reference to the effect of these policies on

- (a) unemployment
- (b) economic convergence?

Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Council. — (F) In its Resolution on the guidelines for Community regional policy, adopted on 6 February 1979, the Council asserted that

regional policy is an integral part of the economic policies of the Community and the Member States. It forms part of the various elements which contribute to the attainment of a high degree of convergence of the economic policies of the Member States. The establishment of a comprehensive system of analysis and policy formulation for the Community regional policy should make it possible to establish a common basis of assessment. To this end the Commission, working in close collaboration with the Regional Policy Committee, will prepare a periodic report on the situation and socioeconomic developments in the regions of the Community.

The report which the Commission should soon submit will cover the topics raised by the honourable Member. Moreover, in accordance with Article 21 of amended Regulation (EEC) No 724/75 establishing a European Regional Development Fund, the Commission presents a report to the Council, the European Parliament and the Economic and Social Committee before 1 October every year on the operation of this Fund during the preceding year. The report for 1979 was forwarded by the Commission on 8 August 1980. The above communications therefore make possible an overall view of the problems raised.

Mr Adam. — I appreciate that the report was issued in August, but the material is out of date. Certainly in the region that I represent the unemployment situation is steadily worsening, and the unemployment situation in the United Kingdom is worsening at a faster rate than anywhere else in the Community. Will the President-in-Office, in the two remaining days that apparently remain to him in his office (and might I say in parenthesis how much we have appreciated the way he has tried to answer the questions we have addressed to him during his fourth period as President of the Council), impress on his colleagues that this failure to achieve economic convergence in the regions and to deal with the problems of unemployment, although it represents a failure of the national governments, also represents a failure on the part of this Community?

Mr Thorn. — (F) The honourable Member is right in saying that the material contained in a report issued in August is perhaps no longer up to date since it relates to 1979 and the figures have changed substantially since then. However, there is nothing we can do about this as it was the Commission which produced the report. If you want further information which is more up to date, you should consult the Commission which is the source of this information.

As regards your criticism concerning convergence, it is true that we have not obtained the results which both you and I myself would have wished for, but I can tell you in all sincerity that it would be wrong to think that

the Council, the governments represented in the Council and the Heads of State and Government are not aware of this problem. Having been present at all the summits and all the European Council meetings over the last twelve years, I can assure you that this is one of the few problems which has in fact been discussed, particularly in recent years, at all the Council meetings. The fact that it has not proved possible to reach an agreement is a different question. However, this is not the result of negligence on the part of the Heads of State and Government or the ministers, and you will see that this problem will also be included on the agenda for the Council on 1 and 2 December. However, I do not think there would be any point in my making any promises in connection with this meeting.

Miss Quin. — Is the President-in-Office aware that some of us are concerned about the way the Council makes decisions on regional policy, in particular the fact that the Council is often composed of ministers whose primary responsibility back home is not for regional policy at all, but for some area of policy — for example, the Foreign Ministers? Has he any suggestions for improving the way the Council considers regional policy and establishing a real regional council?

Mr Thorn. — (F) I am afraid there may be some slight confusion but I must apologize for not having followed the interpretation very well.

As regards regional policy in the sense in which we understand it and in which everyone should understand it, I must point out that it is not the Council which makes the decisions. As you will see in our directives, the council draws up the basic framework for regional policy, which is a very vague affair. Regional policy proper, i.e. its conception and implementation, are matters for the Commission and is not a matter which the Council has ever discussed or even wished to discuss. I am not trying to shuffle off any responsibility here, I am merely pointing out the facts of the matter. It is up to the Commission, and not the Council, to make proposals regarding the regional measures it thinks should be taken.

Mr Price. — The question seeks an objective assessment of what is being achieved towards economic convergence through national regional policies. Would the President-in-Office agree that there should be a similar continuing review of the regional effects of all the Community's own policies and that this would be helped if each of the Commission's proposals had attached to it a regional impact assessment if it was likely to have any effect upon regional economic convergence?

Mr Thorn. — (*F*) I personally think this is an interesting suggestion, and my own answer would tend to be 'yes'. You must realize, however, that in saying this I am not speaking on behalf of nine governments.

Mr Marshall. — Does the President-in-Office of the Council realize that there are a substantial number of people who doubt the effectiveness of regional policies, and would he accept that there are a large number of people who believe that the Community and the member governments should spend their time encouraging economically successful areas, which are most likely to provide the jobs necessary to defeat unemployment?

Mr Hutton. — Would the President-in-Office agree to bring pressure from his colleagues to bear upon the Commission to submit to this House the opportunity to revise the regulations of the European Regional Development Fund, due to be revised by the end of this year but now postponed indefinitely, so that the first directly-elected Members of this Chamber may have an opportunity to influence the direction of the Fund in the manner indicated by the asker of the question?

Mr Thorn. — (*F*) I go along to a considerable extent with the criticisms made by the two honourable Members. Having said this, I should like to correct the last point made. You said that the revision had been postponed indefinitely, whereas it has in fact only been postponed until next year.

President. — I call Question No 52 by Mr Megahy (H-437/80):

What arrangements are being made by the Member Governments with respect to the tuition costs of Greek students commencing courses in the autumn term of 1980 in the light of the fact that Greece enters the Community on 1 January 1981?

Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Council. — (*F*) The general report by the Education Committee, the content of which received the approval of the Council and the Ministers of Education meeting within the Council on 27 June 1980 — which I think I mentioned last month — was to establish the principle that students from other Member States should be treated on the same footing as students of the host country, stated that, in the case of students from new Member States, application of the principle of treating them in the same way as nationals in respect of tuition costs could be postponed by any Member State until the beginning of the academic year following the accession.

This means that following the accession of Greece, which will take effect as from 1 January 1981, those Member States which deem it necessary may decide

not to apply the principle of non-discrimination as regards tuition costs immediately but only as from the academic year 1981/1982.

Mr Megahy. — Could the President-in-Office inform us which of the nine member countries have, in fact, taken a different line? My understanding of the situation is that only the United Kingdom Government is, in fact, refusing to treat Greek students in the same way as other countries and that it has imposed and is imposing on Greek students for the whole of this academic year a very high rate of charges, which would, in fact, penalize those students and seems quite against the whole spirit of treating new countries entering this Community.

Mr Thorn. — (*F*) I really do not see on what grounds you are making this criticism. It is not for me to comment on the way in which a particular Member State or Government chooses to make use of the options open to them. At any rate, this situation can only possibly persist until the end of the transitional academic year and nine months later the same conditions will have to be applied across the board. I do not see, therefore, what else I could add.

President. — Mr President, the questioner asked which countries had taken a different view. I think this question could well be answered in writing if the President-in-Office is unable to answer it today because he has no specific details at hand.

Mr Thorn. — (*F*) Mr President, I cannot answer now and do not know if there is any need for me to say which country is making use of an option open to it. The honourable Member has, however, himself mentioned one country and I will not contradict him.

Mr Patterson. — Could I press the President-in-Office to divulge the precise terms of the exemption? When I put a similar question to Commissioner Burke on Monday, he told us that a national government could allow Greek students to be charged higher fees than other Community students until next autumn if charging equal fees were to lead to administrative difficulties when Greece joins in January. Now first of all most fees are charged not by the year but by the term, and secondly the United Kingdom Government has sought to justify its action not on grounds of administrative difficulties but of cost. In view of these facts will the President-in-Office of the Council raise this matter at the Council?

Mr Thorn. — (*F*) I hope all the Members of Parliament will understand that, in my capacity as President-in-Office, all I can do is inform you of texts and decisions. I am not here to pass comment on this or

Thorn

that or make predictions. I will now read you the decisions we have reached and which are universally binding.

As regards the financial aspect, the report states that

where tuition fees are charged in a Member State, those payable by students from other Community countries shall be no higher than those payable by nationals of the Member State concerned.

Thus this also applies in the case of Greek students. Then comes the exception:

However, in the case of students from a new Member State, a Member State may, for administrative reasons, postpone implementation of the principle contained in this paragraph until the start of the first academic year after accession.

If then they wish to make the change earlier, they can do so. It is up to them to decide. There is nothing more I can add at this stage.

President. — I call Question No 53 by Mr Seeler (H-442/80):

In a discussion on trade relations between the Community and the Commonwealth countries, the Canadian Ambassador in Brussels stated that the Council had not so far granted the Commission a mandate to negotiate a new agreement on the supply of uranium to the Community, even though the existing agreement expires at the end of 1980. Why has no negotiating mandate yet been granted and will such a mandate be granted in the immediate future?

Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Council. — (F) Paragraph 5 of annex C to the amendment to the Agreement between the European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom) and the Government of Canada for cooperation in peaceful uses of atomic energy stipulates that:

As soon as possible after 31 December 1979 or the termination of the INFCE study, whichever is earlier, the parties will commence negotiations with a view to replacing this arrangement by other arrangements which will take into account *inter alia* any results of the INFCE studies in relation to the operations in question. If no such arrangements have been agreed upon by the end of 1980, the parties may jointly agree to extend the present interim arrangement.

The Council's subordinate bodies are currently examining the draft decision submitted by the Commission on 4 July 1980 and the Council intends to give the Commission in the very near future negotiating directives enabling the Community to fulfil its undertaking.

Mr Seeler. — (D) Will the delay, which there has undoubtedly been, in the granting of the negotiating mandate affect uranium supplies for European undertakings and what does the Council envisage doing if

this gives rise to problems particularly involving power generating undertakings?

Mr Thorn. — (F) As far as I know, this does not pose any problems at present. As you might have guessed from the answer I have just given you, there will be absolutely no problems for the rest of this year. If we do not then reach a satisfactory conclusion, we will have to extend the present arrangement. But from what I have heard, there are no real problems.

President. — I call Question No 54, by Sir Frederick Warner (H-446/80):

In view of the fact that this relatively small matter of principle has been under consideration for a number of years now, can the Council tell Parliament what progress they are making with the Austrian request for a tariff reduction on a quota of concentrated perry-pear juice?

Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Council. — (F) The question of whether concessions should be granted for imports of perry-pear juice originating in Austria has already been raised on a number of occasions within the Council's subordinate bodies. However, as I stated in my reply to Question H-246/79 put by Mr Scott-Hopkins, the Council has not received to date any proposal from the Commission concerning this matter.

Sir Fred Warner. — This really is a lamentable case of Commission and Council batting the responsibility to and fro between each other. The Commission stated here two days ago that, as far as they knew, every one was perfectly satisfied with the present situation, but I know that that is not so. Indeed I have had very strong representations on the subject. I would therefore ask the Commission to make proposals to the Council as quickly as possible. I, for my part, will certainly try to make sure that the Commission's proposals are in line with popular demand.

Mr Thorn. — (F) This is a reversal of roles. It is not for the Council to take the place of the Commission and make proposals, and in saying this it is not my wish to point a finger at the Commission or send the ball back into its court since the fact is that if on this occasion the Commission has not submitted any proposals, I have certain reasons to believe that this was because certain national delegations had already indicated that they were not very inclined to accept these proposals. In saying this, however, I am already going quite a long way.

Lord O'Hagan. — Do I understand that the President-in-Office feels that the Council is wholly unable to take any action and that, as the Commission is not yet in a position in which action can be taken, the

Lord O'Hagan

Community is therefore without any powers whatsoever to prevent the present disastrous or seemingly disastrous situation from getting considerably worse? Do I understand that the President-in-Office is washing his hands of this matter?

Mr Thorn. — (F) I will admit quite frankly that I am no expert on pear juice. However, I might quite simply remind you that the Council cannot impose sanctions and take decisions in the absence of a relevant Commission proposal. All it can do is ask the Commission to submit proposals. However, as I have already explained too clearly, various national delegations do not feel inclined to invite such proposals since, unlike you, they do not think the situation is disastrous.

Mr Seefeld. — (D) Mr President, may I ask whether you are prepared to ask the future President of the Commission whether he is prepared to do what you have just said?

(Laughter)

Mr Thorn. — (F) If I did not I am sure you would remind me to.

(Laughter)

Mr Welsh. — Are we to understand from what the President-in-Office has just said that he considers it legitimate that if the Commission feels that there might conceivably be opposition from one Member State on the Council to one of their proposals, that justifies them not making any sort of proposal at all?

Mr Thorn. — (F) I never said I considered it legitimate. I merely pointed out the fact that the Commission has not submitted any proposal and I will be quite frank with the honourable Member and tell him that I know there is not only one but several delegations within the Council which take a different view of the market situation than that of the honourable Member. I do not think it is a crime to admit this, but it should not be taken as an attempt to justify the absence of proposals.

President. — I call Question No 55, by Mr Antonozzi (H-395/80):

With reference to the current situation in Poland, what measures will the Council take to support Polish workers in their struggle for economic, social and institutional progress, so as to enable them to attain their just objective of securing respect of human rights in the spirit of the joint commitment of Helsinki, and does it expect to conclude agreements to give all possible support to the Polish economy?

Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Council. — (F) As regards the more political aspect of the question put by the honourable Member, the Presidency confirms the reply already given, on behalf of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs Meeting in the Framework of Political Cooperation, to Written Question No 1194/80 put by Mr Percheron. It is neither for the Nine nor any government to intervene in any way in the internal affairs of Poland. This, of course, does not prevent the Nine from continuing to follow events in Poland very closely.

As for the more directly economic aspects of the current situation in Poland and the possibilities for Community action referred to in the second part of the question, I would point out that Community policy with regard to State-trading countries is characterized by openmindedness and willingness to negotiate bilateral trade agreements with each of these countries and that in 1974 it sent to Poland, and to the other State-trading countries as well, an offer to negotiate. This offer, which has so far given rise to no reaction on the part of Poland, is still valid. I can reiterate what I have already had the opportunity of saying during your recent debate on Poland, namely, that the Council will consider, in a constructive frame of mind, any request made by Poland along these lines.

Mr Antonozzi. — (I) I agree that we must not intervene in the internal affairs of other States and I therefore approve of the line we have adopted. However, since I have read in the press that Poland is currently in need of help — which I think it deserves — and it appears that it has addressed specific requests for aid to various international bodies — there has been talk of it asking the United States and various international economic and credit institutions for aid — I should like to know whether, after the offer made in 1974 of which you have just reminded us, any specific requests have been made to which we could reply in some way as a Community, either within the context of international political cooperation or through extra-Community bodies in which we are involved.

I am convinced that even if you only have two more days to go as President of the Council, you, with your experience and the competency and enthusiasm which you have for this matter, will push it forward in specific terms, if this is at all possible, after taking up your post in the Commission.

Mr Thorn. — (F) If I had to give a yes or no answer, my answer would be 'no, Poland has not made any requests to the Community'. However, it is quite possible that a request might be made one day, and although the Community will be predisposed to adopt a favourable attitude to it, it will nevertheless be examined on the basis of its economic and financial merits so that neither I myself nor any of you could predict the outcome and our attitude would be the same even

Thorn

if this problem were to arise in a larger context. However, it has not yet reached this stage.

President. — I call Question No 56, by Mrs Ewing (H-419/80):

In view of the unique nature of land and its inherent value to citizens of all Member States, what view does the Council take of the enormous purchases of land in Scotland by

1. third country companies and individuals whether residents of Scotland or not, and
2. by absentee purchasers from other Member States?

Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Council. — (F) The Council would draw the attention of the honourable Member to the fact that Article 52 EEC on the right of establishment in agriculture provides that restrictions on the freedom of establishment of nationals of a Member State in the territory of another Member State shall be abolished by progressive stages in the course of the transitional period.

In addition, Article 54 EEC provides that the Council and the Commission shall carry out the duties devolving upon them under that Article by enabling a national of one Member State to acquire and use land and buildings situated in the territory of another Member State insofar as this does not conflict with the principles laid down in Article 39 (2). Pursuant to these provisions, the Council has adopted a number of directives, a list of which is available to the honourable Member.

The Council also wishes to draw the attention of the honourable Member to the fact that, quite apart from the adoption and implementation of Directives, the principal of freedom of establishment laid down in Article 52 is directly applicable, in accordance with the judgment of the Court of Justice in Case 2/74 whereby:

Since the end of the transitional period, Article 52 of the Treaty is a directly applicable provision despite the absence, in a particular sphere, of the directives prescribed by Articles 54 (2) and 57 (1) of the Treaty.

Under Article 155 EEC it is for the Commission to ensure that the provisions of the Treaty and the measures taken by the Institutions pursuant thereto are applied. It is not for the Council to express an opinion on the problems arising from the acquisition of land by nationals of third countries.

Mrs Ewing. — Is the President-in-Office not aware that, by failing to distinguish between freedom of establishment and the need to be resident, the Council is failing to give a blanket condemnation of one of the world's land scandals, unique certainly in the EEC, namely absentee landlordism? The giant scale of this

problem is preventing the best use of an area about the size of the Netherlands, so that a few may hunt, shoot and fish in the style of medieval princes. Is he aware that by turning a blind eye to this serious question the Council is merely going to encourage further abuses and further gross speculations not only by EEC nationals but by Swiss banks and billionaires and others until in the vast tracts of my area there may be no Highlanders able to survive? Is this not economic folly in a world short of timber? Is it not immorality in a world short of food?

President. — Mrs Ewing, you have given your assessment of the situation but not asked a question. Would you please put your question?

Mrs Ewing. — I asked whether you are aware that you have failed to distinguish between freedom of establishment and residence, with all the resulting consequences. It was a perfectly clear question; perhaps it was awkward for you to answer!

Mr Thorn. — (F) I am sure the honourable Member realizes that the President-in-Office is not, at this point in time, going to look into all the different interpretations of the Treaty in the various countries and consider the question of whether the Treaty is good or bad. You say this situation is causing you some concern and I can sympathize with you. Nevertheless, it is first and foremost Her Majesty's Government which should be reminded of this question, since I was President of the Council at the time when the negotiations leading to the accession of the United Kingdom, Denmark and Ireland were conducted. I should point out that, at the time, Denmark asked for a derogation to the text relating to the right of establishment and was granted this derogation by the Community. All I can say is that the United Kingdom did not ask for a similar derogation during these negotiations.

As for the Dutch citizens who buy land in Scotland, why do you want me to deprive them of a pleasure which they take in Luxembourg too?

(Laughter)

Mr Seligman. — Is the President-in-Office of the Council prepared as future Commissioner to take on board that this problem also affects southern England where wide acres are being bought up by the Dutch making it impossible for young farmers, because of the inflation of land prices, to get started in that area?

Mr Thorn. — (F) It is my personal belief that we should not try to use the right of establishment as an instrument for solving the structural problems in the agricultural sector. There are various national instruments in existence, and the Community as a whole can

Thorn

also tackle these problems. If I might make a slightly treacherous remark, I might say that even if the right of establishment can give rise to the state of affairs which Mrs Ewing criticizes, I think various possibilities are open to imaginative governments which could enable them to discourage excessive speculative purchases.

Mr Purvis. — Have all countries now completed the transitional phase to right of establishment or are there still some countries with restrictions — perhaps including Denmark and there may be others — as to who can own farmland whether they be companies or non-farmers or non-residents? I ask if any attempt has been made to assess the impact of this capital investment by non-residents and their land or the welfare of those who live and reside around it?

Mr Thorn. — (F) The transitional period has been completed by the six original Member States of the Community. In the case of the more recent members, only Denmark requested this derogation, which still applies.

As regards the second part of the honourable Member's question, I must offer my apologies for not being able to answer it today as the necessary studies have not been made.

President. — I call Question No 57, by Mr Prag (H-447/80):

Does the Council agree that the disabled (both physically and mentally) have suffered greatly from the cuts in public expenditure undertaken of late by Member States, and that, despite the almost total lack of provision in the Community Treaties for help to the disabled, it is high time the Council began work on a European Charter for the Disabled?

Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Council. — (F) It is not for the Council to comment on the level of public expenditure devoted in the Member States to action to help the disabled. The Council would, however, refer to its Resolution of 27 June 1974, which envisages the vocational rehabilitation of handicapped persons.

In addition, I would draw your attention to the fact that part of the European Social Fund's resources go to help finance operations in the Member States for the integration or reintegration of the handicapped in economic activity.

Mr Prag. — Much of the money spent by the Community is in the social field of money-shuffling in which the Community pays back to the Member States money it has received from them for projects which change nothing and add nothing to what the Member

States are doing anyway. Would the Council of Ministers contemplate, if so proposed by the Commission — of which the President-in-Office of the Council will shortly be President — the setting of Community standards or norms to be applicable in due course in all the Member States for assisting the disabled in such fields as housing, transport, access to buildings and education?

Mr Thorn. — (F) I can reply to the honourable Member by referring to a regulation which has just been handed to me. I can only quote the main point and I do not know whether this will satisfy you:

Disabled persons may be granted aid from the Fund under Articles 4 and 5 of our Decision 71/66 EEC. The types of aid include the following: aid intended to eliminate obstacles hindering access to potential jobs; aid intended to help adapt workplaces to the special needs of disabled persons or to help in their vocational training or retraining.

I do not have anything more specific at hand.

Mr Boyes. — Mr President, it is absolute hypocrisy that a question of this kind should be tabled by a Conservative in this Parliament this afternoon. The Tory Government...

Shouts from the European Democratic Group — cries of 'Question'!

President. — Mr Boyes, I must ask you, in accordance with the Rules of Procedure, to put your supplementary to the President-in-Office. This is Question Time, not a debate.

Mr Boyes. — ... I shall listen very carefully throughout the rest of Question Time, and I shall be on my feet at once if people make any statements without immediately asking a question, if that is the way you are going to rule the proceedings.

Does the President-in-Office of the Council agree that Mr Prag would be better employed using his time in trying to convince the leader of his government that she ought to be doing something about the disabled, instead of generating the terrible consequences that might arise and the tragic situation in which the disabled might find themselves if she doesn't do a U-turn, change her policies and start increasing rather than decreasing public expenditure? I might remind Mr Prag that the disabled cannot live by eating charters.

Mr Thorn. — (F) Since I am not able to judge the extent of Mr Prag's powers of persuasion over his government, I cannot answer the question put by the honourable Member.

Ms Clwyd. — Is the President-in-Office aware that the Committee on Social Affairs is at present drawing up a report on the disabled? Presumably the Council is now particularly interested in waiting for the opinion of the Parliament. Will he give that report, which will make a number of sweeping recommendations on behalf of the disabled, detailed consideration? Will he also, when he becomes President of the Commission, make sure that the Commission makes a special effort to take action in the International Year of the Disabled and not simply make pious statements, but act on the opinion of the Parliament?

Mr Thorn. — (F) I can assure you that the Council — and, I am certain, the Commission — will take account of the opinions of this Parliament and take due note of all the suggestions made by a Parliamentary committee on this matter. The honourable Member will, however, understand that it is far too early to say what results this may have.

Mr Moreland. — Does the President-in-Office of the Council not agree with me that in 1981, the Year of the Disabled, the Community should take a number of initiatives in this field and that there should be an expanded Social Fund to deal with problems in this field? Will he in his present and future capacities make proposals to the Council and the Commission in order to ensure that 1981 is stamped as the Year of the Disabled in the Community?

Mr Thorn. — (F) The answer is 'yes'. I would also draw your attention to the existence of the Social Fund, which does in fact take initiatives, but I should like, in a personal capacity, to ask why people are always asking this of the Community?

Everyone here knows the problems we will have to contend with in the context of a budgetary debate. With the almost insurmountable difficulties facing us, are we always going to turn to the Community when we want something? Why not to the Member States, so that we will be able to use all the money available for the implementation of Community policies in regions where both you and we want them and where they should receive priority.

(Applause)

President. — I call Question No 58 (H-459/80) by Mr de la Malène:

In view of the recent change in the method of calculating the value of special drawing rights, what is the Council's reaction to the fact that the new weighting reveals significant differences, in particular an increase in the weight given to the dollar?

Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Council. — (F) The decision referred to by the honourable Member is a matter for the statutory organs of the International Monetary Fund. The Council, for its part, has no comment on the decision.

Mr de la Malène. — (F) May I, therefore, take it that the Council finds it perfectly reasonable that, in the current situation as regards international trade and the role of the various currencies, the dollar should be strengthened and that it finds this change a desirable one which reflects the reality of international trade?

Mr Thorn. — (F) Mr de la Malène, you are frankly being a little hasty in your conclusions and you know much better than a lot of people how the Council takes its decisions. Thus, I think, as you might have guessed, that these conclusions would not be shared by all the Member Governments.

As regards the dollar, you will of course realize that the importance of its role does not depend solely on decisions taken by the Council of the European Communities. I might mention that the dollar, which was previously given the weight of 33 %, currently has a weight of around 42 %. The Community currencies in the old special drawing rights basket had a total weighting of approximately 41 %. The three Community currencies still in the basket, i.e. the German Mark, the French Franc and the Pound have a total weighting of about 45 %, thus still higher than that of the dollar because the weighting for these currencies have also been increased by 4 %.

Mr Cousté. — (F) Since we are talking about the three currencies which have remained in the basket and their weighting of 45 %, can you tell us what their relative weight will be following the decisions of the International Monetary Fund since if the weight of these three Community currencies has in fact been increased, the question arises as to the relative weight of these three currencies individually and this is the point of Mr de la Malène's question? It is not only the weight of the dollar, but the weight of the other European currencies about which I am sure this Assembly is concerned.

Mr Thorn. — (F) All I can do at present is answer regarding the total weight of the three European currencies and I have already done so in my reply to Mr de la Malène's question. Whereas the dollar has increased from 33 % to 41 %, the three Community currencies have at the same time increased to 45 %. I cannot, however, tell you in what relation they stand to each other.

Mr Cousté. — (F) Then I will submit a written question on this subject.

Mr Thorn. — (*F*) It would in fact be easier to answer you in this way.

President. — We proceed with the questions to the Foreign Ministers meeting in Political Cooperation.

I call Question No 78 by Mr Lomas (H-376/80):

Given the Indonesian Government's genocidal policies against the people of East Timor, 150 000 of whom have died as a result of Indonesia's attempted annexation of the territory, what is the view of the Council on the increase in arms sales by Member States to the Indonesian Military since the 1975 invasion of East Timor?

Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — (*F*) This problem has not been discussed within the context of political cooperation. I therefore hope the honourable Member will understand that I am not in a position to give a reply on behalf of the Nine.

Mr Lomas. — In that case, could I press the Foreign Ministers to discuss this question, because there are tens of thousands of people being murdered by the Indonesian Government with arms which are being supplied by the Member States of this Community? So, whilst obviously fully accepting the reply given, may I press him to see that this is raised as a matter of some urgency, in order that weapons supplied by us are not used to butcher the people of East Timor, as they are being now?

Mr Thorn. — (*F*) I will naturally pass on the request of the honourable Member, but I cannot say, if only for personal reasons, that I shall press the Council to adopt a decision on this matter, since I will not be in a position to do so anyway. However, I would also like, in a personal capacity, to remind the honourable Member that if we were to adopt the attitude he proposes in this specific case, there would be a whole list of areas in which it could apply.

Mr Marshall. — I would like to ask the President-in-Office whether, before the Community indulges in an orgy of masochistic self-criticism, he would confirm that this Community gives much more economic assistance than military and that it is in fact the Soviet Union which specializes in giving away arms rather than economic aid to the Third World.

Mr Thorn. — (*F*) All I can do is confirm what I have already said several times and assure the honourable Member that I go along with him entirely.

President. — I call Question No 79 (H-463/80) by Mr Spicer, for whom Mr Seligman is deputizing:

In the light of the conflict between Iraq and Iran, what steps are the Foreign Ministers taking to ensure the physical security of vessels transporting oil from the Gulf supplying States to fuel social and economic life in the Community?

Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — (*F*) In their statement of 23 September 1980 in New York, the Foreign Ministers of the Nine Member States of the European Community expressed their concern regarding the military confrontation between Iraq and Iran which, incidentally, I mentioned earlier this morning. On the same occasion, they stressed the crucial importance for the international community as a whole of the freedom of navigation in the Gulf which must at all costs be protected.

However, the question of practical measures aimed at ensuring the security of vessels in the Gulf has not been discussed within the context of political cooperation. As I have already pointed out in my meeting with the Political Affairs Committee, the Presidency is not, therefore, in a position to reply to the honourable Member on behalf of the Nine.

Mr Seligman. — I wonder whether, in order to avoid the danger of the Straits of Hormuz being closed and also the dangers to which these lengthy supply-lines round South Africa are exposed, the President-in-Office would consider the possibility of promoting the idea of establishing a pipeline from Saudi Arabia and the Persian Gulf through Sinai to the Mediterranean? This would avoid two problems and would greatly increase the security of supplies to the West.

Mr Thorn. — (*F*) I realize that this problem has been brought up in certain quarters. It is a question of investment, among other things. I hope the honourable Member will realize that I cannot reply on behalf of the Nine today.

Mrs Hammerich. — (*DK*) Mr President, on 21 May last year we were discussing a question which was an exact counterpart to this one. On that occasion, the then President-in-Office, Mr Zamberletti, stated quite clearly that all questions of military and security policy were outside the scope of Community activity. I should like to ask Mr Thorn whether he shares the view expressed by Mr Zamberletti on that occasion.

Mr Thorn. — (*F*) The Treaties are the Treaties and do not contain references to matters of defence, military problems or security problems.

This very morning we had a debate on the Security and Cooperation Conference in Madrid, during which I pointed out on behalf of the Nine that they had supported the French proposal for a disarmament

Thorn

conference, which demonstrates — and I am mentioning this simply as an example — that in certain ways, not to say through certain channels, we do sometimes come to touch on questions of security within the context of political cooperation, but this is only when they form part of a whole, and we do not deal with military or security problems as such.

President. — I call Question No 80 by Mrs Lizin (H-472/80):

What stage has been reached in consultations among the Nine on the attitude to be adopted to the representative of the Cambodian Regime, and is it true that an attitude favourable to allowing the representative of Pol Pot to sit as the representative of Cambodia is emerging?

Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — (F) On 13 October 1980, the United Nations General Assembly approved, without vote, the report on the committee on the verification of credentials.

Previously, an amendment contesting the credentials of the delegation of Democratic Kampuchea had been rejected by the General Assembly. In the vote on this amendment, the Nine did not adopt a common position. At the debate on the situation in Cambodia on 15 October 1980, the Nine stated their deep concern at the continuing serious situation in that country. They drew the attention of the Assembly to the sufferings of the Khmer people who, after being subjected to the atrocities of the Pol Pot regime, has been deprived of its independence as a result of the Vietnamese invasion of its territory. This is my answer on behalf of the Nine.

Mrs Lizin. — (F) In view of what he said this morning in his statement on political cooperation and the condemnation, which he has repeated just now, of the Pol Pot regime and the support it might receive, which would be similar to supporting Hitler in 1936, does the President-in-Office of the Council think that it would be possible to recommend the eight of the Member States which have supported this regime, to adopt from now on a different position in the international bodies where this question arises?

Mr Thorn. — (F) This is a far more complex question, but I should like first of all to point out that this is not a question of supporting the Pol Pot regime. There has never been any question of this and I should like to refer you to what I said this morning about my feelings and the feelings of the Nine regarding the Pol Pot regime. However, this is a question of a basic approach to the representativity of certain governments and the changes which could be made in these regimes. To put it another way, if we are condemning the current regime, this does not mean that we are supporting the Pol Pot regime and, if we were to

change our minds on this point, this would be tantamount to changing our basic philosophy and I should like to add, in addition, that we are not the only ones in this situation. Many of our friends such as the ASEAN countries, among others, have consulted us on this matter and there is a certain amount of solidarity. I should like to leave it at that for the time being.

President. — In accordance with the Rules of Procedure, the questions by Mr Cousté on the Turkish regime, Mrs Ewing on the Madrid Conference and Mr Israël on concerted Community action on the Middle East cannot be put as they have already been discussed in the debate this morning.

I call, therefore, the remaining Question, No 82 by Mr Boyes (H-512/80):

Would the President-in-Office inform Parliament about what has been achieved by discussions with the Chairman (or his representative) of the non-aligned countries?

Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — (F) I regret to have to reply that I have not, either in my capacity as President-in-Office of the Nine, or in a national or even private capacity, had talks with the Chairman of the non-aligned countries, or his representative. Thus I cannot say anything more on this subject today.

Mr Boyes. — I would like to ask the President — I regret that he has not had a meeting with the non-aligned countries in view of the important role they play in the world today and although I understand obviously that his term of office is ending pretty soon to take on a more challenging and important position — if he would advise his successor that it is a meeting that ought to take place at an early date in the new President's period of office and to raise an important question, namely the American blockade against Cuba. We had a statement here from one of our rapporteurs yesterday that in the steel crisis in the Community we were unable to sell some steel to America because there was a small amount of Cuban nickel in it. That, to my mind, is a ridiculous situation when you think of the number of unemployed people in the Community. So I would hope the President can give me a positive answer to my question.

Mr Thorn. — (F) This supplementary contains several questions and I do not wish, nor am I able, to comment on the last one, i.e. the American blockade against products from Cuba. Political cooperation is not the correct context in which to comment on this point, as it would necessitate a far more lengthy discussion.

This leaves us with the fundamental question of who has contacts with the Chairman of the non-aligned

Thorn

countries. Firstly, I should like to say that, in my view, the Community should undoubtedly maintain contacts with the non-aligned countries and I can assure you, for the rest, that we have always done so. As regards specific contacts with their Chairman and, in particular, their present Chairman, this is another question, especially since the structure of that organization is not, as you know, the same as that of this one. It is possible to have contacts with the organization of the non-aligned countries without, as it were, making too much of the current Chairman or maintaining permanent contacts with him. This is not always very logical, however, since within the non-aligned countries, as we all know, there is more than a tendency in this direction. However, to give a political answer to a political question, I do not see why this should not be a possibility.

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

Mr Cousté. — (*F*) Mr President, you are not in my view applying the Rules of Procedure since the question of the developments of the Turkish regime and the respect for human rights have not been discussed at any point. I have been present all the time yesterday and today and this point has not been touched upon. I therefore strongly urge the President to invite the President of the Council to reply on behalf of the Foreign Ministers meeting in political and — I mean political — cooperation.

President. — I listened very carefully to what the President of the Council had to say in his report. Both he and the groups spokesmen went into these questions during the debate. I must therefore assume that you were not present at the debate here today.

I call Mr Israël on a point of order.

Mr Israël. — (*F*) Mr President, I naturally respect your decision, but I should nevertheless like to point out with all due respect that my question relates to a very specific matter concerning the action of the European Community at UNESCO's General Assembly and I am not aware of this matter having been discussed under any heading whatsoever during today's debate. Above all, Mr President, I would not wish you to give the impression of taking a dilatory attitude regarding the basis of the debate.

President. — Mr Israël, I must admit that, unlike Mr Cousté's question which is of a general nature, your question relates to a specific point. I call therefore Question No 84 by Mr Israël (H-530/80):

At Unesco's General Assembly in Belgrade the Nine Community countries were unable to present a united front when it came to voting on a resolution concerning the education and cultural establishments in the occupied

Arab lands (21 C/PRG/V/DR8 of 14 October 1980). Eight voted against the resolution and one abstained.

Can the President of the Council of Ministers explain this state of affairs and indicate what is the point of various declarations of intent such as that made at Venice and of the President of the Council's personal mission to the Middle East at that time when the need for concerted Community action is not respected?

Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — (*F*) It is true that the Nine adopt a common position in the vote on the resolution referred to by the honourable Member. The Presidency is unable to give an explanation on behalf of the Nine. There is no need to remind the honourable Member that the action of the Nine in the Middle East is based on the Venice declaration. We have discussed this sufficiently, as I pointed out on 23 September last at the United Nations General Assembly. The Nine are confident that the sincerity of their intentions and their determination to make a genuine contribution towards solving the conflict will be recognized and appreciated by all concerned.

Mr Israël. — (*F*) I was present at the UNESCO General Assembly at the time when the Nine of the Community countries failed to vote as a body. Do you not feel that if we are unable to take a united stand on questions as vital as the occupation of Arab territory by Israel, we must draw certain conclusions and exercise a little more restraint in our attitudes concerning the Middle East? Do you not think that I may have a point in drawing your attention to the danger and the risk which has appeared?

Mr Thorn. — (*F*) I go along with the honourable Member in regretting that things turned out the way they did. However, I am sure he will excuse me if I do not draw the same conclusion. In my view, given the situation as it stands, what we must do is attempt to counteract it and see to it that nothing similar happens in the future.

President. — Before closing Question Time, may I Mr President of the Council, thank you on this occasion of your last appearance before this Parliament in your present office, you have for so many years been so committed to the European cause that Parliament can only wish that all Presidents of the Council could show the same sense of fairness in their dealings with this Parliament as you have shown in your answers. I think Parliament can count itself lucky to have such a committed European, who is now familiar with all the

President

views of this Parliament, as the next President of the Commission. I should like on behalf of this Parliament to wish you every success in this work. Thank you.

(Applause)

Question Time is closed.¹

9. Urgent procedure

President. — I have received four motions for resolutions with request for urgent debate pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure:

- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-602/80) by Mrs Lizin and others on the treatment by the Soviet authorities of a number of women activists seeking to abolish discrimination between men and women in the Soviet Union,
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-604/80) by Mr Welsh and others on the renegotiation of the Multifibre Arrangement;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-607/80) by five groups, Mr Carossino and Mr Capanna on the referendum in Uruguay;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-609/80) by Mr de Clercq and others on the sale of butter to the Soviet Union.

The reasons supporting these requests for urgent debate are contained in the documents themselves.

Parliament will be consulted on these requests for urgency at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

10. Agenda for next sitting

President. — The next sitting will take place at 9 a.m., 3 p.m. and 9 p.m. tomorrow, Thursday, 20 November 1980, with the following agenda:

- decision on requests for an early vote on a number of motions for resolutions
- decision on urgent procedure for a number of motions for resolutions
- Notenboom report on the first supplementary and amending budgets for 1980 (debate and vote)
- joint debate on the Wawrzik report and the Sablé report on the ACP-EEC Convention
- joint debate on a Kirk report, a Clinton report, a Cresson report and an oral question to the Commission on fisheries policy
- Quin report on imports of New Zealand butter
- Colleselli report on the system of agricultural surveys in Italy
- Rabbethge report on food aid
- Ghergo report on the application of social security schemes to employees
- van der Gun report on aid from the European Social Fund to workers in the shipbuilding industry
- Pearce report on generalized tariff preferences

3 p.m.: Votes

The sitting is closed.

(The sitting was closed at 7.15 p.m.)

¹ See Annex

ANNEX

Questions which could not be answered during Question Time, with written answers

1. *Questions to the Commission*

Question No 3, by Mr Maher (H-427/80)

Subject: Bank interest rates

With bank interest rates wavering between 7 % in some Member States and almost 18 % in others, the operation of truly common prices under the CAP is impossible; does the Commission have any proposals to make to ensure that this serious distortion is removed?

Answer

The issue raised by Mr Maher is one aspect of the much broader problem of differences between the general economies of Member States. It is not only interest rates which differ widely but also, for example, inflation, rates of taxation and social benefits. The economic, social and fiscal policies pursued in Member States also differ. One cannot therefore just take out one element of the overall economic picture. There are other factors that have to be taken into account for a full appreciation. The problems raised by these differences can only be mastered by closer coordination of economic monetary, social and fiscal policies in the Community.

*

* *

Question No 5, by Mr Come (H-438/80): deferred

*

* *

Question No 9, by Mr van Aerssen (H-353/80)

Subject: Sixth International Tin Agreement.

What position is the European Community adopting on the main issues of the Sixth International Tin Agreement negotiations, such as stabilization of tin prices, financing of buffer stocks, an export control clause, increasing tin production by granting royalties to producers, levying a tax on exports and so on?

Answer

At the first session of the United Nations conference on the negotiation of the Sixth International Tin Agreement held in May of this year, the Community explained what it felt should be the three main elements in the Sixth Agreement.

- Firstly, the setting-up of normal buffer stock of 35 000 tonnes, financed by direct contributions from the participants.
- Secondly, the setting-up of an additional buffer stock, financed by credits on the basis of storage collateral certificates and government guarantees, where necessary. This additional stock would be utilized at the discretion of the Tin Council whenever the normal buffer stock was nearing depletion. The Community's proposal was that the additional buffer stock should comprise something like two-thirds of the normal buffer stock. The Community has declared its readiness to enter into discussions on limiting the participants' financial obligations with regard to the supplementary buffer stock.

- Thirdly, introduction of export controls at the discretion of the Tin Council, whenever the Council judges the resources in the buffer stock to be inadequate to maintain the minimum price.

The Community has declared its readiness to discuss the conditions for the introduction of these export controls at a later date; in its opinion, any such measures should be lifted automatically and rapidly.

In the Commission's view, there is no evidence that export levies would help to stabilize prices, as the agreements are aiming for. This is a very tricky matter, as discussion of this question could be interpreted as interference in the sovereign decisions of third countries.

Mr van Aerssen will recall that it was the Community's attitude to these three main elements of the agreement which really prompted the negotiations on the Sixth Agreement, and it was these three points which were discussed in the course of the many consultations held by the parties to the negotiations during the last few months. The negotiations themselves are scheduled for resumption next month, and the Community awaits the official reactions from the other parties to its proposals.

*

* *

Question No 11, by Mr de la Malène (H-458/80)

Subject: State assistance to nationalized industries

What policies are currently being pursued by the Commission regarding State assistance to nationalized industries?

Answer

The Commission is currently following very attentively developments in the Community's car industry (an assessment of which has been forwarded to Parliament) and the general economic situation regarding trade in goods between the Community and Japan (on which the Commission has presented a memorandum to the Council).

The question of imports of Japanese cars must be viewed against this background.

Of course, the question raised by Mr de la Malène regarding the possible effects of a limit on Japanese car exports to the United States has not escaped the Commission's attention.

Mr Haferkamp and Mr Davignon expressed their concern on this matter to the Japanese Government on the occasion of the visits of Mr Amaya and Mr Okita last October.

The Commission is following carefully the development of discussions on this matter between Japan and the United States, and this issue was of course also dealt with at the high-level discussions on 17 and 18 November 1980.

*

* *

Question No 15, by Mr Megahy (H-473/80)

Subject: State assistance to nationalized industries

What policies are currently being pursued by the Commission regarding State assistance to nationalized industries?

Answer

The Commission is currently examining the aid granted to public undertakings like that granted to other undertakings on the basis of Articles 92 and 93 of the EEC Treaty. However, in order to provide the necessary guarantees regarding transparency in relations between the Member States and nationalized industries — this being an essential precondition for the effective application of the arti-

cles I just referred to — the Commission adopted a directive on this matter in June 1980. This initiative, supported by your Assembly, will enable the Commission to exercise its discretionary powers in a non-discriminatory spirit — and of course bearing in mind the particular tasks referred to in Article 90 (2) — regarding aid to nationalized and private undertakings. The Commission is determined to act in this spirit, mindful of the fact that these two types of undertakings coexist and are in direct competition with each other in various sectors in the Community.

*

* *

Question No 16, by Mr Cecovini (H-475/80)

Subject: Energy economies in shipping

Having regard to the increasingly grave energy crisis caused by continuous increases in the price of petroleum and its derivatives and the difficulty of procuring supplies, and having regard to the crisis in shipbuilding, will the Commission recommend that the Member States adopt a policy aimed at replacing turbine with diesel engines in merchant ships, thereby achieving the following: lower fuel consumption in absolute terms; a reduction in operating speeds, with a consequent higher demand for shipping which will also relieve the strain on the world shipbuilding industry by increasing orders; job opportunities in the ship conversion and repair industries; a general increase in employment levels in the shipbuilding and marine engineering industries?

Answer

The Commission knows that replacement of steam turbines by diesel motors, which mainly concerns some big tankers and big container ships, is among the effective methods of saving energy consumption.

But this, even if its importance has increased, is not the only determinant for shipowners in decisions to convert ships' propulsion systems. Such decisions reflect a whole range of criteria of an economic, technical and commercial nature, without forgetting financial considerations given the size of the investment. Moreover conversion to diesel is not the only method that allows marked energy saving to be achieved. In this regard speed reduction, already widely practised, should also be mentioned.

Taking account of these considerations and noting that shipowners are usually keen to save energy, the Commission does not think it timely to recommend a systematic policy of conversion from steam turbine to diesel. The effect of such a measure on employment in the sector concerned should not be overestimated when account is taken not only of the competitive situation in the market in this sector, but also the relatively limited number of ships to be converted.

*

* *

Question No 23, by Mr Cousté (H-485/80): deferred

*

* *

Question No 25, by Mr Lynge (H-487/80)

Subject: Dutch ban on sealskin imports

In view of the fact that not all species of seal are threatened with extinction, what grounds did the Commission have for accepting the total ban imposed by the Netherlands on 4 September 1980 on the import of sealskin products in any form?

Answer

The purpose of the regulation referred to by the honourable Member is to implement Article 3 of the law on threatened exotic animal species. The purpose of the law is to protect such species. According to the law, an animal species is considered threatened when its natural environment is gradually disappearing or when trade in or consumption of the species is a risk to its existence. The Commission was informed of the new regulation by the Dutch Government.

The regulation must be assessed in the light of the criteria laid down in Article 36 of the EEC Treaty. This article provides for certain exceptions to the provisions concerning the free movement of goods to the extent that these exceptions are particularly justified on grounds of public morality and the protection of the life of animals.

The Commission feels that on overall view of the matter is essential. On the basis of an overall consideration of current provisions in the Member States, it will be in a position to comment on compliance with the Treaty.

*

* *

Question No 26, by Mr Welsh (H-488/80)

Subject: A Community system for vehicle type approval

Could the Commission explain what impediments exist to the establishment of a Community-wide system of type approval for heavy goods vehicles and indicate what progress has been made to harmonize standards and ensure that these vehicles can be freely sold throughout the Common Market?

Answer

1. It must be remembered in the first place that many directives on the approximation of Member States' legislation on type approval of motor vehicles apply to goods vehicles (international category N).

The following directives may be mentioned:

- lighting and light-signalling devices;
- air pollution;
- braking devices;
- steering mechanism;
- permissible noise level;
- tachograph.

2. As for the road vehicles mentioned by the honourable Member, the main barrier to a Community-wide system of type approval is the problem of weight and measurement.

The Commission has submitted a number of proposals in recent years in connection with this. The most recent proposal (1979) is currently being discussed by the European Parliament's Committee on Transport.

The Commission hopes that the Council will be in a position to make a decision in 1981.

*

* *

Questions No 27, by Mr Deleau (H-490/80), and No 28, by Mr Ansquer (H-492/80): deferred

*

* *

Question No 29 by Mrs Squarcialupi (H-495/80)

Subject: Compliance with international standards on working conditions.

Can the Commission indicate what action has been taken on the proposal, contained in the memorandum of 16 February 1978 on the renewal of the Convention of Lomé, for the granting of Community concessions, particularly in the commercial sector, to all the developing countries, including those covered by the Convention of Lomé, to be made subject to compliance with certain basic international standards on working conditions?

Answer

1. On 8 November 1978, the Commission presented the Council with a communication on 'development cooperation and compliance with international standards on working conditions', on which the Parliament expressed a favourable opinion.
2. At the end of 1979, this communication was discussed by the Council's Working Party on Development Cooperation and, in a more restricted framework (the new system of general preferences), by the Committee of Permanent Representatives.
3. However, study of the Commission document has got no further than the Council's Working Party on Development Cooperation, and the Council itself has, generally speaking, taken no account of the Commission's communication. This matter was not raised in connection with the negotiations on the renewal of the Convention of Lomé.
4. Nor does the communication appear to figure on the agenda for the forthcoming meeting of the Council of Development Cooperation Ministers on 18 November 1980, as discussions within the Working Party on Development Cooperation have not produced clear results, while the discussions held by the Committee of Permanent Representatives resulted in the Commission's proposal to consider compliance with international standards on working conditions in terms of the system of general tariff preferences being unanimously rejected.
5. Despite these difficulties and delays, the Commission will persevere in its attempt to ensure that certain minimum standards with regard to what are seen as basic working conditions are complied with. In accordance with the opinion of the Economic and Social Committee, the Commission feels that this matter should be discussed further by the International Labour Organization.

*

* *

Questions No 30, by Mrs Vayssade (H-501/80), and No 31, by Mr Turcat (H-505/80): deferred

*

* *

Question No 32, by Mr Fanton (H-506/80)

Subject: Greek exchange market

Is the Commission helping at present to set up a foreign exchange market in Athens and can it say on which of the Community's foreign exchange markets the drachma is expected to be subject to an official quotation when Greece enters the Community on 1 January 1981?

Answer

The Commission is not involved in the setting-up of a foreign exchange market in Athens. This is a matter for the Greek authorities, who have undertaken to make a foreign exchange market operational by 1 January 1981, when Greece will become a Member State of the Community. The legislation relating to the establishment of a foreign exchange market in Athens has been adopted by the Greek authorities, and the Commission has been told that the market will be opening in the very near future.

In the course of negotiations on Greek membership, it was agreed that the Greek drachma would be quoted on at least one of the Community's foreign exchange markets. No precise details are available yet as to which market will be selected, nor the date from which the drachma will be quoted. The Greek authorities have made it known that they would like to gain experience on the Athens market before their currency is quoted on a foreign market.

*

* *

Question No 33, by Miss Quin (H-509/80)

Subject: Japanese competition in the European machine-tool industry

Has the Commission made a study of how the machine-tool industry in the various countries of the EEC has been affected by Japanese competition and does it plan any initiatives on a European basis to withstand this competition?

Answer

1. The Community's machine-tool industry is currently ranked number one in the world, with a 34 % share of world production in 1979.
2. Japan's market share has gone up from 7.8 % in 1975 to 11.9 % in 1979. In particular, the Japanese machine-tool industry has built up a very strong position in advanced machinery and equipment. The Japanese producers appear to have made good use here of their lead in the field of electronic technology, which has enabled them to build up a technically remarkable position as regards numerically-controlled machines and robots. This growth strategy is based in part on cooperation agreements with European companies (e.g. the manufacturing licence agreement between Renault-Somva, the second largest French manufacturer, and Toyoda).
3. The Commission is keeping abreast of developments in the machine-tool industry, which is of strategic importance as regards both the scale of production and the share of external trade.

The Commission would like to emphasize that, if the European machine-tool industry wants to maintain its present market position, it will have to develop its production of advanced electronic components, which will in the future be a major competitive factor on the machine-tool market. For this reason, the Commission places great value on the initiative it has taken in the field of telematics, and hopes Parliament will give it its effective support.

*

* *

Question No 34, by Mrs Desmond (H-510/80)

Subject: Existing aid for redundant steelworkers

Can the Commission outline what sources of aid are available at present for redundant workers in the steel industry, pending the agreement of the measures currently under discussion?

Answer

On the basis of Article 56 (2b) of the ECSC Treaty, the Commission has entered into bilateral agreements with the governments of the Member States, by dint of which certain payments made to redun-

dant workers (or workers threatened with redundancy) from the steel industry and the other ECSC industries can be financed in part from Community funds.

These types of additional aid, which are granted on the basis of proposals made by the governments, take account of the personal situation of the persons concerned.

The types of aid to be made available are decided on by each of the Member States following consultations at national level with workers and employees; they therefore reflect, in principle, the wishes and feelings of all concerned.

Consideration is currently being given to the rules in force in each of the countries concerned for the various types of social aid.

Generally speaking, the following types of aid are given: reduced pay, travelling, removal and installation expenses and reimbursement of the costs of retraining. It is possible to use the reduced-pay provisions for older workers to bring about an improvement in existing pension rights.

The bilateral agreements also stipulate that the Commission should share, up to a maximum of 50 %, in the costs incurred by governments in this respect.

For these types of aid for workers from the coal and steel industries, the Commission has made 67 million units of account available in 1980, the lion's share being earmarked for the steel industry.

The applications submitted so far for 1980 amount to some 82 million units of account, which means that some of the money will not be available until 1981. The 1981 budget provides for 75 million units of account for these social measures.

As the House will know, the Commission proposal (supported by Parliament) for additional funds to be made available from the Community budget for the ECSC budget to finance special applications regarding workers in the steel industry, submitted to the Commission by a number of Member States, is currently awaiting the Council's attention.

*

* *

Question No 35, by Mr Boyes (H-511/80)

Subject: Integrated operations

In view of the answer to my oral question in October (H-461/80)¹ in which the Commission states that it is working on a project at Naples, is considering a project in Belfast and has neither the resources nor the staff to consider any further areas for the project, would the Commission inform Parliament how and when it expects to determine whether or not the experiment has failed or succeeded?

Answer

1. The Commission believes that the Naples and Belfast operations have been successful experiments insofar as they have enabled the investment earmarked for those areas to be coordinated and speeded up, and have resulted in better utilization and more effective concentration of the available funds from national and Community sources.

2. The time limit for these operations is of the order of five years, and so it is impossible for the Commission to draw a complete and definitive conclusion as regards these operations until the end of that period.

Nonetheless, the Commission will of course draw provisional conclusions some time before the final phase, in an attempt to ascertain the effects of these operations on the economic and social situations in the areas concerned.

As regards Naples, for instance (the only operation which has been underway for some time), the Commission already feels able to say that positive results have been achieved.

¹ Debates, Report of proceedings, 13 October 1980, p. 46.

For Belfast, on the other hand, it is still premature to make any predictions in view of the fact that the operation has not yet reached a truly operational stage.

*

* *

Question No 36, by Mr Marshall (H-513/80)

Subject: UK exports to the Members of the EEC

Can the Commission make available figures indicating by how much UK exports to other Community countries have grown since 1973; what percentage of UK exports now go to other EEC countries; how the rate of growth of UK exports to other EEC countries compares with the growth of UK exports in general.

Answer

Between 1973 and 1979, UK exports to the other Member States of the Community increased at an annual average rate of 23 %, which is substantially higher than the average annual rate of 18 % by which all UK exports increased over the same period.

As a result of this faster rate of increase, UK intra-Community exports as a proportion of all UK exports have increased from some 32 % in 1973 to almost 42 % in 1979.

This trend has been maintained in 1980; over the first six months of this year, UK intra-Community exports as a proportion of all UK exports amounted to 42.7 %, compared with 41.3 % in the corresponding period in 1979.

*

* *

Question No 37, by Mr McCartin (H-515/80)

Subject: Grant-aiding uranium prospecting in Donegal, Ireland

Is the Commission aware that they are grant-aiding uranium prospecting in Donegal, Ireland, and in view of this fact can it give assurances that this venture is not potentially dangerous to workers engaged in the venture, potentially dangerous to the environment, potentially dangerous to the community living in the area of prospecting? Has the Commission any mechanism whereby there is an ongoing system of monitoring the effects of prospecting?

Answer

In accordance with Article 70 of the Euratom Treaty the Commission is supporting uranium prospecting projects carried out in Donegal by two companies. The Commission has also given a small amount of financial aid to the Geological Survey of Ireland, which is also carrying out studies in the area. The purpose of the prospecting projects is to assess the amount of uranium in the area. The work is designed to provide more accurate details about the geological information which is already available, and this is obtained mainly by detailed mapping of the area by geologists and geophysicists and by the collection of samples of water, soil and rock for analysis. Shallow drilling may be needed to obtain new rock samples. The work should have no adverse effects in the area or on those involved. The Commission regularly monitors the progress of all prospecting projects in receipt of financial aid under Article 70.

*

* *

Question No 38, by Mr Bocklet (H-520/80)

Subject: Sales promotion for butter

Does the Commission intend before the end of 1980 to promote schemes for the sale of butter at reduced prices (e.g. Christmas butter) to the citizens of the Community and if this is not the case, why not?

Answer

The Commission has examined the need for short-term butter sales and has concluded that, in the light of the budget and the stock situation, it would not be right to propose such sales this year. The public intervention stock of butter has fallen substantially this year to its current level of about 170 000 tonnes. Short term butter sales are expensive for the Community budget, taking into account that there is at least some substitution for normal market sales.

*

* *

Question No 39, by Lord Bethell (H-521/80)

Subject: Gibraltar

What consideration has the Commission given to the continuing Spanish blockade of Gibraltar; have they made representations to the Spanish government about the need to restore overland communication between Gibraltar and Spain, to accord with European law and the April 1980 Lisbon agreement and what account have they taken during the current negotiations on Spanish accession, with particular respect to the migration of workers, of Gibraltar's special demographic situation?

Answer

The Commission is convinced that, following contacts between the Spanish and the British Governments, the Spanish blockade of Gibraltar will be lifted before Spain becomes a Member, so that conditions can be created for the harmonious development of relations within the enlarged Community.

After Spain's accession to the Communities, and without prejudice to any transitional arrangements which may be included in Spain's accession treaty, Community rules governing free movement of workers (Article 48 and following of the EEC Treaty) will apply uniformly throughout the Community, in Gibraltar as well as in Spain. In the Commission's view transitional arrangements regarding free movement of workers will certainly be required. In its Opinion on Spain's application, the Commission has already stated that the potential migratory pressures justified provisions for the adoption of a safeguard mechanism and progressive liberalization phases for access to work. The Council agreed that it would be necessary to be cautious and to fix the duration and content of the transitional measures accordingly. At this stage of the negotiations, it is not possible to give any definite indication of the nature and length of such transitional arrangements.

*

* *

Question No 40, by Mr Nicolson (H-523/80)

Subject: Importation, regulation and chartering of yachts

Does the Commission have any plans to address the harmonization of regulations regarding the importation, regulation and chartering of yachts throughout the member countries of the EEC?

Answer

In 1976, the Commission forwarded to the Council a draft outline directive on which Parliament gave a very favourable opinion on 11 March 1977. As a result of the Council's attitude to this proposal, the Commission decided to withdraw it.

Since then, and having noted the existence of obstacles to trade resulting from the disparity of the Member States' legislation and the interest shown by industry, the Commission has begun preparing

draft directives in specific fields (those in which safety and environmental protection take priority and in which the divergent nature of national regulations has given rise to the most serious technical obstacles to trade between the Member States).

It is anticipated that the Council will be called upon to tackle this subject some time in 1981. The Commission intends to use its proposal as a means of testing the Council's political will to bring this problem to a speedy conclusion.

*

* *

Question No 41, by Mrs Marin (H-524/80)

Subject: Exports of Community cereals to third countries

Is the Commission aware that its present over-cautious market policy in the cereals sector is likely to prevent the conclusion of important contracts with third countries, particularly China, at a time when there are excellent opportunities for selling Community cereals to these countries?

Answer

The Commission agrees with the honourable Member that it is important to take advantage of export opportunities for cereals in the light of the excellent Community harvest. The Commission wishes to emphasize however, that in the present crop year it has practised a very active export policy to traditional markets. Thus in the summer and early autumn of 1980 the quantity of cereals committed for export was substantially higher than in any previous year. Currently the quantities committed for export, either as grain or in the form of flour or malt, are about 6.5 million tonnes of wheat and just under 4 million tonnes of barley. China is one of the potential markets for the Community. From 27 November China will be included within the coverage of the general tender for wheat exports.

*

* *

Question No 42, by Mr Seligman (H-529/80): deferred

*

* *

Question No 43, by Miss Hooper (H-531/80)

Subject: Community levy on lactalbumin imports

Why do manufacturers in the Community have to pay an import levy of £ 755 per 1 000 kg on lactalbumin, which has to be imported from New Zealand, since it is not a product produced or otherwise available within the Community, and the levy paid by EEC companies makes them uncompetitive compared to the Americans, who import the same lactalbumin from New Zealand but do not have to pay the levy?

Answer

The possibility of substituting lactalbumin very largely for ovalbumin has led the Council to accord to lactalbumin the same protection accorded to ovalbumin (i.e. where trade is very closely linked to the egg market).

As a result, import levies on lactalbumin are the same as for ovalbumin and, if the price of these products at an EEC frontier are below the sluice-gate price, an additional levy may be imposed on exports from one or more third countries.

*

* *

Question No 44, by Mr Stewart-Clark (H-532/80): deferred

*

* *

Question No 45, by Mr Purvis (H-533/80)

Subject: The use of recycled paper and board in food packaging

What steps is the Commission taking to encourage the use of recycled paper and board in food packaging?

Answer

The Commission is extremely interested in the use recycled paper and board, and points out that it has submitted to the Council a draft Council recommendation to the Member States aimed in particular at encouraging the use of recycled paper and board by public authorities.

The Commission has also undertaken a study on the formulation of specifications for the various paper products to enable the quality of paper to be better adapted to the use to which it is put and to facilitate the elimination of contaminated substances which rule out or hamper recycling operations. The results of this study will be available in 1981 and may also be of interest to the question of food packaging.

Finally, in the context of the 1978-1981 research programme on old paper and board (2 900 000 units of account from Community funds), it is intended to tackle the health problems resulting from the use of recycled fibres.¹ Most of the projects do not directly concern food packaging.

Clearly, any development in the use of recycled paper and board for food packaging must take account of the health aspect.

For this reason, an outline directive on materials and articles intended to come into contact with foodstuffs was adopted on 23 November 1976.² This directive indicates the principles to be complied with in the case of packaging which will come into contact with foodstuffs.

A number of implementing directives in fields which are considered to be of priority interest have been adopted or are in preparation (cf. point 3 above).

However, work on recycled paper and board cannot be tackled until sufficient progress has been made in the Council's discussions on the draft directives on ceramics and plastics. To enable it to state its position more precisely and more quickly on this important matter, the Commission intends to have a study made of this specific problem in 1981.

¹ OJ No L 107 of 21. 4. 1978.

² OJ No L 340 of 9. 12. 1976.

Pending the formulation of a specific directive in this field,¹ the Member States are required to adhere to the rules and principles laid down in the outline directive and whatever rules exist in their own countries.

*

* *

Question No 46, by Mr Van Miert (H-534/80)

Subject: Grain embargo against the Soviet Union

Since the grain embargo imposed against the Soviet Union at the beginning of this year has not achieved the desired result and has not been respected by certain countries, does the Commission not consider that it is time to review this measure and draw the appropriate conclusions?

Answer

As regards the management of the cereals sector, the Commission will continue to respect the terms of the directive formulated by the Council of Ministers on 15 January 1980.

*

* *

Question No 47, by Mr Kavanagh (H-537/80)

Subject: National Conservation Limits for Fisheries

Does the Commission agree that national conservation limits are the only realistic way of ensuring the continued existence of the fishing industry in those peripheral areas traditionally dependent on fisheries?

Answer

No, however, the Commission agrees with the aim to ensure the continued existence of the fishing industry in peripheral areas traditionally dependent on fisheries. This is why, in elaborating its quota proposals for 1980, it provided for those regions where the local communities are particularly dependent upon fishing and the industries allied thereto, as defined by the Council Resolution on 3 November 1976, a preferential part of the catch, which is included in the respective Member States' quota.

In addition, in its Proposal for a Council Regulation establishing a Community system for the conservation and management of fishery resources, it has provided for the general application of a coastal zone of 12 miles, within which Member States are authorized to restrict fishing to vessels which fish traditionally in those waters and which operate from parts in that geographical area, without prejudice to any special fishing rights which other Member States may enjoy in that region. The Commission is confident that the exercise of such fishing rights will be defined by the Council in such a way as not to jeopardize the continued existence of the fishing industry in the peripheral areas mentioned.

¹ Cf in particular Council Resolution of 17. 12. 1973 (OJ No C 117 of 31. 12. 1973) on the programme to eliminate technical barriers to trade (Annex I: food products) and the environment action programme (OJ No C 139 of 13. 6. 1977).

Finally, I wish to underline that the measures concerning conservation and control already approved by the Council this year will lead to an overall improvement of the situation of the fishing industry from which the coastal fishery traditionally dependent on fishing will certainly benefit most.

*

* *

2. Questions to the Council

Question No 59, by Mr Seefeld (H-497/80)¹

Subject: Future of Eurocontrol

What steps does the Council intend to take to implement the recommendations adopted by the European Parliament by a large majority on 10 July 1980 concerning the role of Eurocontrol as part of a coordinated European air traffic management and control system, at the meeting of the Permanent Commission on 20 November 1980.

Answer

Decisions regarding the future role of Eurocontrol are a matter for the contracting parties to the Eurocontrol Convention. In addition, on the question of setting up a coordinated European air traffic management and control system, let me repeat what was said in reply to Written Question No 499/80, by Mr Moreland, namely that the problems of air transport are not at present the subject of discussion by the Council bodies.

*

* *

Questions No 60, by Mr Berkhower (H-466/80), No 61, by Mr Moreland (H-471/80), and No 62, by Mr Davern (H-479/80): deferred

*

* *

Question No 64, by Mr Welsh (H-489/80)

Subject: Implementation of Directive 70/156/EEC — Community-wide system of standardized vehicle approval

Could the Council explain why Directive 70/156/EEC covering the establishment of a Community-wide system of standardized vehicle type-approval has not been implemented?

Answer

The Directive of 6 February 1970 on the type-approval of motor vehicles currently enables those applying for national type-approval to obtain the application, as part of this type-approval, of the specific technical requirements already harmonized at Community level instead of the corresponding national requirements. However, the stage of full EEC type-approval for the whole of a vehicle has not yet been reached since certain technical requirements are not yet covered by Community-wide rules. This is the case for instance with safety windows and pneumatic tyres. Moreover, the more

¹ Previously Oral Question with debate (0-49/80), changed to a question for Question Time.

general question of access of products originating in third countries to the directives designed to remove technical barriers to trade is currently under discussion in the Council

*

* *

Questions No 65, by Mr Deleau (H-491/80), and No 66, by Mr Ansquer (H-493/80): deferred

*

* *

Question No 67, by Lady Elles (H-494/80)

Subject: Reciprocal health benefits for the self-employed and non-employed

What prospects are there that when it meets on 27 November the Council of Social Affairs Ministers will be able to agree on the extension to the self-employed and non-employed of Regulation 1408/71 and 574/72?

Answer

At its meeting on 27 November, the Council hopes to be able to resolve the problems outstanding regarding the proposal for a Regulation on the adaptation of Regulation (EEC) No 1408/71 to extend the coordination of social security schemes to self-employed persons.

If the result is positive, the Council will then have to adopt the implementing Regulation — i.e. to adapt Regulation (EEC) No 574/72 — on the basis of a proposal to be submitted by the Commission on the subject.

*

* *

Question No 68, by Mrs Squarzialupi (H-496/80)

Subject: Compliance with international standards on working conditions

Can the Council indicate what action it has taken on the proposal, contained in the memorandum of 15 February 1978 on the renewal of the Convention of Lomé, for the granting of Community concessions, particularly in the commercial sector, to all the developing countries, including those covered by the Convention of Lomé, to be made subject to compliance with certain basic international standards on working conditions?

Answer

As indicated in the replies given to Written Question No 517/79, put by Mr Damseaux and No 905/79 put by Mr Michel the Commission communication on compliance with certain basic international standards on working conditions was referred to by the Council in the context of discussions on the renewal of the Convention of Lomé. Since the scope of the communication extends to all the developing countries with which the Community cooperates, the Council felt it should firstly make comprehensive and detailed examination of this important and complicated question.

The Council also took note of the Resolution on this subject which the European Parliament adopted on 11 May 1979 and the report of its Committee on Development and Cooperation.

*

* *

Question No 69, by Mr Bettiza (H-498/80)

Subject: TV and radio programmes by satellite

Some countries in the Community are planning to transmit television and radio programmes by satellite. Does the Council consider that it might be possible in this framework to set up a European channel?

If so, might it include Community programmes?

Answer

The Council has not discussed any such question and has received no suggestions or proposals on the subject from the Commission.

*

* *

Question No 70, by Mr Cronin (H-502/80): deferred

*

* *

Question No 71, by Mr Fanton (H-503/80)

Subject: Voluntary restraint agreements between the EEC, Australia and New Zealand

Can the Council give details of the agreements negotiated with New Zealand and Australia on sheepmeat; have the difficulties which were expected at one stage been ironed out? Can the Council give an assurance that the voluntary restraint agreements will be rigorously enforced?

Answer

In accordance with the 'Westerterp' procedure, the relevant European Parliament Committees were informed by the President of the Council on 13 October 1980 of the substance of the voluntary restraint agreements with certain third countries in the sheepmeat sector.

The Decision concluding these agreements and the implementing Regulations adopted formally by the Council on 14 October 1980 were published in Official Journal L 275 of 18 October 1980.

It is for the Commission to ensure that these agreements are enforced.

*

* *

Question No 72, by Mr Turcat (H-504/80): deferred

*

* *

Question No 73, by Miss Quin (H-508/80)

Subject: Directive on safety and environmental standards for ships using EEC ports

What progress has been made by the Council in consideration of the proposed directive on safety and environmental standards for ships using EEC ports?

Answer

The Commission proposal for a Council Directive concerning the enforcement, in respect of shipping using Community ports, of international standards for shipping safety and pollution prevention was submitted to the Council on 2 July 1980. The Council, which attaches great importance to improving safety at sea, immediately began the preliminary work on the proposal. This is well in hand and the Council awaits with much interest the Opinion of the European Parliament and that of the Economic and Social Committee.

*

* *

Question No 74, by Mr Price (H-516/80)

Subject: New building to be erected for the Council in Brussels

In respect of the new building which is proposed to be erected for the Council in Brussels, will the Council confirm that the construction contract will be open for tender by contractors from all Community countries and state where advertisements inviting tenders will be placed?

Answer

As early as 1975, work was started by the Council on organizing an international architects' competition to produce the design of a possible new building to be built on a site made available by the Belgian Government. That this work was not brought to a successful conclusion was due in particular to the problem of the seat of the Institutions.

It was in the light of this that the Belgian Government took the step of having the proposed Council premises built at its own risk, the Council being able when the time came to either rent or purchase them. In order to implement its decision, the Belgian Government issued an invitation to tender for a public promotion contract for the design, construction and financing of the building.

According to information available to the Council, the Belgian Government has not yet selected a bidder from among those who responded to the invitation to tender. So far, the various stages of the selection procedure instituted have simply resulted in the gradual elimination of certain candidates.

During stage three of the selection procedure the Council was asked by the Belgian Government at the beginning of this year to express a reasoned opinion on a number of plans. This opinion was arrived at following a detailed examination by a Working Party of State experts and consultations with staff representatives from the Secretariat.

At that time the Council held that one of the plans seemed of exceptional quality but that in varying degrees three of them could meet the main operating requirements inherent in the activities of the Council and of its various departments.

*

* *

Question No 75, by Mrs Roudy (H-518/80)

Subject: Council meeting on consumer affairs

At the European meetings of consumer organizations held in Paris from 15 to 17 October 1980, Mr Helminger stated on behalf of the Luxembourg Presidency that the Council was willing to convene a meeting of the Council of Ministers on consumer affairs before the end of the year.

Can the Council state when it intends to convene this meeting and what subjects will appear on the agenda?

Answer

At the European meetings of consumer organizations held from 15 to 17 October 1980 by the French Ministry of Economic Affairs, Mr Helminger stated that the Luxembourg Presidency would contact

the various national authorities to determine whether the time was ripe for convening a Council meeting of Ministers responsible for consumer affairs before the end of the year.

Since these contacts are still in progress the Council is unable to state the date and agenda for such a meeting.

*

* *

Question No 76, by Mr Radoux (H-519/80)

Subject: Improvement of institutional procedures with a view to the enlargement of the EEC

During the September 1980 part-session of the European Parliament, the President of the Council replied to my question (H-331/80) on the same subject indicating that the European Council would adopt a position on a report by the Foreign Ministers on 1 December.

Can the Council tell Parliament how, between the 1 and 31 December, it will be possible to implement measures to 'improve the institutional procedures with a view to the second enlargement of the Community', to employ the terminology used by the European Council?

Answer

I would remind the honourable Member that in the reply which I had the honour of giving him on 15 October, I said that 'the Foreign Ministers have succeeded in reaching a broad consensus on a number of suggestions contained in the report of the Three Wise Men and that the points covered by this consensus have already been put into effect or will be as soon as possible on the initiative of the Institutions and bodies concerned.'

Irrespective of any decision the European Council may take at its next meeting and which would be for implementation between now and 1 January 1981, the Institutions have already taken or will be taking measures to improve their functioning.

*

* *

Question No 77, by Mr Nicolson (H-522/80)

Subject: Eurotra proposal to automate Community translation

Does the Council expect an early and favourable decision on the EUROTRA proposal to automate Community translation, bearing in mind the extremely high proportion of administrative expenses due to the need to translate between 6 languages at present and the pending increase of this problem with the accession of new members to the Community?

Answer

The Council is interested in any proposal which is likely to reduce the burden of translation, and is giving careful consideration to the Eurotra proposal.

The Council recalls that it has asked the Parliament and the Economic and Social Committee for their opinions on this proposal, and looks forward to receiving them.

SITTING OF THURSDAY, 20 NOVEMBER 1980

Contents

1. Approval of minutes	191	8. Votes	211
2. Documents received	191	<i>von Alemann report (Doc. 1-442/80):</i>	
3. Welcome	191	<i>Nuclear power stations in frontier regions</i>	
4. Decision on requests for an early vote and for urgent procedure		<i>Mrs von Alemann, rapporteur</i>	211
<i>Point of order: Mr Pannella</i>	191	<i>Points of order: Mr Pannella; Mr Beazley; Mr Herman; Mr Forth; Mr Pannella; Mrs von Alemann; Mrs Lizin; Mr Gendebien; Mrs von Alemann; Sir Fred Warner; Mr Coppieters; Mrs von Alemann; Mr Capanna; Mr Veronesi; Mrs von Alemann; Mr Veronesi; Mrs von Alemann; Mr Gendebien; Mrs von Alemann</i>	213
<i>Mr Klepsch; Mr Fanti</i>		<i>Explanations of vote: Mr Turcat; Mr Capanna; Mrs Bonino; Mrs Lizin; Mr Coppieters; Mr Seligman; Mr Collins; Mr Gendebien; Mrs Weber; Mr Rogers; Mr Veronesi; Mr Calvez</i>	219
<i>Point of order: Mr Pannella</i>	192	<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	
<i>Mr Ansquer; Mr Moreland; Mrs Lizin; Mrs Bonino; Mr Welsh; Mr Ansquer; Mr Delorozoy; Mr Glinne</i>	192	<i>Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-598/80) by Mr Müller-Hermann and others: Community oil supplies from the Middle East</i>	221
<i>Points of order: Sir Fred Catherwood; Mr Enright; Sir Fred Catherwood</i>		<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	221
<i>Mr Pannella; Mr De Gucht; Mr Delatte; Mr Harris</i>	194	<i>Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-599/80) by Mr Linkohr and others: Supplies of oil to the Community from the Middle East</i>	221
5. Draft amending and supplementary budget No 1 of the Communities for 1980 — Report (Doc. 1-600/80) by Mr Notenboom (Committee on Budgets):		<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	221
<i>Mr Notenboom, rapporteur</i>	196	<i>Schmid report (Doc. 1-521/80): Multiannual Community programme in biomolecular engineering</i>	221
<i>Mr Tugendhat (Commission); Mrs Castle; Mr Tugendhat; Mr Fich</i>		<i>Consideration of the motion for a resolution:</i>	
<i>Point of order: Mr Griffiths</i>	200	<i>Mr Schmid, rapporteur</i>	222
<i>Mr Langes; Mr J. M. Taylor; Mr Gouthier; Mr Nord; Mr Dankert</i>		<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	224
<i>Point of order: Mr Notenboom</i>	203	<i>Moreau report (Doc. 1-550/80): Decision on the adoption of the annual report on the economic situation of the Community</i>	224
<i>Mr Dankert; Mr Forth</i>		<i>Consideration of the motion for a resolution:</i>	
<i>Consideration of the motion for a resolution:</i>		<i>Mr Moreau, rapporteur</i>	224
<i>Point of order: Mr J. M. Taylor</i>	204	<i>Explanations of vote: Mr Cousté; Mr Ruffolo; Mr Bonaccini</i>	227
<i>Mr Notenboom</i>	204	<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	228
<i>Explanations of vote: Mrs Castle; Mr J. M. Taylor; Mr Martin; Mr Ansquer; Mr Bonde; Mr Balfe; Mr Motchane; Mr Rogers; Mrs Focke</i>	204	<i>Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-500/80) by Mr Glinne and others: Seat of the European Parliament</i>	228
<i>Personal statement: Mr Fich</i>	207	<i>Explanations of vote: Mrs Le Roux; Mr Penders; Mr Zagari</i>	228
<i>Adoption of the resolution:</i>		<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	229
<i>Mr Tugendhat</i>	207	<i>Ferri report (Doc. 1-506/80): Right of residence of nationals of Member States in the territory of another Member State</i>	229
6. Urgent procedure	207		
7. Right of residence of nationals of Member States in the territory of another Member State — Report (Doc. 1-506/80) by Mr Ferri (Legal Affairs Committee):			
<i>Mr Gonella, deputy rapporteur</i>	207		
<i>Mr Prout, Mr De Gucht; Mrs Macciocchi; Mr Buttafuoco; Mr Cheysson (Commission)</i>	209		

<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	229	(Doc. 1-560/80) by Mr Clinton (Committee on Agriculture), report (Doc. 1-537/80) by Mrs Cresson (Committee on Agriculture) and oral question with debate (Doc. 1-515/80) by Mr De Pasquale and others:	
9. <i>Urgent procedure</i>	229	Mr Kirk, rapporteur	253
10. <i>ACP-EEC Convention — Joint debate on the report (Doc. 1-559/80) by Mr Wawrzik (Committee on Development and Cooperation) and the report (Doc. 1-522/80) by Mr Sablé (Committee on Development and Cooperation):</i>		Point of order: Mrs Kellett-Bowman	254
Mr Cheysson (Commission)	230	Mr Clinton, rapporteur; Mrs Cresson, rapporteur	254
Mr Wawrzik, Mr Sablé, rapporteurs	233	Mr De Pasquale	257
Mr Maher; Mrs Focke; Mr Bersani; Sir Fred Warner; Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli; Mr De Gucht; Mr Israel; Mr Pannella; Mr Lezzi; Mr Michel; Mrs Poirier; Mr Skovmand; Mr Jalton; Mr Narducci	235	Mr Josselin; Mr Tolman; Mr Battersby; Mr Papapietro; Mr J. B. Nielsen; Mr Davern; Mr Gundelach (Commission); Mr Almirante; Mr Gautier; Mr Giummarra; Mr Kirk; Mrs Le Roux	258
Points of order: Mr Martin; Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul; Mr Gautier; Mr Kirk; Mr Baillet; Mr Fanton; Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul	250	Points of order: Miss Quin;	273
11. <i>Fisheries policy — Report (Doc. 1-597/80) by Mr Kirk (Committee on Agriculture), report</i>		Mr Nyborg; Mr Woltjer; Mr de Lipkowski; Mr Enright; Mrs Ewing; Mr Fich; Mr Harris; Mr Remilly; Mr Newton Dunn; Miss Brookes; Mr Purois; Mr Gundelach	274
		12. <i>Agenda for next sitting</i>	282

IN THE CHAIR: MR ROGERS

Vice-President

(The sitting was opened at 10.05 a.m.)

President. — The sitting is open.

1. *Approval of the minutes*

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

Are there any comments?

The minutes of proceeding are approved.

2. *Documents received*

President. — I have received various documents, which are listed in the minutes.

3. *Welcome*

President. — I have great pleasure in welcoming a delegation of Canadian parliamentarians led by Mr

Van Roggen, who are visiting Strasbourg for the 8th meeting with the delegation from the European Parliament.

We attach very great importance to interparliamentary contacts of this kind which have linked us to our Canadian friends for a number of years. I should also like to wish the Canadian delegation every success in its meeting with the European Parliament delegation.

(Applause)

4. *Decision on requests for an early vote and for urgent procedure*

President. — The next item is the decision on a number of requests for an early vote or for urgent procedure.

We shall begin with a request for an early vote on three *motions for resolutions (Docs. 1-605/80, 1-606/80 and 1-608/80): Situation in Turkey.*

I call Mr Pannella on a point of order.

Mr Pannella. — *(F)* Mr President, I see that we have on the agenda the decision on the urgency of the motion for a resolution by Mr Habsburg on the release of Rudolf Hess. I did not think that there still

Pannella

was a request for urgency. I should like to know what is happening.

President. — I am first of all going to take the vote on the following request for an early vote and then we shall come to that matter afterwards.

Mr Pannella. — (*F*) Mr President, we have a right to know the order of business from the beginning of the sitting. Since we have a document telling us that we shall have to decide on a request for urgent procedure by Mr Habsburg in respect of a motion for a resolution on the release of Rudolf Hess, it is high time we knew whether the document is correct. My impression is that the agenda here is not correct, since this item should not be on it. I think we ought to know from the outset.

President. — When we come to the item on the agenda, there may be information which will alter the situation, but we are going to come to that item.

We are first going to stay on the vote on the requests for an early vote. I propose that we take a single vote on the three motions for resolutions dealing with the same subject.

I call Mr Klepsch.

Mr Klepsch. — (*D*) On behalf of our group, Mr President, I should like to explain why we cannot support the request for an early vote on these three motions for resolutions.

It is the view of our group that the information we were given yesterday by the President of the Council was not so comprehensive as the House might have wished. We also take the view that we need more information about this matter. However, we also feel that the three texts before us raise a great number of complicated questions, and it is inadvisable for the House to decide on a matter of this importance between ten and eleven o'clock in the morning. Our group would prefer it if the Political Affairs Committee prepared a report for consideration by the House in December or January. All the available information could be got together and we could also draw on the experience of the Members who are part of the EEC-Turkey Joint Parliamentary Committee.

Our group wants the Political Affairs Committee to draw up a report on this matter. Consequently, we shall not vote in favour of an early vote.

(Applause)

President. — As I have received a request from the chairman of a political group not to vote on the three motions together, I propose to take them separately.

I call Mr Fantì.

Mr Fantì. — (*I*) I do not agree with your proposal, Mr President, as it seems to me that Mr Klepsch was not asking for a separate vote but outlining the reasons why his group did not feel it could vote in favour of an early vote on the three motions. It is quite an arbitrary decision to separate the three motions. Can I ask you to put the three motions to the House together?

President. — I shall do as you ask and take all three motions together in the vote on this request for an early vote.

I call Mr Pannella to speak on a point of order.

Mr Pannella. — (*F*) In connection with Rule 47 of the Rules of Procedure, Mr President, there is a precedent which is now always followed. The President of the House mentioned it yesterday: whenever there are several documents on the same subject in connection with a request for urgent procedure or an early vote, we always take a single vote on them. Your second decision was right, Mr President.

President. — This is what we are going to do.

I call Mr Ansquer.

Mr Ansquer. — (*F*) Mr President, on behalf of my group may I say that I should like the House to take a single vote on these three requests?

President. — Since there are no objections, that is agreed.

(Parliament rejected the request for an early vote)

The motions for resolutions are therefore referred to the appropriate committee.

*

* *

President. — We shall now consider the requests for urgency.

I have been informed by Mr Moreland that the authors of the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-575/80), with request for urgent procedure, on the release of Rudolf Hess from Spandau prison now wish to withdraw this request. This item is therefore removed from the agenda.

President

I call Mr Moreland.

Mr Moreland. — Mr President, you used the word 'withdraw'. I think I should make it quite clear to Parliament that this motion was, in fact, signed by myself and many others under Rule 25 and submitted to Parliament under Rule 25. I am not quite sure why it is down under Rule 14, but there is no question of withdrawal. Certainly in view of the remarks made yesterday by members of the French Communist Party, those of us who signed it intend to pursue it, because we find it deplorable that attacks should be made on it by a group led by somebody who had a record during the last war.

(Cries from the Communist and Allies Group)

President. — The working document does contain the words 'request for urgent debate pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure'.

The request for urgent procedure is withdrawn.

I cannot accept any further points of order on this motion for a resolution.

(Applause from various quarters — protests from certain Members of the Communist and Allies Group)

*

* *

President. — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-602/80) by Mrs Lizin and others: Discrimination between men and women in the Soviet Union.*

I call Mrs Lizin.

Mrs Lizin. — *(F)* The motion before the House was drawn up at the express request of the International League for the Rights of Man which voiced its deep concern about the situation of the women who have been arrested and about the unhappy outlook for those who have already been harassed on several occasions.

We all know — since it has often been discussed here in Parliament — about the situation of the dissidents. But among those who challenge certain aspects of the Soviet régime there is a group of human beings who are almost completely forgotten. They are the women in the feminist movement, and we wanted to bring them to people's attention. It is hard enough talking about women's rights in the West, Mr President, but when you are up-against absolute power, it is usually women's rights which are most often and most forcibly

trampled underfoot. This is why we particularly wanted an urgent debate on one of these women, whom we have heard nothing of for more than two months.

President. — I call Mrs Bonino.

Mrs Bonino. — *(I)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in view of the reactions by Members in the House — all the muttering and so on — I could not agree more with what Mrs Lizin said. I should like to ask Parliament to do something and to debate this topic, so that once and for all we can put a stop to something wrong, instead of just condemning it after the event. There has been no news of this woman since 23 September, while in the case of others we know that they have been persecuted. I do not think Parliament should wait any longer, until we fail to have news about any other women. I think it is time Parliament used the means and the powers at its disposal to put a stop to this persecution which is going on.

I hope that all the groups will vote in favour of urgency on this motion — even those groups which shocked us just now when they rejected urgency for the motion on Turkey, because that is also a matter of pressing urgency in our view. I hope that all the groups will take a stand on this request for urgency.

(Parliament adopted urgent procedure)

President. — This item will be placed on the agenda of Friday's sitting.

*

* *

President. — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-604/80) by Mr Welsh on behalf of the European Democratic Group, Mr Seal and others: Renegotiation of the Multifibre Arrangement.*

I call Mr Welsh.

Mr Welsh. — Mr President, the honourable Members will know that it is only very rarely that the European Democratic Group invokes this urgency procedure. That we do so now is evidence of the extreme seriousness with which we regard this matter.

Under Article 113 of the Treaty of Rome the Community has full competence to negotiate trade agreements on behalf of the Member States. Although individual ministers are responsible to their national parliaments, neither the Council nor the Commission as institutions is accountable to any democratically elected body. The Multifibre Arrangement is of supreme importance not

Welsh

only to the 9½ % of the working population of the Nine who work in textiles and clothing, but also because it is central to the Community's policy on trade with the world in general and with newly industrialized and developing countries in particular. In preparing its position, the Commission has held extensive consultations with pressure groups representing management, labour, importers, retailers, consumers — everyone, in fact, except the directly elected representatives of the citizens of Europe.

In answer to an oral question at the last part-session, Mr President, President Thorn undertook to consult Parliament under the Luns-Westerterp procedure. This means that when the negotiations are complete and the instruments initialled, the Council will inform Parliament of the conclusions. That is certainly very courteous, but it is not particularly effective. Again in answer to a Written Question, No 603/80, from the honourable Member for West Yorkshire, the Commission said,

Under Article 10, paragraph 5, of the Multifibre Arrangement the GATT Textile Committee has to meet not later than one year before the expiry of the arrangement. It is expected that the committee will hold a first meeting on this subject in December 1980. The Commission will submit its recommendations to the Council in time to enable the Community to take a position at the meeting.

Mr President, today is 20 November. Unless we debate this matter tomorrow, there is no way in which we can place our views on record before the Commission submits its proposals. There will certainly be differences of opinion as to what those views should be, and that will be the subject of a substantive debate which I hope will take place tomorrow. However, it does seem beyond question that we should be failing in our duty to our electors if we do not take every possible initiative to ensure that Parliament's position is available to the other institutions before the proposed mandate is submitted. It is in that spirit that we ask the House to support our request for urgency.

President. — I call Mr Ansquer.

Mr Ansquer. — (F) Mr President, we should like to second the motion by Mr Welsh, Mr Scott-Hopkins and several other Members. This motion in fact comes just at the right time, because the effects of the Multifibre Arrangement are being felt in most sectors of the textile and clothing trade in the Member States of the Community. We are aware of these serious effects, especially where unemployment is concerned. For this reason, we echo the call to the Commission to take account of the requirements outlined in the motion tabled by our colleagues. We should like to see a debate on this particularly vital issue for the future of these two major sectors, textiles and clothing, which

again involve many jobs and therefore entire regions in Member States of the Community.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Delorozoy.

Mr Delorozoy. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, although I am going to speak against urgency, it is not because I disagree with what has been said, since we go along entirely with the views which have just been expressed concerning the importance of this Multifibre Arrangement and the need to get down to a thorough examination of it as soon as possible.

What we think, in actual fact, is that it is not a practical proposition to tackle such an essentially complex subject by way of an urgent debate and to deal with it in proper circumstances. This is why we think that an urgent debate would be a wrong idea which would even have an adverse effect on the thorough examination. Let me say in closing that the Council — and it is down here in the motion — has promised to consult Parliament on the content of any new agreement. Here and now, there is no reason to doubt the Council's promise. The ball is now in their court, as it were, and we expect them to consult us in the coming days or weeks. The council cannot take a decision before we are consulted — that is the promise we were given.

President. — I call Mr Glinne.

Mr Glinne. — (F) Mr President, even though this is a very important matter, as others have said, most of us intend to vote against urgency. We know that the appropriate parliamentary committee, the Committee on External Economic Relations, is meeting next Tuesday and Wednesday, and this item is on the agenda. Consequently, we hope that the parliamentary committee will work especially hard, and that the Council and the Commission do the same, so that the matter can be considered by everyone here in the Chamber at Parliament's next part-session in December.

President. — I call Sir Fred Catherwood on a point of order.

Sir Fred Catherwood, chairman of the Committee on External Economic Relations. — I would just like to say, Mr President, that I am told that I have got this on my agenda for next Tuesday and Wednesday. I cannot find it on my agenda. It is not going to be discussed next Tuesday and Wednesday in the Committee on External Economic Relations.

(Laughter)

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

Mr Enright. — Surely those entitled to the floor are one speaker for, one against and the leaders of political groups, and therefore I am entitled as a signatory to explain why I shall not be voting for urgent procedure.

President. — The procedure, Mr Enright, on a request for urgent debate is that first the author is allowed to speak, then one speaker for and one against, then the political group spokesmen and also the chairman of the committee concerned, or a rapporteur if that is appropriate. So I am sorry, your point of order is not sustained.

Mr Enright. — We just had one speaker against, even though we have had spokesmen for the political groups.

President. — Yes, we have. Mr Delorozoy spoke against.

I call Sir Fred Catherwood.

Sir Fred Catherwood. — I simply wish to clarify the point that we are having an exchange of views on this matter but we are not bound to come to any conclusion, which was what Mr Glinne said we were about to do.

(Parliament rejected the request for urgent procedure)

President. — The motion for a resolution is referred to the appropriate committee.

*

* *

President. — We shall now consider the request for urgent procedure in respect of the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-607/80) by five political groups, Mr Carosino and Mr Capanna: Referendum in Uruguay.*

I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — *(F)* Mr President, almost the whole of Latin America is under the increasing sway of military juntas. It is a phenomenon which is slowly spreading throughout the world. In my view, most of the groups which are going to vote for this motion are shutting their eyes to the fact — and indeed they are quite incapable of appreciating the consequences — that there are whole areas of the world where there is no confrontation between countries, but the military is

simply in power to crush the people and impose a law of violence and death. I am delighted to be able to speak on this occasion, Mr President, and to note that people who now and then like to call themselves Christians, or liberals, or democrats, are rallying to the defence of democracy. This is why I think we should vote for the urgency of this motion.

Let me add, Mr President, that it is dismaying — to say the least — to observe that those who put on a show of concern about events in Uruguay are standing in the way of a parliamentary debate on Turkey, where fellow MPs are languishing in prison and where a cruel military junta has taken over. We are all for freedom elsewhere, while we are quite happy to put up with torturers at home if we have to. I am disgusted at the behaviour of certain so-called liberals, and yet I shall be voting along with them in favour of urgency in this matter, in favour of freedom and human rights and against the torturers.

(Parliament adopted urgent procedure)

President. — The motion for a resolution will be placed on the agenda of Friday's sitting.

*

* *

President. — We shall now consider the request for urgent procedure in respect of the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-609/80) by Mr De Clercq and others: Sales of butter to the Soviet Union.*

Mr Vernimmen has informed me that he withdraws his signature from this text.

I call Mr De Gucht.

Mr De Gucht. — *(NL)* Today, Mr President, I want to talk simply about the urgency of this matter. As for its substance, the issue at stake is a technical and political matter about which a great deal can be said. The main point, Mr President, is that it is the responsibility of this Parliament not to betray the trust which the people of Europe have in us. It is clear from all the reaction to the possible sales of this butter — because the matter is not yet definitely settled — that there is a great deal of concern among the citizens of Europe, and Parliament ought to consider the subject without delay. That explains why we have taken this initiative, Mr President, and tabled this motion with a view to having a debate tomorrow.

President. — I call Mr Delatte.

Mr Delatte. — *(F)* With this request for urgency, Mr

Delatte

President, I fear that we are confusing the House, because we must be very careful not to confuse the sale of Christmas butter with exports to the Soviet Union.

The House must realize that with Christmas butter sales the idea is to help the European consumer enjoy cheaper butter at Christmas. The statistics show that this has made absolutely no difference to the overall stocks of butter which are still a tremendous burden on the market. This was pointed out at our last part-session on the budget.

Butter sales to the Soviet Union come under the common agricultural policy, and this is an entirely different matter. I urge the House to vote against urgency, Mr President, precisely because I do not want any confusion between the export of agricultural products and the sale of Christmas butter. If urgent procedure were adopted, I should feel that this matter — which on the whole comes under the common agricultural policy — had been dealt with in far too hasty a manner. That is why I am asking the House to reject urgency.

President. — I call Mr Harris.

Mr Harris. — Mr President, I did not originally intend to speak, but I feel I must follow the last speaker. The case for urgency is set out very clearly in the justification before us, and that is that it is based on public reaction to possible sales of butter to Russia and the disastrous effects on the people's confidence in the EEC. Now there are a lot of suggestions going around that we might be on the verge of another large-scale sale of butter at highly subsidized prices to Russia. I can only speak for my country, but I can tell the last speaker and the Commission that nothing has done more harm to the whole idea of the Community in the United Kingdom than the sale of butter to Russia at low prices. If we are on the verge of yet another big sale, then indeed this Parliament must have an urgent debate on it, because I happen to hold the view, and I know this is shared by some of my colleagues, that the Commission has ignored the stated views of this Parliament on this subject, and I think we must have a debate on this subject this week. Therefore I wholeheartedly support the request.

(Parliament adopted urgent procedure by sitting and standing — Applause)

President. — The motion for a resolution will be placed on the agenda of Friday's sitting.

5. *Draft amending and supplementary budget No 1 of the Communities for 1980*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-600/80), drawn up by Mr Notenboom on behalf of the Committee on Budgets, on the

draft amending and supplementary budget No 1 of the European Communities for the 1980 financial year drawn up by the Council on 6 November 1980 (Doc. 1-569/80).

I call Mr Notenboom.

Mr Notenboom, rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President, this draft falls into two parts. The first deals with VAT. The VAT base has proved to be higher than had been assumed in budgets preparing since 1979. This windfall means that even those countries which made their contributions in 1979 on the basis of Gross National Product are now getting another pay-out. The financial provisions dealing with VAT mean that adjustments are made to revenue in the year in which these differences are detected, that is 1980. The Commission has announced that it has already taken this higher VAT base into account in its estimates for the 1981 preliminary draft budget. The VAT rate for 1980, backdated to 1 January is now being reduced from 0.7216 % to 0.6951 %, which means that the amounts due from the Member States for own resources from VAT in the financial year 1980 are now lower. A bit of a windfall for the Member States, Mr President. I would like to point out that in the written explanatory statement to the motion for a resolution I have tabled on behalf of the Committee on Budgets, there are a number of questions which have in the meantime been answered, so that my verbal statement can now partly replace the written one.

The second part of this draft supplementary budget deals with the net increase in customs duties and agricultural levies for 1980. The customs duties will probably bring in an extra 332 million EUA, and the agricultural levies 199 million less. This will mean an overall increase in revenue of 133 million. Yet another windfall. The European Commission has drawn the necessary conclusions — as permitted under the financial regulations — and has proposed amendments to the current budget. It was not considered necessary to adjust the 1981 figures. If we subtract from the 133 million the 10 % due to the Member States for collection, that leaves a net sum of 119.7 EUA. This brings me to the political aspect of this draft: the Commission and the Council want to use this sum, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, to finance part of the advance for the United Kingdom provided for in the appropriate regulations. The Council has now decided on a net advance of not more than 200 million EUA from the 1980 budget. The Committee on Budgets withdraws none of its objections both to the procedure used to pass the regulation on the British contribution problem and to the content of that regulation, but this advance is provided for by a regulation which has now been adopted in due legal form. The rest of the advance — this is only a part — will have to be

Notenboom

financed by appropriations which would otherwise lapse at the end of this year. The European Commission has again confirmed this and it is repeated in recital (d) of my motion for a resolution. This reflects the facts as we found them. This proposal caused the Committee on Budgets problems for various reasons. We did not know which projects this advance would be used to finance. That is no longer the case, ladies and gentlemen, because Commissioner Tugendhat and his staff complied with our request and gave us the necessary information and the Commissioner willingly answered all our further questions on the matter. The projects to be financed are in Wales and North-West England.

The Commission has also promised that budgetary and financial control will be exercised on these advances, in accordance with the provisions of the Treaty and the Financial Regulation, with six-monthly reports and the possibility of on-the-spot checks, etc. I would ask Mr Tugendhat to confirm this here in plenary session. That clears up one difficulty. The other difficulty our Committee initially had, ladies and gentlemen, was that neither the Commission nor the Council had realized the implications, for the 1981 budget, of the fact that part of the supplementary measures for the United Kingdom were being paid for from the 1980 budget, by way of an advance. After all, they must not be paid for twice. For obvious reasons our Committee was very concerned about this. The Council was so disappointingly cautious in the 1981 draft budget partly because there had come to be so little margin before reaching the 1% VAT ceiling on own resources, and now this margin is to be increased again in 1981. We took the view that this should also be made apparent. After our Committee had decided on this on Monday evening, the Commission put a proposal to the Council on Tuesday morning for a letter of amendment to the 1981 budget. The Council held a special meeting on Tuesday, and decided to submit a letter of Amendment No 2 to the 1981 budget, whereby the budget would be reduced as we requested by 119.7 million, the figure I mentioned a minute ago. I have never known the Commission and the Council to take such rapid and decisive action, and the majority of the Committee on Budgets therefore decided to try to adopt this draft at one reading. Of course we have the right to propose amendments. We even have the right, in view of the 45 days allowed by the Treaty, to postpone discussion. But since the Council complied with our request, the Majority of the Committee on Budgets proposes making no amendments or modifications and, if the House agrees, I would ask the President to declare the amending and supplementary budget No 1 for 1980 adopted. May I ask you, Mr President, to pass on this request to Mrs Veil. If, then, our Committee has decided not to amend the remarks to Article 580, to the effect that it should be classified as non-compulsory expenditure, that does not mean to say that the Committee is not of that opinion. The Committee on Budgets still maintains that this is non-compulsory

expenditure and states this twice in the motion for a resolution. But such an amendment would entail a second reading, and this would mean that the cash benefits for the Member States would be delayed and the advance to the United Kingdom would be postponed as well, while Parliament would perhaps lose a slight advantage in its negotiating position on the 1981 budget in December. If the supplementary budget is adopted now — and we support this — it will be due recognition of the gesture the Commission and Council were willing to make this week, and will show that Parliament too can take decisions quickly. This will also demonstrate that we do not always need to insist on every last detail of the Treaty provisions and will contribute to the negotiating climate at the conciliation meeting on the 1981 budget next Monday between delegations from this Parliament and the Council.

That is what the Committee on Budgets opted for. And in fact this was the reason why Mr Dankert withdrew as rapporteur. Personally I was sorry he did that. I did not feel it was necessary, but we must respect his decision and so, as Vice-Chairman of the Committee on Budgets, I took over the position of rapporteur this week. We hope, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, that this procedure will, if the House adopts our motion and acts accordingly, help to achieve better results for the 1981 budget, in the sense that there will be much more room in it for non-compulsory expenditure. The Committee on Budgets is therefore almost unanimously in favour of Amendment No 1 by the Socialist Group to the motion for a resolution, which reflects this view.

President. — I call Mr Tugendhat.

Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission. — Mr President, after Mr Notenboom's speech, I can be very brief because he described the contents of the amending and supplementary budget in terms with which I completely agree and he also described the desirability of dealing with this matter quickly and expeditiously in terms with which I can agree.

As he said, the budget in fact consists really of two parts: there is the excess of VAT and GNP contributions which have been paid in by Member States and which we wish to repay to Member States as quickly as possible. If Parliament can take this matter in one reading then we can get that money back to the Member States before the end of this calendar year. And in the case of many Member States that means before the end of the financial year, which in turn will obviously help their own budgeting. It is, as Mr Notenboom says, a windfall for the Member States.

The second part concerning the customs duties and agricultural levies, where we also have rather more than we had expected, will go towards advances for the United Kingdom. And if Parliament can deal with

Tugendhat

this matter expeditiously, we will also be able to make the full advance to the United Kingdom that has been discussed. I say the full advance because we do not know of course how much the so-called *virement ouvert* — the open transfer — will actually yield, but so long as Parliament can deal with this matter in one reading we will be able to pay over as much as is obtainable under that resource. This in turn will mean that there will be more money available for the 1981 budget because obviously the United Kingdom does not get it twice over, and if money is paid over in this budgetary year it eases the pressure slightly, but none the less to a welcome extent, during the course of the next budgetary year . . .

Mrs Castle. — Mr President, could I ask a question on a point of information, please, at this point in the Commissioner's statement, which I think as it stands might be misleading?

President. — Well, I will take that then if Mr Tugendhat is prepared to accept it.

I call Mrs Castle.

Mrs Castle. — Mr Tugendhat has given the impression that it is essential to rush this through today in order to get the advance payment to the United Kingdom in 1980. Would he not confirm that even if Parliament were to pass some Socialist amendments which would necessitate a second reading in December, it would still be possible to pay the United Kingdom her advance in 1980?

President. — I call Mr Tugendhat.

Mr Tugendhat. — Mr President, the right honourable lady has concentrated entirely on the British aspect of the matter. I did not in fact say what she said. I did not say that it was essential for Parliament to pass this matter quickly in order that the United Kingdom could get the maximum advance; I said it was desirable to pass this budget in one reading, first of all so that the Member States which have paid an excess of VAT and GNP contributions should get their money before the end of the year. If this budget is not dealt with at one reading then they will not get the money before the end of the year.

Then I came to the United Kingdom and I said that if this budget is passed in one reading it will certainly enable us to be quite sure that we can pay over the full amount of the advance that is available. If the budget is not passed at one reading, it will be very much more difficult for us to do so.

I cannot say absolutely that we would be able to and I cannot say absolutely that we would not be able to,

because obviously we would try. But it would certainly be very much more difficult. But we would not be able to pay the other Member States — and there are after all eight other Member States in the Community — the money to which they are entitled under this heading.

Returning to Mr Notenboom's speech: he said that Parliament had been worried about the time the Council might take in terms of altering the 1981 budget and he explained that Parliament had insisted that, rather than waiting until the New Year to alter it, the matter should be altered straight away. He also said, and again I agree with him, that the Commission and the Council had moved as rapidly as they possibly could. We put forward a proposal; the Council acted on it and between the meetings of the Committee on Budgets on Monday evening and Tuesday evening what Parliament wanted done was done. I am delighted to see that the other arm of the budgetary authority as well as the Commission are able to move with that degree of celerity in response to the demands of Parliament.

He asked me whether I could confirm that the points made in the Socialist draft amendment concerning the reports to Parliament on the implementation of the appropriations and on the checks, etc. would occur in any case. I can only repeat what I said in the Committee on Budgets yesterday where I said that particular amendment is entirely unnecessary in order to achieve its objective, because we are in fact bound by the terms of the regulation, as well as by the Treaty, to do exactly what that amendment demands, and we shall be doing in any case. We shall be making the checks and Parliament will have the opportunity to carry out its twice-yearly checks on what we have been doing. So everything that is in that amendment will in fact be done in any case and I can confirm therefore exactly what Mr Notenboom has said.

He also drew attention to the fact that the committee had been uneasy about the extent of the information which it had concerning the actual purposes to which the money would be put in the United Kingdom and he said that we had therefore made a good deal of information available to the committee. That is indeed true. We went as far as we possibly could consistent with our own responsibilities as the executive arm. We did provide as much information as we could and I am grateful to Mr Notenboom for acknowledging it.

I would therefore conclude, just as he did, by asking Parliament if it could deal with this matter in one reading, because I believe it would facilitate the budgeting of all the Member States and it would also make it slightly easier for us to deal with the 1981 Community budget as well. So I commend this matter to the House, Mr President.

President. — I call Mr Fich to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Fich. — (DK) Mr President, this is of course not a purely technical matter. The main problem in this context is the question of the United Kingdom contribution, the question of the advance payment. Allow me to remind you a little of the background because I have discovered that several members in other political groups evidently have short memories.

We had all agreed that the problem with the United Kingdom contribution was in reality a structural one which arose from lack of balance in the Community's policy and was therefore of course also reflected in the budget. Allow me also to remind all the groups that we therefore said that in reality this solution would not solve the problems. There is talk here of a financial mechanism which would defer the question for one or perhaps two years but by that time the problem will be just as acute if not more acute.

I think it is very important to remember that the issue has not been resolved. You recollect perhaps also that when a solution was arrived at on 30 May it was in the context of other issues which plainly showed that there was no question of a radical change in the budget but rather more of a political compromise entered into on various sides by politicians.

I would like to say on behalf of my group that none of us question the decisions which were taken. We wholeheartedly support the decisions which the Council took on 30 May; we stand by them fully in all respects. Allow me also to stress the fact that we uphold the Council Decision of 6 November that an advance can be paid this year. It is not at all that we contest — I want to make that quite clear since some people have called our motives into question.

For the sake of the background to this I would like to remind you of what we ourselves agreed on a month ago:

The European Parliament reiterates its anxiety at the absence of adequate control procedures... reaffirms the principle that any expenditure arising from the supplementary measures in favour of the United Kingdom should be non-compulsory.

That is what we agreed a month ago.

What then is the situation today? Well, now we must follow up what we agreed, what we said a month ago. In other words we must agree to make this non-compulsory expenditure and to introduce some better control measures. That is precisely what the Socialist Group proposes. There is nothing new in our proposal for an amending and supplementary budget. We are simply repeating what we all decided a month ago. But we also made a third proposal, draft amendment No 1 to the draft decision. We propose that the money which we save through this procedure in 1981 should be used in areas which Parliament itself considers as priority areas. There can be nothing new in that either.

Thus we in no way wish to block the whole process. We simply want to make very clear what we decided a month ago.

What would the consequences be if our proposal is accepted i. e. draft amendment No 1 on non-compulsory expenditure and draft amendment No 2 on controls?

In the case of draft amendment No 1 we want another discussion in December. But the Commission has already said very clearly in the Committee on Budgets that it does not want to create insuperable problems; it still wants to be able to pay the money to the United Kingdom before the year's end. I was somewhat surprised to hear Mr Tugendhat when speaking here hesitate as it were about whether this is possible. This statement does not tally with what we heard in the Committee on Budgets, since then it was very clear that the payment could be made. Thus even if we had a second discussion it would not block anything. What will happen if our draft amendment No 2 on control measures is passed? It will come up at the Council's next meeting which is on Monday and then the matter will presumably be definitively settled.

Thus it is quite obvious that we are in no way trying to obstruct matters. What we would like is to bring the question about whether these monies should be compulsory or non-compulsory into the consultation procedure on the 1981 draft budget. Permit me to remind quite a number of the members that we made this proposal during the consultation procedure on the 1980 draft budget but that Parliament itself did not agree on it. Your last chance of a debate on whether it should be compulsory or non-compulsory lies in approving the Socialists' proposals today.

Now what is likely to happen here today? I have no doubt that we will see an extremely interesting attitude on the part of the Christian Democrats. They will vote the exact opposite to what they agreed last month. And yet, it is not that straightforward. We will see that when votes are cast on the draft decision the Christian Democrats will vote one way and when they vote on the two proposals to amend the budget they will vote the opposite way — within an interval of five minutes presumably. This will be interesting indeed and it will back up my old theory that the Christian Democrats do not have a coherent policy. I will not indulge in speculations as to the reasons for this attitude; I will merely call attention to it.

Now of course in a few minutes I will be told that I am completely wrong. It will be explained to me at length that such is not at all the case. However, there is no point in discussing this in theory. We will be able to observe what happens in practice today and we will also observe it during the 1981 budget procedure. Then we will see if the Christian Democrat Mr Adonino, is ready to be consistent in his policy or not. The Christian-Democrats have every opportunity to

Fich

disprove what I am saying here. It will be interesting to see if they do so.

Finally, I again invite all those who are present during the voting, journalists or others, to watch closely how the Christian Democrats vote. I ask you to study the texts and note that at one moment they will vote for the monies to be non-compulsory and a moment later they will reject the same proposal. It is going to be interesting.

President. — I have had a request from the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group) for an electronic roll-call vote on this matter. I anticipate that the vote will take place in about 20 or 25 minutes.

I call Mr Griffiths on a point of order.

Mr Griffiths. — Mr President, could you tell me whether a bell will be rung in all the buildings used by Members in sufficient time to enable them to return to the Chamber to vote?

President. — The reason that I am giving this 20 minute warning is to enable the political groups to let their members know, if they wish to do so.

I call Mr Langes to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party.

Mr Langes. — (*D*) Mr President, our group will be voting in favour of settling the supplementary budget once and for all today in one reading. We therefore abide, Mr Fich, by the logic of our argument, which Mr Notenboom, the rapporteur, who is also deputy chairman of the Committee on Budgets, presented just now. I can quite appreciate that, as spokesman for the Socialists, you endeavoured to adopt a different course and that now in the plenary session you are once again attempting, by using amendments which yesterday were rejected by the Committee on Budgets and which you are putting forward once again today, to make good your defeat in Tuesday's ballot. Politically you are within your rights to do so but, even if it is your right, it is not necessarily logical to do so.

In my opinion, the logic lies with the majority in this House. And why is this? Ladies and gentlemen, the Commissioner and the rapporteur have already presented the facts of what is today being put to the vote. I can, therefore, confine myself to a few points. It was important for us as a Parliament to make it clear that, if the Council submits a clear and unequivocal statement on the 1981 budget within the short time it has, i. e. 20 hours, Parliament too is prepared to act quickly. We all know that in political life too there is some truth in the saying 'Well done is quickly done.' There is no question that it is good and right for the British economy — and this is something which we

must surely all be interested in, Mr Fich. There is no point whatsoever in still discussing the matter of principle raised by the British contribution! We have already reached a majority vote on the matter in this House and we feel that we must pursue a sensible policy with the British — and we should be quick about it.

However, if this is what we want, we must not keep on delaying the solution as it were by devious means, only to arrive at it on 17 December. That is not a policy; it is simply spinning things out. Just because a lot of people are not entirely satisfied they want to spin things out a bit. So I think — and this became obvious through what Mr Tugendhat said — that it is in our interest — and this applies to our group, too, even though we have no British representative in our ranks — for the 119.7 million EUA to be handed over to the UK immediately. And we can do this by the way in which we vote today.

Secondly, it is also in our interest as a Parliament because the budget estimate, which at the moment is once again with the Council after its first reading, is to be reduced, according to the letter sent by the Council the day before yesterday — and you too, Mr Fich, should be familiar with this — by 119.7 million EUA. Objectively speaking, this increases our room for manoeuvre. As you know, we requested a series of measures in the fields of energy and social and regional affairs during the first reading. Now, objectively speaking, we have more room for manoeuvre, and I also feel that we can make it clear to the Council during next week's discussions — and this is why we support this third amendment also — that we see the amount by which the general budget is now being reduced — because we can already pay back part of the UK contribution this year — as a margin within which Parliament's resources can be increased. This is a logical, sensible and consistent policy because it is one which can be implemented quickly. I always have the impression that the Socialists are only satisfied if everything takes a long time and is flogged to death for weeks on end. But then the aid would not be so effective. We have here two lots of aid, namely for the UK and for our 1981 budget. These are quite simply the reasons why we are in favour of it.

And so, ladies and gentlemen, I ask you to reject Amendments Nos 1 and 2 tabled by the Socialist Group because they are only acting as a stalling device and are helping neither the UK nor ourselves in our discussion on the 1981 budget. I ask all Members to make this clear in the roll-call vote. All those who want a prompt, consistent and effective policy — and for this I would like once again to thank the Council and the Commission — should today be satisfied with one reading and reject the amendments tabled by the Socialist Group.

President. — I call Mr J. M. Taylor, to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Mr J. M. Taylor. — Mr President, Mr Fich is right when he says that deeper, structural changes are needed in the Community budget to ensure that neither the United Kingdom nor Denmark, nor for that matter Italy or any country can in future find itself in a position in which it pays much more resources into the Community than it gets out. I agree: of course he is right. Where he is wrong, however, is when he says that the UK financial retrieval is the only issue. If the Socialists oblige us with their modifications to have a second reading, then the UK, as Mr Tugendhat has said in reply to the question from Mrs Castle, will get its money regardless; but that will not be so of the refunds to the other Member States — and does Mr Fich and do the Socialists really want that? By contrast, I would like to commend the realistic and helpful contributions made by, for example, Mr Langes, of the Christian-Democratic Group, and his colleague Mr Notenboom, who so skillfully took over the rapporteurship, at short notice when Mr Dankert, the Socialist, suddenly and rather inexplicably put it down.

We all appreciate that the background to this brief debate and the transaction of this important business is that two or three circumstances have come together in the closing stages of the budgetary year 1980. Almost a year ago, we were rejecting the 1980 budget, and now, perhaps a little surprisingly, it is paying to the Community a twilight dividend. The things that have made this possible, I suppose, are, firstly, that we have managed, at last, to do without an agricultural supplementary budget (and that is a darned good thing!); secondly the revenue has slightly exceeded the estimates, and that is fair enough; thirdly the Commission has spent slightly less than anticipated, and that is no great cause for concern. And so the opportunity has arisen to make refunds to the Member States, which is proper and appropriate, and a valuable opportunity has also arisen to make a 1980 instalment to the United Kingdom, which is bound, of course, to release corresponding funds in 1981, and that can only be of advantage to the Parliament in its budgetary margin of manoeuvre. The supplementary 1980 budget is constructive and sensible, and Parliament should adopt it in a single reading here in Strasbourg today.

While making that invitation and joining other colleagues who have said very much the same, may I say that it should not pass unnoticed that the only group in this Parliament who have made life difficult in the progress of this supplementary budget have been the Socialists. I should like to say a word for Mr Tugendhat, who dealt most patiently with their unending demands and requests, and I should like to say a word of appreciation to colleagues in other groups who allowed their ultimate tedium with the Socialists to be reflected in their votes on this matter when it was decided in the Committee on Budgets. This group hopes with some confidence, Mr President, that that pattern will be sustained in a single-reading vote here today.

(Applause from the right)

President. — I call Mr Gouthier to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Gouthier. — *(I)* Mr President, on behalf of the Italian Communist and Allies Group, I would just like to clear up one or two points which we feel are of vital importance. We have no objections whatsoever to the content of the agreements between the Community and England, and agree wholeheartedly that this Community aid should reach its destination as quickly as possible, so that it can achieve the best possible results. No-one would question this.

Certain questions of a political nature have arisen, however, which are of no small importance, and have already been brought up many times by this Parliament: the nature of this expenditure, which we maintain, and rightly, to be 'non-compulsory', and the question of Parliament's control. As for the nature of the expenditure which, as I said, we consider to be non-compulsory, I would like to remind you that you were not in agreement on the Socialist Group's amendments, that it is one thing to insert the concept of non-compulsory expenditure into the resolution, and quite another to enter it as a booknote in a balance sheet. Even after the assurances and explanations given to the Committee on Budgets by Commissioner Tugendhat, we maintain that in view of bearing the Socialist Group's amendment will have on Parliament's right of control it should be considered in a favourable light in that it underlines Parliament's function of control. We were, then, in agreement in the committee, as we are in this House, on the Socialist Group's amendments. All the more so, — in so far as these problems are of some importance — in view of what Mr Tugendhat told the Committee, that to vote on and to pass amendments, of this nature would not constitute serious obstacles to the expenditure.

We have the opportunity today to confirm positions which are, in principal, justified, political positions which affirm and re-enforce Parliament's powers: even more because — I repeat — it will not prevent the policies in favour of the United Kingdom from following their course and taking full effect.

President. — I call Mr Nord to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Nord. — *(NL)* Mr President, my group wholeheartedly supports Mr Notenboom's report. We also support the rapporteur's advice on the way to tackle various proposals for amendments and modifications. I would like to take this opportunity, on behalf of my group, to express our sincere gratitude to Mr Notenboom who, besides being vice-chairman of the Committee on Budgets, has so unexpectedly and at

Nord

such short notice taken on the job of rapporteur yet has carried out this so admirably and so fairly.

Mr President, our group wants to deal with this problem in one reading, in view of the concessions made by the Council and the Commission during the negotiations with the Committee on Budgets. It is important for the United Kingdom to have the money in question made available before the end of the year. If therefore, it is important for the United Kingdom to have these advances available before the end of the year, and for the other eight to have the cash benefits available before the end of the year, it is of vital importance for us in the Committee on Budgets for the famous 119.7 million involved here to be deducted from the 1981 budget, so that it can play some part in the 1981 budget negotiations between Parliament and the Council. This has, for reasons which we have not fully understood, caused quite a lot of problems in the Committee on Budgets. The Council, above all, found it much more difficult than we had expected to agree to hold an emergency debate to decide the matter once and for all. I would like here to thank Mr Tugendhat and the Commission for taking such prompt action in sending their rectifying letter, which meant that the Council met very quickly to approve this procedure. It seemed at one point in committee that we would have to refuse permission for a single reading, in view of the repeated objections raised to simply deducting 119.7 million from the 1981 budget. This was done and this has opened the way for the solution which you find in the Notenboom report.

Two further remarks. The first concerns the question just put by Mrs Castle, that is, if there were now a second reading, if one of the Socialist amendments were adopted, would this or would it not then obstruct the financial settlement of this case?

Mr Tugendhat replied that: perhaps it would, perhaps not, but he couldn't be certain either way. Mr Finch told us that Mr Tugendhat gave a completely different answer in committee, namely that it would cause no difficulty whatsoever. I must confess that, as far as I can remember, what Mr Tugendhat said in committee was a shade different from what he said here this morning, but in quite another sense. Because I distinctly remember his telling the Committee that it would be almost impossible. He even said, by way of example, that the necessary transfer of appropriations which would require the intervention of Parliament's Committee on Budgets, would probably not be able to take place, because he could not imagine that our Committee on Budgets would be ready to give its Christmas holidays for that.

I believe, therefore, that if we really want the United Kingdom to have this money in good time, this budget must be adopted in one reading, and we must not pretend that it would work just as well with a second reading. I do not think that is true.

My second remark concerns classification. We maintain that we are dealing here with non-compulsory expenditure. This is stated in our motion for a resolution, as it has been in previous resolutions. This is stated in our motion for a resolution, as it has been in previous resolutions. The fight goes on. Allowing this question to be dealt with in a single reading, certainly does not mean that we have altered our opinion.

To sum up, Mr President, we will therefore vote for the Notenboom report, against Amendment No 1 and proposed modification No 2 by the Socialist Group, which would lead to delays, but for Amendment No 1 by the Socialist Group to the motion for a resolution, because this amendment reflects precisely what we in the Committee on Budgets have been fighting for this week and, thanks to a large measure of cooperation, have succeeded in maintaining.

President. — I call Mr Dankert.

Mr Dankert. — (NL) Mr President, I can be relatively brief. First of all, I would like to stress my gratitude to Mr Notenboom, who had to take over an extremely tiresome task from me, at very short notice, and I would like to congratulate him on the admirable way he has done this. I felt, as rapporteur for the 1980 budget, that this time I could not defend the standpoint of the Committee on Budgets and so I withdrew as rapporteur for this supplementary budget for 1980. What actually happened? Last October, Parliament expressed its opinion very clearly in a resolution: if there was no agreement with the Council before the budgetary procedure for 1981, on the 'non-compulsory' classification with respect to expenditure on supplementary measures for the United Kingdom, it would negotiate with the Council, during the budgetary procedure, to try and enforce this non-compulsory character by an amendment. This was the opinion of the vast majority of Parliament. And I feel this means that as soon as the opportunity presents itself, as indeed it has, in an extremely concrete form, in these advances to the United Kingdom, Parliament must try to negotiate with the Council to establish this classification of 'non-compulsory expenditure'.

Mr President, this Parliament had to struggle for years with the Council to get the Regional Fund, which is a comparable type of expenditure, classified as 'non-compulsory'. We succeeded in doing this, but I believe that the somewhat cautious way in which we are tackling the present problem, is likely to mean that we will not succeed in establishing the 'non-compulsory' classification for the supplementary measures for the United Kingdom. This is why my group has tabled this amendment: we wanted to confront Parliament with the real dilemma, the question of how to get this classification through by negotiation.

The matter is somewhat complicated by the fact that the VAT repayments to the other Member States are

Dankert

also included in this supplementary budget. This shows at the same time how unwilling the Member States are to reimburse the United Kingdom from their own resources. In my opinion this refund is not at issue. My group is of this opinion too. But the fact that these VAT repayments are now included in the supplementary budget leads to the complaint that Parliament's refusal would in fact make the taxpayer suffer.

I find that a somewhat nonsensical point of view. The VAT money is in the coffers of the national banks. The national Finance Ministers have a free hand with it, until it is claimed by the Commission. The only problem which arises here, is, I think, of a technical bookkeeping nature. It is not a financial problem for the Member States. This leads me to think that all this talk about the damage which will be done by a second reading is not justified. Even if there were a second reading, the United Kingdom and the other Member States would have their money in time.

President. — I call Mr Notenboom to speak on a point of order.

Mr Notenboom, rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President, I think it is my duty to point out my views on proposed modification No 2. I cannot agree on the content. I have already spoken on this point. But in my personal opinion the Bureau cannot regard this as a modification but as an amendment, which thus needs 205 or 206 votes. If we were to consider this as a proposed modification, it would mean that this expenditure is regarded as compulsory expenditure, and Parliament has always maintained that it is non-compulsory expenditure. We would be at odds with ourselves, and even in contradiction with our earlier decisions. This is the opinion of your rapporteur.

President. — I call Mr Dankert.

Mr Dankert. — (NL) Mr President, I should like to pursue the point raised by Mr Notenboom, the classification of the proposed modification. Are we going to call it an amendment or a proposed modification? Two of the three institutions, Council and Commission, have taken the line that the supplementary measures for the United Kingdom are classified as 'compulsory'. Parliament is not prepared to try to force an amendment through during the budgetary procedure to make this expenditure non-compulsory. At least, I assume so. The result of the rejection, or non-acceptance, of the amendment is that there will be two institutions who consider the expenditure for the United Kingdom as compulsory. That means that in the Council, since it must be voted, it will stand as compulsory expenditure. So in fact, we can only submit a proposed modification and it is not necessary to submit an amendment.

IN THE CHAIR: MRS VEIL

President

President. — I call Mr Forth.

Mr Forth. — I would like to take this opportunity of commenting on one or two points that have been made, particularly by Mr Fich and Mr Gouthier. They emphasize the importance of Parliament, through the modification being proposed, in exercising parliamentary control over expenditure. I find this curious, because we were assured several times and in great detail in the Committee on Budgets by Commissioner Tugendhat that the Commission were in any case obliged by the existing regulations to provide exactly the sort of information and control that is asked for in this modification. On that basis alone, Madam President, I would suggest to the House that this modification is gratuitous, redundant and totally unnecessary. It is the kind of thing which I suspect may bring this House into disrepute if we keep covering ground which is already quite adequately covered in existing regulations, as we have been assured by the Commissioner.

Coming to the second point, we were told by Mr Fich and Mr Gouthier that if indeed we passed the amendments which were suggested today and forced a second reading, the Council meeting on Monday would, and I quote Mr Fich here, 'probably accept what we have done'.

Now really, Madam President, this is playing fast and loose with a very important matter. The Council, as Mr Notenboom pointed out earlier, has already moved very quickly and very considerably in our direction this week. To assume, as I think is being assumed, that they would as easily or as glibly do it next week is, I think, a very dangerous assumption to make. To ask the House to accept what is being proposed here by way of modification and amendment on that kind of basis really is not good enough. That is why I believe that we should not entertain either the modification or the amendment, but should for all the reasons given by colleagues here today, from the European People's Party and from my group, move to accept this, accept what is within it and get on with considering the really important issue of the moment, which is the 1981 budget itself.

President. — The debate is closed. The vote will now be taken.

On Article 580 of the draft amending and supplementary budget No 1 of the European Communities for 1980, I have Draft Amendment No 1, tabled by Mr Dankert on behalf of the Socialist Group, and Draft Modification No 2, tabled by the Socialist Group.

The Committee on Budgets is not in favour of either.

President

During the time we have to wait I should like to announce that we have asked the firm which installed the voting system to do what it can to restrict the waiting time between roll-call votes as much as possible. The work will be finished by January, thanks to the efforts of the Quaestors.

I call Mr Taylor.

Mr J. M. Taylor. — In welcoming what you have said about having the voting machine looked at, I wonder if you could also use your special prestige and influence as our President to have the whole question of the cost of these voting machines referred to the Committee on Budgets for a proper examination.

(Parliament rejected Draft Amendment No 1 and Draft Modification No 2 by roll-call vote)¹

(Laughter)

President. — The Committee on Budgetary Control has the file on data processing, which includes this subject.

We shall now consider the motion for a resolution.

(Parliament adopted the preamble and paragraphs 1 to 3)

After paragraph 3, the Socialist Group has tabled Amendment No 1 seeking to add the following paragraph:

Insists that the extra margin within the 1981 budget created by rectifying Letter No 2 should be used to increase resources available in Title 5 for the priorities in non-compulsory expenditure established by the European Parliament on 6 November 1980.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Notenboom, rapporteur. — *(NL)* In favour, Madam President.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 1)

President. — I note that the procedure laid down in Article 78 of the ECSC Treaty, Article 203 of the EEC Treaty and Article 177 of the Euratom Treaty has thus been completed.

Explanations of vote may now be given.

I call Mrs Castle.

Mrs Castle. — Madam President, I wish to explain why I voted for the two Socialist amendments to the budget. I did so because it is a question of maintaining Parliament's consistency. It is a question of daring to put into the budget the point of view you express in a motion for a resolution. It is no good having an attitude and being afraid to incorporate it in the budgetary instrument.

It is not a question, as Mr Taylor himself made quite clear in his remarks a few minutes ago, of preventing Britain from getting an advance payment on her rebate in 1980. That is not at issue; there will be a slight delay, but it will still be within the annual period. It is simply a question of ensuring that the money which goes to the United Kingdom is spent to the benefit of the British people as a whole.

(Applause from certain quarters on the left)

That is the issue — whether it will be spent and Parliament will see it is spent on the industrial, social and regional priorities of this Parliament; on creating new jobs and the whole issue this afternoon is whether Parliament can trust the assurances that the Commissioner said he has received.

Mr Notenboom has told us that the information was given to the Committee on Budgets by the Commission, and this seemed to reassure them. Well, I have some information for this Parliament which I hope will open their eyes to the fact that they are being conned. I have here a letter from the Department of Energy in my country in reply to a request for help for a firm which is closing down, with a consequent loss of jobs, of the collapse of textile machinery and requesting help from this Parliament to move into heat recovery work. This is the reply that was sent to my Westminster colleagues who raised the matter as I have done:

It is the British Government's intention that refunds to the United Kingdom arising from the May 30 agreement in Brussels will play an important part in reducing public expenditure and borrowing to acceptable levels. It will not, therefore, be possible to utilize these funds for new projects such as that being suggested by Stone Plat.

That is the evidence we are getting every day from the United Kingdom, and that is why I voted for the more rigorous control demanded by the Socialist Group because this Parliament is being conned and the cynicism of the British people about this Community grows when you let something like this go through unchallenged, when we at home know that this money is not being spent to create new jobs; on the contrary it is being spent to finance growing unemployment in Britain contrary to all the policies of this Parliament.

(Applause from certain quarters on the left)

¹ The detailed results of roll-call votes, which are all taken electronically, are given in the Annex.

President. — I call Mr Taylor.

Mr J. M. Taylor. — Madam President, the one thing that this Parliament, I have learnt, finds tiresome is the airing across its benches of national political differences.

Mrs Castle cheapens the debate by taking the opportunity of a so-called explanation of vote to wave her letter around and lose any limited sympathy she may have in this Chamber. She comes from a political background which has helped place the United Kingdom in its present difficult circumstances.

(Applause from certain quarters on the right)

During the course of the debate this morning the vast majority of this Parliament, including my own group, as the results of the votes clearly show, has seen fit to take advantage of the opportunity available in late 1980 to remit these monies to where they should go. Fortunately certain monies can go to Great Britain before the end of the calendar year. Certain other monies go back to the Member States who collect the own-resources of the Community. That is a proper state of affairs. Parliament has transacted its business well in a single reading under your presidency this morning. I am sorry that an occasion for explanation of vote has been disturbed by Mrs Castle's partisan politics. For the vast majority of this Chamber the work so far done has been work well done.

President. — I call Mr Martin.

Mr Martin. — *(F)* Madam President, I wish to say on behalf of the French Members of the Communist and Allies Group that we shall be voting against this draft amending budget. We have no intention of getting involved in the financial procedures in question. It is not a question of determining whether the contribution for the United Kingdom following the agreement of 30 May is part of the compulsory or non-compulsory expenditure.

We were forthright in our criticism of the 30 May agreement because we felt that Mr Giscard d'Estaing had given in to Mrs Thatcher. The bargain that was reached turned out to be a fools' bargain. We tabled an amendment in Luxembourg calling for the transfer of the appropriations allocated to the United Kingdom to the budget of the common agricultural policy. The amendment was rejected. We intend to be consistent, and so today we are going to vote against the appropriations allocated to Mrs Thatcher under the 1980 budget.

President. — I call Mr Ansquer.

Mr Ansquer. — *(F)* For the sake of consistency, ladies and gentlemen, we voted in favour of the draft amendment and the proposed modification which were put to the House just now.

The fact is we have stuck to the position we adopted when we considered the 1981 budget with regard to how to classify the British contribution. Furthermore, then and now, we hope that Parliament will exercise its full responsibility over this expenditure. We nevertheless support the draft budget. We were delighted to discover that we were richer, or less poor, than we thought, because the income from customs dues has been higher than the Commission's forecasts.

In connection with this — and I am speaking to the Commission now — we hope that these forecasts can be more accurate. This is the second time that the Commission has provided us with forecasts which have turned out to be wrong. I am not saying this just for the record, Mr Tugendhat, but for the simple reason that if the House is told that we are quickly running out of what we get from VAT, a number of Members use this as an excuse for systematic criticism of the agricultural policy, while others pontificate about non-compulsory expenditure. What I mean is that some people are tempted to veto certain non-compulsory expenditure which is nevertheless of great use with regard to industrial policy, energy policy or cultural policy.

The point is, Mr Tugendhat, I feel that the Commission ought to make more of an effort to achieve budget transparency, with a more accurate idea of income, and I hope that you will make every effort so that the MPs here have all the facts before deciding. Be that as it may, Madam President, the Group of European Progressive Democrats will vote in favour of the draft supplementary budget.

President. — I call Mr Bonde.

Mr Bonde. — *(DK)* Madam President, I am sorry that the electronic voting system is being improved because with the composition of the house being what it is this will detract from the excitement involved in voting. On the other hand I am glad that Mr Fich specified that he was speaking on behalf of the Socialist Group, because that gives me an opportunity to give an explanation of vote on Mr Fich's programme and to reflect the attitude of the Danish Government.

When, for example, Mr Fich says that he fully supports everything that was decided in the Council, this does not actually apply to the Council's decision that the contribution to the United Kingdom should count as compulsory expenditure. When looked at more closely, it emerges therefore that Mr Fich's support for the Council is not total but half-hearted and incomplete. On the other hand his programme is totally opposed to the Danish Government's attitude

Bonde

on this issue and also totally opposed to the EEC election programme of the Danish Social Democrats, because the party that Mr Fich represents when he is not standing here as a representative of the Socialist Group, namely the Danish Social Democratic Party, agrees according to its election programme with the People's Movement in opposing the transfer of more power to this Parliament. But to attempt to reverse the Council's decision regarding the compulsory nature of the contribution to the United Kingdom is in fact trying to transfer more power to this House. For this reason the representatives of the People's Movement cannot support the proposal put forward by the Socialist Group.

President. — I call Mr Balfe.

Mr Balfe. — Madam President, some of us voted against the amendments put down to this document. The agreement which was reached last year was quite specific in that it provided for an advance payment of monies to the United Kingdom in order to get a better balance of money within the budget. The opinion of some of us has been for some time that this money should be treated as non-compulsory. This point is covered in the resolution at point 3 of Mr Notenboom's resolution, where it says that we reaffirm the non-compulsory nature. There is therefore no need for an amendment on this matter. The draft modification which sought to lay down rules for this repayment is inappropriate since, if rules are to be laid down, they should be laid down for all monies paid out under the budget and the final amendment to the resolution, in the view of some of us, adding a final paragraph is quite improper. It is improper to add a paragraph which specifically pre-empts part of the money saved in this way.

We recognize, some of us, that this means that there is more room for an agricultural settlement next year. That is not what we are talking about. What we are talking about is the implementation of the agreement of last May. The right to spend that money, although it is difficult for some of us on these benches to accept, must finally rest with the sovereign government because, unlike many of our opponents, some of us in this Chamber believe that we should minimize the transfer of functions to this Assembly. Whilst we seek the possibility of influencing expenditure, and whilst we seek to keep it classified as non-compulsory, because all the other expenditure under these headings is so classified, there are some of us who cannot accept that there should be special restrictions set down for the United Kingdom which effectively transfer further sovereignty from there into this Assembly. And as such, to some of us, these amendments are unacceptable. Most of the reasons put forward for having two readings were, in my view, specious. We should get this budget out of the way. It was provided for under the procedure earlier this year. The sooner it is passed the better.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Motchane.

Mr Motchane. — *(F)* Madam President, unlike Mr Taylor I do not think that the airing of political differences here is tiresome. Indeed, I find it extremely soothing. What is more, it accounts for why I am going to offer a few words of explanation on behalf of my colleagues, the French Socialists.

The amendment and the proposed modification to the supplementary budget have just been rejected, which means that the budget procedure has now been completed. The French Members of the Socialist Group are pleased at this. The extra income from tax during the financial year can be used to cope ahead of schedule with some of the consequences of the decision of 30 May on the British contribution, and this means that the available resources will be greater for the 1981 budget. We felt that it was only common sense to get on as quickly as possible with the budget procedure in connection with this.

Unfortunately, we have noticed over the last few days two types of response which inevitably arouse fears. The first response — which was fairly widespread and echoed the feelings which led the House to adopt the attitude it did last December — was that with regard to this margin and these extra resources we should state quite categorically that we have no intention of spending as much as a penny of it on the farmers. If I may use an image from the farming world, Madam President, this is tantamount to lopping off the very branch we are sitting on. The French Socialists are very critical about structures and we cannot condone this wasteful attitude.

The second point is that a number of Members have tried to question the legal nature of this expenditure. This is not an appropriate reaction in our view because this is expenditure deriving from a special case which has nothing to do with normal budgetary procedure. For this reason, Madam President, we shall be abstaining from the vote on the motion before the House.

President. — I call Mr Rogers.

Mr Rogers. — Madam President, Mrs Castle, in her explanation of vote, demonstrated to the House the unreliability of the Conservative Government, which we all know anyhow, as British Labour Members, in maintaining their promises to the people of Britain. We do not have to go to second-hand letters; we simply have to believe what Mr Nigel Lawson, the Minister from the Treasury, said when he visited Brussels a couple of weeks ago in an attempt to brainwash British Members into supporting the Conservative Party line. As he said in a meeting with us, he asked

Rogers

for a cash return in order to reduce public expenditure in Great Britain. Now, quite frankly, as we said to him then and as I say now, I think it is immoral of the British Government, when we pay direct taxes under an international treaty for specific purposes, to ask for a straight cash return. And it really is a myth for people to stand up and say in this Chamber that Brussels determines the areas of public expenditure in the United Kingdom. I would remind my British colleagues that the submissions that go to Brussels come from local authorities in the United Kingdom and from government departments. British Labour Members are continually asking for more expenditure on regional and social matters and for areas that are affected by the closure of textile mills, steel mills and coal-mines. We should now follow the logic of our own arguments and cast our votes in that direction.

President. — I call Mrs Focke.

Mrs Focke. — (D) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I shall be voting against this resolution. This is the only way I have of expressing how very much I regret the way in which this House has handled this supplementary budget. By spinning out our decision on the supplementary budget, we would have had a means of bringing pressure to bear, a useful weapon to help push our own ideas through in the forthcoming discussions with the Council on the 1981 budget.

I am sorry that the House was neither united nor clever nor man enough to do this. We have missed our chance. More's the pity for Europe!

(Scattered applause from the left)

President. — I call Mr Fich.

Mr Fich. — (DK) Madam President, I was surprised a moment ago, when Mr Bonde gave an explanation of vote, that you did not immediately stop him. According to my interpretation of the rules of procedure explanations of vote cannot be used to make personal attacks.

I would like to point out that Mr Bonde did not join in the political debate, that he did not say anything about the Socialist Group's proposal during the whole debate but merely used the explanation of vote for a purely personal attack on me. I could answer him, answer with more damning examples, of which I can think of many. But since I still maintain that personal attacks have no place in an explanation of vote, I will refrain from doing so.

(Parliament adopted the resolution¹ — Applause from the centre and right)

President. — I call Mr Tugendhat.

Mr Tugendhat, *Member of the Commission.*
— Madam President, one word, if I may, in answer to Mr Ansquer, who talked about the Commission's accuracy. I place it on record that, out of a total figure of 8 000 million EUA from customs duties and agricultural levies, our inaccuracy amounted to 133 million EUA; and out of a total of 7 000 million EUA from VAT, our inaccuracy amounted to 261 million, although it was the first time the calculation had ever had to be done, as a number of Member States had only recently gone over to the system. I challenge any member government to beat us on accuracy on that basis!

(Applause from the European Democratic Group and from the Liberal and Democratic Group)

6. Urgent procedure

President. — I have received from Mr Enright and others a motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-612/80) with request for urgent debate, pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure, on the places of meetings for plenary sessions.

The reasons supporting this request for urgent procedure are contained in the document itself.

Parliament will be consulted on the request for urgent procedure at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

7. Right of residence of nationals of Member States in the territory of another Member State

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-506/80), drawn up by Mr Ferri on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee, on the right of residence of nationals of Member States in the territory of another Member State.

I call Mr Gonella.

Mr Gonella, *deputizing for the rapporteur.* — (I) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, on 17 April 1980 the European Parliament adopted the motion for a resolution contained in the report, drawn up on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee, concerning the proposal for a directive on the right of residence of

¹ OJ C 327 of 15 December 1980.

Gonella

nationals of Member States in the territory of another Member State.

On that occasion the European Parliament adopted three main amendments: an amendment to Article 1, Paragraph 2 (2), designed to extend the benefits of the proposed measures not only to the direct descendants of the holder of the right but also to 'any person whom the holder of the right of residence has an obligation to support or who is in practice dependent on the holder'; an amendment to Article 4, Paragraph 2, abolishing the requirement for proof of sufficient resources for students over 18; a third amendment, inviting the Council to adopt at the issue of the directive a recommendation concerning the adoption by the Member States of a system of treatment for stateless persons and refugees from third countries resident in the Community which would be as favourable as that applied to nationals of Member States in respect of right of residence, freedom of movement and right of establishment.

In the course of the interesting debate which Parliament held on this issue on 15 April 1980, Mr Davignon stated — and I quote — 'The Commission accepts the amendments proposed by the Legal Affairs Committee, subject to what I shall be saying presently about Article 4'.

The Commission of the Communities stated essentially that it could accept the first and third amendments I have mentioned, while reserving judgment on the second.

On 19 May 1980, in the document distributed to the Members of Parliament informing them of the action taken by the Commission on Parliament's resolutions, the Commission stated that it had been able to accept Parliament's amendments to the proposal for a directive.

On 27 May 1980 the Commission officially submitted the amended proposal for a directive, but neither the first nor the third amendment was incorporated in it.

On 2 October 1980 the Legal Affairs Committee, aware of the continuing importance of Parliamentary control after the end of the procedure for consulting Parliament, unanimously approved a text to be voted on by Parliament, after noting the amendment made by the Commission.

The Commission, in a memorandum attached to the working document (Annex IV), gave substantive reasons for its action.

Mr Davignon's letter of 8 October 1980 dealt exclusively with the problems relating to the right of residence as such.

Nevertheless, in the last few paragraphs of the memo-

randum accompanying that letter, the Commission explained that, having submitted one of the amendments — the first one — orally to the Council (which had already begun to examine the text of the proposal for a directive), it had noted that 'most of the Member States were opposed to this amendment' and had therefore not considered it necessary to submit it a second time in its amended proposal.

At this point let us go over all the details:

Firstly, we would point out that the Commission is bound by the statements made by it before Parliament. This is all the more true and necessary in the context of the Community's legal system.

Secondly, and from a more political viewpoint, the fact that the Commission informs us that it had orally defended the amendments proposed by Parliament without success, before a Council working party cannot be regarded as satisfactory, since the Commission committed itself before a plenary sitting of Parliament, and its commitment must be fulfilled by an official act.

The amendment of a proposal after Parliament has been consulted is specifically envisaged in the second paragraph of Article 149 of the EEC Treaty:

As long as the Council has not acted, the Commission may alter its original proposal, in particular where the Assembly has been consulted on that proposal.

The fact that such a proposal has its own status is a cornerstone of the Community legal system. Take, for example, the first paragraph of Article 149 of the Treaty, by virtue of which the Council approves or rejects Commission proposals by the majority laid down for particular cases by the Treaty, but can amend those proposals only by a unanimous decision.

The reasons I have outlined led the Legal Affairs Committee on 2 October 1980 — and we beg the Commission to note this too — to approve a sternly worded text, contained in the report before you.

However, on 21 October 1980 the Committee resumed consideration of the matter in the presence of Mr Davignon.

Mr Davignon informed us that the Commission would submit as soon as possible a second amended proposal to take account of Parliament's amendment relating to the concept of 'member of the family'. He explained to us — and the Commission representative will now have an opportunity to clarify this point — that the Commission had not intended to go back on the commitment it had given in this Chamber. We note this with great satisfaction and express our thanks to Mr Davignon.

In view of this new development, the Legal Affairs Committee decided to submit an amendment to the

Gonella

text which it had adopted, and I now urge you to approve this amendment. It involves a new version of the motion for a resolution. Firstly, it takes note with satisfaction of the second amended proposal submitted by the Commission, and secondly it calls on the Commission to abide by its decisions — and indeed the Commission does so in this second amended proposal.

The Community timetable means that this request is addressed in practice to the Commission which will take office on 5 January 1981. It is the result of Parliament's belief that Europe must be built through a frank and open dialogue among all our institutions, and especially between the Commission — the 'guardian of the Treaties' — and the Parliament elected by the peoples of Europe.

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

Vice-President

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

Mr Prout. — I would like first of all, Mr President, to congratulate Mr Ferri on bringing this matter before the House. There is no more resolute or dedicated guardian of our parliamentary rights than he. He understands so clearly that we must protect and nurture with the utmost zeal what powers we have. The successful conclusion of the isoglucose case will stand as a monument to his courage and vision and a landmark in the history of this institution. We are, Mr President, all of us trustees of the constitutional powers of Parliament and we ignore them at our peril. Would that more of us were aware of it!

This time Mr Ferri is concerned about the constitutional status of undertakings given by Members of the Commission to this House before it votes, and he has, I am glad to say, had another success. It is a well-established principle that the Commission as a whole is responsible for the undertakings of its individual members. When one Commissioner gives an undertaking on Commission policy, it is a statement which reflects agreement between the Commissioners and binds them collectively. In this case the Commissioner in question undertook that the Commission would amend its proposals in two respects, both of which conformed with Parliament's views. Had he not done so, the subsequent vote by this House on the motion for a resolution might have taken a different course or might not have taken place at all.

Now this is not the first time that Parliament has debated this principle. The House will recall the

debate of 22 May on product liability which raised an identical issue. This matter has of course, yet to be resolved. On this occasion I am very happy to say that Mr Davignon, with a courage and generosity which we all admire, has persuaded the Commission of its duty to adopt Parliament's amendment. His action is a recognition of the Commission's constitutional duty towards us.

I should add in conclusion that my group was opposed to both these amendments, but we support wholeheartedly the Ferri report because we believe that the constitutional rights of this House are more important to us than our own political self-interest.

President. — I call Mr De Gucht to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr De Gucht. — *(NL)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to make a few comments on Mr Ferri's motion for a resolution, which are relevant not only to this particular case, but to the functioning of Parliament as well.

The practice of inviting representatives from the Commission to committee meetings, for discussion, is an excellent one. The Commission as originator, and the European Parliament, as advisory body, can and must work together, to achieve good Community legislation. The argument that the two institutions have less power than the Council in the decision-making process is without foundation. But this is the very reason why, now more than ever, we need to institute consultation, as a formal procedure, and continue to work together in a spirit of mutual trust.

With regard to the problem of the Ferri report, it was very remiss of the Commission to state in writing that it could support Parliament's amendments, and then fail to do so. This did nothing to improve cooperation and trust between the Commission and Parliament.

May Parliament continue to safeguard the construction of the Community. Our Parliament can, as representative of the people, assess the present state of affairs better than any other European institution. The European Commission has undertaken to repair its mistake. There is, therefore, no need to keep on about it, and with regard to this proposal for a directive, make matters worse. Mr Ferri's original text was somewhat forcefully worded, but this has now been modified, and we can therefore give our approval. However we must make it clear that if Parliament is to function effectively in the future the Commission is obliged in every respect, to comply with the written and unwritten rules of the EEC Treaty.

The authority of this Parliament is extremely limited, and it is for this very reason that we must all play the

De Gucht

Community game correctly. I want to say finally, Mr President, that this Assembly has every interest in organizing and instituting a real follow-up to its activities. This report constitutes the most positive move in that direction.

President. — I call Mrs Macciocchi to speak on behalf of the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members.

Mrs Macciocchi. — (I) It may be Mr President, that all's well that ends well, and that there has been much ado about nothing, but I would prefer to say — to continue in the Shakespearean vein — that, on the contrary, there has been much ado about something, and something of great importance at that, because, as Mr Gonella has pointed out, this is the first time that the Commission has presented a proposal for a directive which has been modified a second time as a consequence of Parliament's reaction, after the explicit statements by the Commissioner who had accepted our proposals and our votes in this House. Viscount Davignon, like a true viscount, stressed that he stood by what he had said before, he has therefore been true to his word as befits a man of his noble rank.

It may be, therefore, that this debate is unnecessary, but it has come at an opportune moment since we find ourselves on the eve of the coming into office of the new Commission on 5 January 1981 — as Mr Gonella has mentioned — and all this is clearly a warning that this Parliament will no longer tolerate changes being made to decisions taken here. We should like the new Commission to know, when it takes up its duties, that we shall use all the means of defence at our disposal, not excluding a possible motion of censure. We are motivated neither by anger nor by spite, but by the awareness that Parliament runs the risk of being immobilized by the Commission. This debate is therefore basically a kind of farewell to the old Commission, but it is also a welcome — a cautious welcome — to the new Commission, to tell them that we are on our guard and that it should be on its guard too.

President. — I call Mr Buttafuoco, a non-attached Member.

Mr Buttafuoco. — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, laws, regulations, measures and decrees institutionalize — at least that is the intention of those who create them — the needs which gradually arise in human affairs. And when this fails to happen as a result of blatant bad faith — tangibly displayed here by no less a body than the Commission — it is humiliating not only for the dignity and prestige of Parliament but also and above all because the question essentially relates to inalienable human rights.

In this context, I congratulate the Legal Affairs

Committee on the fact that the Ferri report fully satisfies those who, like me, have concerned themselves greatly with their compatriots who have emigrated for work or study purposes, or as a result of a free choice.

This need to improve legislation which is intended to make bureaucracy more flexible towards those who have made the sacrifice of leaving their own country undoubtedly complements earlier initiatives — and the observations made here by Mr Gonella are very proper and worthy — and it also fills a gap and is an essential step in the process of integration of the peoples of Europe. I come from Sicily, the homeland of emigrants who have contributed by their labour to the economic development of many countries, and I remember seeing some of them leave for distant places in total ignorance of the country where they would be working, often imperfectly speaking their own language, and seeking abroad the social recognition which was denied to them in their own country by circumstances beyond their control. Mr President, these are the real heroes of modern times, and they have an inalienable right to be welcomed by the country to which they contribute with their labour and their intelligence, in the best way possible, that is in the same way as the citizens of that country. We must therefore ensure that they can exercise as many civil rights as possible. Their dignity must remain intact and never be impaired by any measure. Particularly today, when the integration process is gaining ground especially by its own intrinsic and irreversible force and through the merits of these workers themselves, such a measure would no longer have any *raison d'être*. It seems to me rational to believe that European unity will come about above all by feeling that we are Europeans and behaving accordingly.

The political value of this initiative and its aims is enormous. The right of residence cannot be limited except for reasons of public order, safety or security. This aim must therefore have top priority for the sake of Europe's future. I particularly wished to stress the human aspect of these measures, because, apart from the social structures, we must not lose sight — I repeat — of the improvement of living conditions for the individual, since Mr President, the human aspect is the basis of any political solution.

President. — I call Mr Cheysson.

Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission. — (F) Mr President, after many meetings between, on the one hand, the Legal Affairs Committee and the European Parliament and on the other hand, the departments of the Commission and my colleague, Mr Davignon, this matter has now been clarified.

The Commission has entirely accepted the Parliament's standpoint on the definition of the members of a family, as can be seen from the second amended draft of 22 October, and the Commission maintained

Cheysson

before the Council — and it will continue to do so — that it must be possible to extend the scope of the directive to all persons whom the holder of the right of residence has an obligation to support.

As for the problem concerning the rights of refugees and stateless persons, it is recognized in the motion for a resolution that it cannot be solved by means of the directive itself, since Article 235 is limited to citizens of the Community, but must be solved by means of a recommendation which is, both for the Commission and the Parliament, the logical consequence of the right of residence. Thus, as my colleague Mr Davignon stated on 2 October before the Legal Affairs Committee, the Commission finds itself in complete agreement with this Parliament, which is what Mr Davignon promised at the time.

Mr President, the debate which has just taken place does in fact have a bearing on a subject other than that very specific one which I recalled just now the great importance of which was stressed by the last Member to speak, since it is concerned with the relations between the Commission and Parliament.

It is not always possible for the Commission to undertake to follow a parliamentary committee or to follow the recommendations and the proposals of the European Parliament. But when it does so, it must keep to its commitments. And this is stated very clearly in paragraph 2 of the motion for a resolution before you: it must scrupulously honour the commitments which it has made and, consequently, if it accepts amendments adopted by Parliament, it must immediately amend the proposals concerned accordingly.

This is a formal statement and I am happy that it has been backed up at times amusingly — I shall not fail to report to my colleague, Mr Davignon, that Mrs Macciocchi was kind enough to stress his title of nobility — but more fundamentally, by this Parliament, and by the resolution which will, I hope, be adopted by this House.

President. — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

The proceedings will now be suspended until 3 p.m.

The House will rise.

(The sitting was suspended at 12.55 p.m. and resumed at 3 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR: MR DANKERT

Vice-President

President. — The sitting is resumed.

8. Votes

President. — The next item is the vote on the motions for resolutions on which the debate has closed.

We shall begin with the *von Alemann report (Doc. 1-442/80): Nuclear power-stations in frontier regions.*

(Parliament adopted the first three indents of the preamble)

After the third indent of the preamble, Mr Coppieters and others have tabled Amendment No 15 seeking to insert a new indent:

— having regard to the Commission proposal for a Council regulation introducing a consultation procedure for electric power-stations liable to affect the territory of another Member State (COM (76) 576 final) and to the Commission communication to the Council updating the explanatory memorandum which accompanied that proposal (COM (79) 269 final).

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mrs von Alemann, rapporteur. — (D) The committee would not have accepted this along these lines. I am against.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 15)

President. — On the fourth indent of the preamble, Mr Capanna and others have tabled Amendment No 16/rev. seeking to amend the beginning of the indent to read as follows:

updating its previous resolutions, in particular . . . (rest unchanged)

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mrs von Alemann, rapporteur. — (D) The committee was not in favour of this amendment.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 16/rev. and adopted the fourth indent of the preamble)

President. — Before paragraph 1, Mr Coppieters and others have tabled Amendment No 17 seeking to

President

insert the following new paragraph:

Complements and updates, by the present resolution, its opinion on the Commission's proposals to the Council for a regulation introducing a Community consultation procedure on the siting of power-stations.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mrs von Alemann, rapporteur. — (D) In my view, this motion is not an updated opinion on Commission proposals but on two resolutions. For this reason I am against the Coppieters amendment.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 17)

President. — I have three amendments on paragraph 1:

— Amendment No 38 by Mrs Scrivener and Mr Pintat seeking to delete the paragraph;

— Amendment No 33 by Mr Sassano seeking to reword the paragraph as follows:

Notes that nuclear installations are being constructed in increasing numbers in border areas, in which there may be substantial effects during normal operation and in the event of a major incident from the point of view of security, health protection and environmental conservation; such areas shall be specified by the Commission;

— Amendment No 2 by Mr Gendebien seeking to reword the paragraph as follows:

Notes that nuclear installations are being constructed in increasing numbers in border areas, and sometimes even only a few hundred metres from a neighbouring state (as in the case of Chooz-Givet).

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mrs von Alemann, rapporteur. — (D) The committee decisively rejected an amendment similar to No 38. Likewise, the committee cannot support Amendments No 33 and No 2. The answer is therefore 'no' to all three.

(Parliament rejected successively Amendments Nos 38, 33 and 2 and adopted paragraph 1)

President. — I have four amendments seeking to insert new paragraphs after paragraph 1:

— Amendment No 3 by Mr Gendebien:

Considers that such installations inevitably have repercussions on the environment, the water supply system, the atmosphere, on regional planning and the health

of the inhabitants of the regions concerned, which are situated in two or more Member or non-Member States of the Community;

— Amendment No 18 by Mr Coppieters and others:

Notes that at present neither the governments of neighbouring Member States nor the regional or local authorities nor the populations in those states liable to be directly affected are informed or consulted about plans to build such nuclear installations in border areas;

— Amendment No 19 by Mr Coppieters and others:

Notes that the consequences of an accident in a nuclear power-station may extend over a very wide area;

— Amendment No 4 by Mr Gendebien and others:

Also notes that the siting of nuclear power-stations in frontier regions is likely to be detrimental to good relations between authorities and inhabitants of neighbouring regions or States and to shake the confidence of the local population in the very concept of European integration.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mrs von Alemann, rapporteur. — (D) The committee rejects Amendment No 3 by Mr Gendebien, and also Amendment No 18 by Mr Coppieters and Amendment No 19. The same goes for Amendment No 4.

(Parliament rejected successively Amendments Nos 3, 18, 19 and 4)

President. — I have received from the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members a request for a roll-call vote on all the amendments to paragraph 2:

— Amendment No 39 by Mrs Scrivener and others seeking to delete the paragraph;

— Amendment No 5 by Mr Gendebien seeking to reword the paragraph as follows:

Therefore considers that no nuclear power-station should be constructed less than 50 kilometres from any of the Community's internal or external frontiers;

— Amendment No 6 by Mr Gendebien seeking to reword the paragraph as follows:

Therefore considers that the building of all nuclear power-stations in the frontier regions of the Community should be postponed until the most stringent Community safety standards have been adopted and a Community consultation and arbitration procedure devised and accepted by all the Member States;

President

— Amendment No 20/rev. by Mr Capanna and others seeking to reword the paragraph as follows:

Considers that when nuclear power-stations are built in border areas, urgently needed Community safety standards must be observed providing for mandatory consultation by means of a referendum among the populations concerned in order to facilitate the necessary concertation at Community level;

— Amendment No 1 by Mrs von Alemann seeking to reword the paragraph as follows:

Considers that Community safety standards should be defined as quickly as possible, thereby facilitating the necessary concertation at Community level;

— Amendment No 21/rev. by Mrs Bonino and others seeking to reword the paragraph as follows:

Considers that when nuclear power-stations are built in border areas, urgently needed Community safety standards must be observed in order to facilitate the necessary concertation at Community level, and recalling paragraph 20 of its resolution of 13 January 1976 (Walz report — OJ C 28, 9 February 1976, p. 14) invites the parliamentarians and the governments of the Member States, where they lack laws in that regard, to submit draft legislation authorizing unions of citizens and associations for the protection of the environment to realize their objectives with the means provided in a state under the rule of law.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mrs von Alemann, rapporteur. — (D) The committee is not in favour of Amendment No 39. Amendment No 5 is also rejected by the committee. The same goes for Amendments Nos 6 and 20/rev. As for Amendment No 1 — this is somewhat embarrassing because I am the author — adoption is recommended, since it represents a correction which proved necessary as a result of the vote in committee.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 39 by roll-call vote)

Mr Pannella. — (F) As happened in Luxembourg, Mr President, I sometimes get the impression that it is not the equipment so much as the way it is used which is at fault here. I know this equipment, and I find it incredible that we have to wait four or five minutes between votes.

President. — Mr Pannella, you were told just this morning by Mrs Veil that the equipment is to be improved. For the time being, however, its brain ticks over somewhat slowly.

I call Mr Beazley.

Mr Beazley. — Mr President, you said that you have been asked for a nominal vote by the Group for the

Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members. I think we have to have 21 Members and in view of the appalling delays that take place in such a method of voting, is it not necessary to ensure that we really have 21 Members who wish this type of vote?

President. — Mr Beazley, either 21 Members or a group can request this vote. The ballot is open.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 5)

I call Mr Herman.

Mr Herman. — (F) Mr President, in view of the results, could we not ask those who requested a roll-call vote to withdraw their request for the subsequent amendments?

President. — As there are going to be many more roll-call votes, Mr Herman, we have just calculated that we are going to need about 30 000 pages, which is roughly equivalent to the paper from all the trees in the *Parc de l'Orangerie* here in Strasbourg. I was waiting for the result of this calculation before asking Mr Pannella the same question you have just put.

Mr Forth. — Mr President, I am trying to make a helpful suggestion here. Would Members agree that the results of these roll-call votes, if the authors insist on pursuing them, should be distributed only to those who ask for them? I doubt if many of the rest of us would be greatly interested in the print-out result. That would save an awful lot of paper, I would have thought.

President. — Mr Forth, I have to follow the rules and they say that the results of a roll-call vote go in the minutes.

I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — Mr President, we are having a look to see how we can cut down on our requests for roll-call votes. We might be left with only three or four. Having said that, let me go on to say that I am somewhat dismayed by the rather intimidating, ideologically intimidating, nature of the procedure which has just been used.

We are told that all these amendments are going to lead to the destruction of the *Parc de l'Orangerie*. If you ask me, when we do our job as MPs, it is not to destroy the park but so that the proceedings here are really public, in accordance with the Rules of Procedure.

Pannella*(Mixed reactions)*

Be that as it may, we withdraw our request for a roll-call vote on Amendments Nos 1 and 21/rev.

President. — At no time, Mr Pannella, did I challenge your right to request a roll-call vote.

(Parliament rejected by roll-call vote Amendment No 6 and then Amendment No 20/rev., adopted Amendment No 1 and rejected Amendment No 21/rev.)

After paragraph 2, Mr Coppieters and others have tabled Amendment No 22 seeking to add the following new paragraph:

Welcomes the fact that the information about investment projects in the electrical energy production sector on which work is due to start within five years, which is needed as a basis for initiating a consultation procedure, is already supplied to the Commission under the terms of Council Regulations Nos 1056/72 and 1215/76.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mrs von Alemann, rapporteur. — (D) I am against, because the introduction of a new text and a new paragraph would cause confusion.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 22)

President. — On paragraph 3, Mr Gendebien has tabled Amendment No 7 seeking to reword the paragraph as follows:

Calls upon the Commission to urge all Member States to comply forthwith with the provisions of Articles 37 and 41 of the Treaty establishing the European Atomic Energy Community and to apply them in ample time for the procedure laid down to become operative.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mrs von Alemann, rapporteur. — (D) On behalf of the committee I reject the amendment.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 7)

President. — After paragraph 3, Mrs Lizin on behalf of the Socialist Group has tabled Amendment No 26 seeking to add the following new paragraph:

Requests the Commission to review the application of these articles, in particular with regard to the validity of the deadlines currently in force, which are too short to be effective.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mrs von Alemann, rapporteur. — (D) I think this amendment can be accepted. In the final analysis — and I think the House ought to realize this — it would mean an amendment to the Treaty, but I think it can be accepted. It fits in with the report.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 26)

President. — I have five amendments on paragraph 4:

— Amendment No 40 by Mrs Scrivener and others seeking to delete the paragraph;

— Amendment No 23/rev. by Mrs Bonino and others seeking to reword the paragraph as follows:

Confirms the position adopted in its resolution of 7 July 1977 (OJ C 183, 1 August 1977, p.56), and in particular paragraph 2, on the Commission's proposal to institute a Community consultation procedure for power-stations which may have repercussions on the territory of another Member State;

— Amendment No 41 by Mr Galland on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group seeking to reword the paragraph as follows:

Might well approve the proposal from the Commission for the establishment of a Community consultation procedure in respect of power-stations likely to affect the territory of another Member State, but points out that such a procedure cannot be envisaged until all the Member States of the Community actually implement a nuclear power policy;

— Amendment No 34 by Mr Sassano seeking to reword the paragraph as follows:

Welcomes the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities for the establishment of a Community procedure for advance information and consultation . . . (rest unchanged);

— Amendment No 8 by Mr Gendebien and Mr Coppieters seeking to reword the paragraph as follows:

Welcomes the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities for the establishment of a Community consultation procedure in respect of power-stations likely to affect the territory of another Member State, and regrets that the Council has not yet adopted it.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mrs von Alemann, rapporteur. — (D) The committee is not in favour of Amendment No 40, nor revised

von Alemann

Amendment No 23. The same goes for Amendment No 41. Amendment No 34 is also rejected, and perhaps I could explain why. There is reference to only one heading, which cannot be changed in the text now. I mentioned only the heading in the original motion. Amendment No 8 can be accepted. Mr Davignon also thought it was a good idea when he spoke about it the day before yesterday.

(Parliament rejected successively Amendments Nos 40, 23/rev., 41 and 34 and adopted Amendment No 8 and then paragraph 4 as amended)

President. — After paragraph 4, Mr Sassano has tabled Amendment No 35 seeking to insert a new paragraph as follows:

Stresses that wherever necessary in the planning, building and operation of installations all the Community regulations should be observed and, pending such regulations, the most restrictive regulations among those applying in the Member States concerned in relation to health protection, safety and protection of the environment.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mrs von Alemann, rapporteur. — (D) I do not think we can accept this amendment because it would ultimately cause a long delay and lead to a big debate. There would be tremendous argument among the experts about which were the most restrictive regulations. I am therefore against the amendment.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 35)

President. — I have four amendments on paragraph 5:

— Amendment No 43, tabled by Mrs Scrivener and others on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, seeking to delete the paragraph;

— Amendment No 24 by Mr Coppieters and others seeking to reword the paragraph as follows:

- (i) Calls on the Council to adopt as soon as possible the proposal for a Council regulation submitted to it by the Commission in December 1976, and to include in it the principles set out under (a) to (h) below:
- (ii) Calls on the Commission to amend without delay its proposal of December 1976 for a Council regulation, to incorporate the principles set out under (a) to (h) below:
 - (a) besides informing Member States annually of the list of planned installations communicated to it, the Commission shall also publish a list containing, in particular, the facts about sites and type of installation; this publication shall be considered compatible with the obligation to confidentiality in Article 4 of

Council Regulation No 1056/72;

(b) Member States shall initiate the consultation procedure if invited to do so by elected local or regional authorities in areas adjacent to the proposed sites;

(c) the Commission, in drawing up its opinion, shall take account of submissions from Member States which consider they are affected by projects, of submissions from local or regional authorities or legally constituted groups of citizens, and of the results of referenda or other popular consultations relating to the projects in question;

(d) the Commission, in its opinion, may propose modifications to the project; it may give a negative opinion; its opinion must be motivated in detail;

(e) if the Commission gives a negative opinion, the Member State on whose territory the project is situated may ask for the application of an arbitration procedure;

(f) the arbitration procedure, initiated by the Commission, shall involve direct contacts between the Member State on whose territory the project is situated, the Commission, the Member State or States whose objections motivated the Commission's negative opinion, and, at their request, other Member States;

(g) if no conclusion satisfactory to all parties is reached by such arbitration, the Member State on whose territory the project is situated may ask the Council of Ministers for a weighted majority vote reversing the Commission's opinion;

(h) projects for which a consultation procedure under the terms of the Council regulation has been sought may not be initiated until that procedure has been completed;

— Amendment No 42, tabled by Mr Galland on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, seeking to insert the words *at the appropriate time before Calls upon the Commission and Council*;

— Amendment No 27, tabled by Mrs Lizin on behalf of the Socialist Group, seeking to reword the paragraph as follows:

Calls upon the Commission and Council to supplement this proposal for a regulation with binding provisions, including the possibility of prohibition, to cover cases where ... (rest unchanged).

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mrs von Alemann, rapporteur. — (D) The committee is against Amendment No 43, and also against Amendments Nos 24, 42 and 27.

(Parliament rejected successively Amendments Nos 43, 24, 42 and 27 and adopted paragraph 5)

President. — I have three amendments on paragraph 6:

President

- Amendment No 25 by Mr Capanna seeking to delete the paragraph;
- Amendment No 44, tabled by Mrs Scrivener and others on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, seeking to delete the paragraph;
- Amendment No 9 by Mr Gendebien seeking to reword the paragraph as follows:

Underlines the vital role which the Commission has to play in this connection and urges it to show firmness and independence *vis-à-vis* both the governments of the Member States and the electricity companies.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mrs von Alemann, rapporteur. — (D) The committee is against Amendments Nos 25, 44 and 9. Mr Davignon has already made it clear.

(Parliament rejected successively Amendments Nos 25, 44 and 9 and adopted paragraph 6)

President. — After paragraph 6, Mr von Wogau has tabled Amendment No 14 seeking to insert the following new paragraph:

Calls on the Commission to draw up binding rules to ensure that information on incidents in nuclear power-stations in frontier regions is transmitted across frontiers in full, and in particular to provide for the establishment of representative bodies on which members of the public from both sides of the frontier are regularly informed on all current questions of safety.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mrs von Alemann, rapporteur. — (D) This aspect was thoroughly discussed in committee. The amendment should be adopted because it follows on logically from the previous one.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 14)

President. — On paragraph 7, Mrs Scrivener and others on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Party have tabled Amendment No 45 seeking to delete the paragraph.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 45 and adopted paragraph 7)

On paragraph 8, Mr Gendebien and others have tabled Amendment No 10 seeking to reword the paragraph as follows:

Calls for the uniform application throughout the Community of the 'polluter pays' principle in the event of trans-frontier pollution by power-stations and for the power-stations to be taken out of operation and dismantled if this principle is not respected or if pollution exceeds previously accepted Community standards.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mrs von Alemann, rapporteur. — (D) If we accept this amendment, it would mean in effect a moratorium. The committee is against.

President. — I call Mrs Lizin.

Mrs Lizin. — (F) Mr President, if Mr Gendebien would agree to delete the words *and dismantled* from his amendment, our group would be willing to vote in favour of the amendment.

President. — I call Mr Gendebien.

Mr Gendebien. — (F) I am willing to delete the words *and dismantled*, as Mrs Lizin suggests.

President. — The Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members has requested a roll-call vote on this amendment.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 10 by roll-call vote and adopted paragraph 8)

After paragraph 8, Mr Coppieters and others have tabled Amendment No 31 seeking to insert the following new paragraph:

Points out that in the event of trans-frontier environmental pollution caused by power-stations, the Member State and/or regional authorities concerned may be held responsible for possible compensation arrangements.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mrs von Alemann, rapporteur. — (D) Amendment No 31 now reads: *Points out that in the event of trans-frontier environmental pollution, and so on.* This is a bit too much for me at the moment. I have not been able to check this afternoon whether this is a legal position which exists in all countries in a general form as expressed here. I cannot therefore give the committee's opinion. We did not discuss the matter in committee.

President. — I call Sir Fred Warner.

Sir Fred Warner. — Mr President, I just wish to report that I have been disenfranchised. My light won't work. My machine won't work. I was therefore excluded from the last vote. I do not wish to be excluded from any more votes.

President. — Could you then, in the event of a roll-call vote, inform the Chair of your vote before the vote is closed if your machine does not work?

I have another request for a roll-call vote on Mr Coppieters' Amendment No 31, with the text as amended.

I call Mr Coppieters.

Mr Coppieters. — (NL) Mr President, I realize that nothing more can be said about the amendments. I merely want to say that the alteration to the text is connected with the fact that it is permissible in international jurisprudence to use the words *Points out*.

President. — I should not have allowed you to speak on that point. I thought you wanted to withdraw the request for a roll-call vote.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 31 by roll-call vote)

On paragraph 9, Mrs Scrivener and others on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group have tabled Amendment No 46 seeking to reword the paragraph as follows:

Requests the Council to require the Member States to undertake the necessary consultation in a bilateral context.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mrs von Alemann, rapporteur. — (D) The committee is against.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 46 and adopted paragraph 9)

President. — On paragraph 10, Mrs Scrivener and others on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group have tabled Amendment No 47 seeking to delete the paragraph.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 47 and adopted paragraph 10)

After paragraph 10, Mr Sassano has tabled two amendments seeking to insert new paragraphs:

— Amendment No 36:

Calls upon the Commission and Council to ensure that emergency plans concerning abnormal incidents at installations are prepared in advance, arranged and possibly implemented with the participation of the Member States concerned, while remaining the responsibility of the State to which the installation belongs;

— Amendment No 37:

Calls upon the Commission and Council to draw up regulations permitting the selection of sites for the location of nuclear power-stations within the Community.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mrs von Alemann, rapporteur. — (D) The committee did not discuss disaster prevention or emergency plans. Amendment No 36 could be incorporated in the motion in my opinion, but not Amendment No 37 since the planning authority of the States would be appreciably affected.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 36 and rejected Amendment No 37)

President. — I have three amendments seeking to reword paragraph 11:

— Amendment No 32/rev. by Mr Capanna and others:

Points out that the above procedures must be supplemented by procedures for fully informing and involving the population in good time and at all stages through elected bodies and non-institutional citizens' organizations for the protection of the environment;

the final decision shall be taken by means of a binding referendum on the construction of the installation;

— Amendment No 11 by Mr Gendebien:

Points out that the above procedures must be supplemented at all stages by procedures for fully informing and consulting the regional and local authorities and inhabitants; such consultation should be organized in each local administration area on both sides of State frontiers within a radius of 50 kilometres from the planned site of a power-station,

— Amendment No 48 by Mrs Scrivener and others on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group:

Stresses the need to keep the public fully informed at all stages of the procedure.

I have received from the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups

President

and Members a request for a roll-call vote on the first two amendments, Nos 32/rev. and 11.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mrs von Alemann, rapporteur. — (D) The committee rejects Amendments Nos 32/rev., 11 and 48.

President. — I call Mr Capanna.

Mr Capanna. — (I) Mr President, I should like to ask the rapporteur to explain why she cannot recommend the adoption of Amendment No 32/rev. The fact is that the first paragraph of the amendment states what has already been said in the motion . . .

President. — Mr Capanna, Mrs von Alemann replied as she thought fit in her capacity as rapporteur. We cannot start a debate on the matter.

I call Mr Veronesi.

Mr Veronesi. — (I) I request that the amendment be voted on in separate parts, i.e. that we have a separate vote on the two paragraphs.

President. — Mr Veronesi has requested a separate vote. Are we going to have a roll-call vote on each part?

I call Mrs von Alemann.

Mrs von Alemann, rapporteur. — (D) Mr Capanna is quite right, Mr President. The first part is the same as paragraph 11 of the motion. We have to consider the second part therefore.

President. — It is therefore pointless to have a separate vote.

I call Mr Veronesi.

Mr Veronesi. — (I) Can I ask, Mr President, that we vote only on the second part?

(Laughter and applause — Parliament successively rejected the second part of Amendment No 32/rev. by roll-call vote, Amendment No 11 and Amendment No 48 and adopted paragraph 11)*

President. — After paragraph 11, I have two amendments seeking to add new paragraphs:

— Amendment No 29 by Mr Oehler on behalf of the Socialist Group:

Calls upon the Member State authorities to involve as a matter of priority the local and regional authorities of the neighbouring State or States, through their elected representatives, in the planning stage of the siting of a power-station near frontiers as well as in any studies or public enquiries concerning the impact of such a project;

— Amendment No 12 by Mr Gendebien:

Invites the Commission to arrange for studies to be carried out on the impact of the construction of a power-station in each of the frontier regions concerned and for the results to be published.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mrs von Alemann, rapporteur. — (D) After the way we have just voted, Amendment No 29 would suit the motion. Amendment No 12, on the other hand, should be rejected.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 29; Amendment No 12 therefore fell)

President. — After paragraph 11, I have two amendments seeking to add new paragraphs:

— Amendment No 13 by Mr Gendebien:

Calls on the Commission and the Council to draw up and implement joint plans for the evacuation and protection of the inhabitants of frontier regions where a nuclear accident might occur;

— Amendment No 30 by Mr Oehler on behalf of the Socialist Group:

Calls on the Commission to recommend the Council of Ministers to take account of Resolution No 116/1980 of the Conference of local and regional authorities in Europe on the activities of local and regional authorities in respect of environmental protection with an eye to the development of nuclear energy.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mrs von Alemann, rapporteur. — (D) With regard to Amendment No 13, Mr Davignon has already said that the idea is good but that it is formulated in a manner which is too strong and subjective. I think it could be acceptable if it were amended as follows:

Calls on the Commission and the Council to draw up and implement joint plans for the evacuation and protection of the inhabitants of frontier regions in the event of disaster.

* Mr Pannella withdrew his request for a roll-call vote.

President. — I do not think we should discuss the wording during the plenary sittings. No one has the text in front of him. One small alteration can be accepted, but if a whole text has to be read out, I imagine it could simply confuse matters. I should like to ask you to comment on the amendment before us and not to make any suggestions concerning alterations. That should have happened in committee.

(Applause from various quarters on the right and centre)

Mrs von Alemann, rapporteur. — *(D)* If you do not accept this alteration, Mr President, I am forced to reject the amendment as it reads at the moment.

President. — I call Mr Gendebien.

Mr Gendebien. — *(F)* Mr President, Mr Davignon agrees with the gist of my amendment. The rapporteur simply wants to delete the last five words. I second her suggestion. It strikes me that this amendment raises an issue of common sense, and it would be to Parliament's credit if it were adopted.

President. — Mr Gendebien, we cannot have changes made to texts during sittings unless we have the proposed changes on paper before us. It is impossible unless we are dealing with isolated words.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 13 and then Amendment No 30)

On Paragraph 12, I have two amendments seeking to reword the paragraph:

— Amendment No 28 by Mrs Lizin on behalf of the Socialist Group:

Calls upon the Commission to submit an annual report to Parliament concerning experience of the application of Articles 37 and 41 of the Euratom Treaty ... (rest unchanged);

— Amendment No 49 by Mrs Scrivener and others on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group:

Calls upon the Commission to submit an annual report to Parliament concerning experience of the application of Article 37 of the Euratom Treaty (rest deleted).

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mrs von Alemann, rapporteur. — *(D)* In favour of Amendment No 28. It was simply an oversight that this was not mentioned. But against Amendment No 49.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 28; Amendment No 49 therefore fell; Parliament adopted paragraph 12 as amended and paragraph 13)

President. — Explanations of vote may now be given.

I call Mr Turcat.

Mr Turcat. — *(F)* Ladies and gentlemen, I am afraid that the motion for a resolution and several votes expressed here are based on an error and two points of confusion. It is an error to think that we are living with the threat of an atom bomb inside nuclear power stations. This is not true and it generates unjustified fears and gives rise to the two points of confusion. The first is that we should be reserving special treatment for nuclear power stations compared with all industry, which is often a much greater source of pollution. The second point is that it is wrong to imagine that the Community procedures are going to provide a solution for problems which in fact directly concern the population and which have to be settled through bilateral agreements. We shall be voting against the motion on account of this.

(Applause from the Group of European Progressive Democrats)

President. — I call Mr Capanna.

Mr Capanna. — *(I)* I am forced by the majority in the House, Mr President, to vote against this motion — and I should do so with both hands if I could. Let me explain. I said at one point during the debate on the von Alemann motion that I considered it decisive for democracy. I was referring to the opportunity of giving the people concerned in frontier areas, where nuclear power stations might be built, ample opportunity — and this means a referendum — to express their views. If this is not the case, Mrs von Alemann, it is senseless to say in paragraph 11 that the population has to be involved, unless they are going to be given the opportunity to express their views in a thorough, direct and responsible manner.

I do not think I am being biased if I say that the nuclear lobby which forms the majority here clearly intends to build nuclear power stations in frontier areas as well, regardless of the yea or nay of the people. This strikes the very meaning and principle of democracy. For this reason, especially, I am forced by the majority to vote against the motion.

President. — I call Mrs Bonino.

Mrs Bonino. — *(I)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I shall be voting against the motion but for

Bonino

reasons diametrically opposed to those expressed by Mr Turcat earlier. I feel there is a basic ambiguity in this report and in the motion. On the one hand, with regard to the siting of nuclear power stations, there is recognition of the need for Community safety standards and special procedures. On the other hand, however, there is nothing specific about procedures for informing the population involved, about the relevant consultation and, above all, about the Community safety standards which in any case have still to be established. In actual fact, this report allows people to go on building nuclear power stations in frontier areas while we are still waiting for Community safety standards.

I think we ought to reject this basic ambiguity whereby we say we need special procedures while at the same time we go on building nuclear power stations regardless of these non-existent procedures. If we all think that there have to be Community standards — and I think we do — we first have to draw up these standards and then site the power stations, and not the other way round.

President. — I call Mrs Lizin.

Mrs Lizin. — (*F*) Mr President, I just want to say that we shall of course vote for Mrs von Alemann's motion as amended.

I want to add that this presupposes that the Commission puts the final touches — and fairly quickly, I hope — to its draft regulation along the lines called for by our committee. However, since the regulation is on the agenda for the next Council meeting — and I think we have to thank the Presidency for that — we also have to hope that one of the Member States, whose representatives here have unhappily made their presence felt with negative votes, does not succeed in again preventing the Council from reaching a decision on this vital matter.

President. — I call Mr Coppieters.

Mr Coppieters. — (*NL*) Mr President, in spite of the gross inadequacies of this motion, which I mentioned during the debate, and the lamentable fact that specific amendments were rejected, I still intend to vote in favour of the motion since I feel that the adoption of some amendments indicates some progress. I do admit that my amendment on paragraph 5, Amendment No 24, perhaps went into too much detail, but it was nevertheless relevant. I shall table this amendment again in the form of a motion.

President. — I call Mr Seligman.

Mr Seligman. — Mr President, after a great deal of thought, I and most members of my group have

decided to vote in principle in favour of the von Alemann resolution. We do not do this lightly. We realize that there may be a delay to part of a Community nuclear power programme caused by this report, but because we are basically pro-nuclear we think the public living near power-stations should be fully informed and satisfied that all necessary precautions have been taken, whichever side of the frontier they live; otherwise, public opposition will grow.

The key paragraph is No 5. As we read it, this does not give power to the Commission to arbitrate in any way. It calls on the Commission and Council to devise a normal regulation, which will come to Parliament for debate in the normal way, to cover cases where there is no agreement between States. On the Council, any country will have the normal right to veto any unacceptable regulation. For that reason, we saw no reason to oppose paragraph 5.

Basically, we support von Alemann because we want nuclear power to have the full confidence of all the people and all nations.

President. — I call Mr Collins.

Mr Collins. — Mr President, I must say, first of all, how much I regret my committee's failure to give an opinion to the Committee on Energy and Research on this particular matter, because this is a report about public safety and about environmental safeguards. And I must admit that I quail at the thought of the environmental damage we have caused today by the destruction of the number of trees needed to reproduce the recorded votes.

(*Applause*)

This is about pollution and about safety standards, and I think these transcend national boundaries and demand international action. We see the essence of the problem when it is illustrated by those amendments which have sought to contain and restrict the action asked for by the rapporteur, and I wonder whether the European Community can ever realize its social ideals if Member States continue to be motivated by nationalistic considerations. Frankly, the real will for European cooperation is cast in doubt by these manoeuvres, and instead we have a collection of self-centred, self-interested nation-States influenced more by their own vote-catching need in presidential election years than by anything else.

The will for cooperation is sometimes just not there, and this is yet another example of the kind of delaying tactics we saw in the case of the Seveso directive. Although I do not think this report is perfect, I shall vote for it, because I think that unless we are prepared to look beyond these narrow, nationalistic considera-

Collins

tions, the safety of the workers and the health of the environment will continue to be in jeopardy. I hope the Council will not only accept this but will also take steps to unlock the Seveso directive as well.

President. — I call Mr Gendebien.

Mr Gendebien. — (*F*) Mr President, I shall abstain. I agree, the report indicates a certain amount of progress and I am glad of that. On the other hand, however, the text which has been adopted still harbours a fair number of ambiguities and it is not going to stop the siting of nuclear power stations in frontier regions, with all the hazards this implies for health and for the environment.

President. — I call Mrs Weber.

Mrs Weber. — (*D*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we have voted on a proposal which provides us with an instrument for intervention in important cases. But I do feel that the instrument is blunt. I should have been happier if it had been a bit sharper, for example, if we had managed to incorporate the possibility of a ban in paragraph 5. I just hope that the Council — and I am quite earnest in my plea — will at least make use of this blunt instrument and not knock it out of our hands again. I shall be voting in favour of the motion.

President. — I call Mr Rogers.

Mr Rogers. — Mr President, although, like Mr Gendebien, I believe that the report represents some progress, I shall abstain from voting, because I feel that by voting for or against I shall legitimize the whole obscenity of nuclear power production at its present level of development.

President. — I call Mr Veronesi.

Mr Veronesi. — (*I*) Mr President, at the meeting on 23 September only the two Communist representatives on the Committee on Energy abstained from voting on the final text. We feel that the substance of the motion is inadequate with regard to the guarantees which have to be given to the population and with regard to the population's involvement in decision-making. In this area, in Italy, the Communists have been behind efforts to provide the general public with greater guarantees.

There is no doubt that the motion has been improved, but it could have been even better if other amendments, which we voted for but which were rejected, could have been incorporated in the overall text of the motion. Be that as it may, we realize that progress has

been made and that there is now a greater degree of willingness. Consequently, although it is with some reluctance that we shed the reservations we expressed when voting in committee, we shall be voting in favour of the motion.

President. — I call Mr Calvez.

Mr Calvez. — (*F*) Can I just say to Mr Veronesi that, along with the two Communist Members, I also abstained when it came to the vote. I heard a lot of talk from the heart, which is all very well, but some of the French Members wanted the voice of reason to be heard. We shall see how things turn out in a few years!

President. — I have received a request for a roll-call vote from the Group of European Progressive Democrats and the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members.

(Parliament adopted the resolution by roll-call vote)

*
* *

President. — I put to the vote the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-593/80) by Mr Müller-Hermann and others: Community oil supplies from the Middle East.*

The resolution is adopted.

*
* *

President. — I put to the vote the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-599/80) by Mr Linkohr and others: Supplies of oil to the Community from the Middle East.*

The resolution is adopted.

*
* *

President. — We shall now consider the motion for a resolution contained in the *Schmid report (Doc. 1-521/80): Multiannual Community programme in biomolecular engineering.*

President

After Article 1, Mr Colla and Mr Notenboom have tabled Amendment No 10 seeking to insert the following new paragraph:

Article 1a

1. The Community shall assist the research projects listed in Annex A which shall take the form of activities under contract on the basis of cost-sharing agreements. Such contracts shall incorporate a clause requiring part of the assistance granted for research to be repaid where such research produces results which are put to commercial use and/or leads to applications for patents and the granting of licences.
2. Participation shall not as a rule exceed 50 %. In determining the Communities' contribution for a specific project, account shall be taken of all assistance already granted, or likely to be granted, for other purposes. Where the 50 % rule is exceeded, this should be the subject of an explicit, reasoned decision by the Commission, which must first be brought to the attention of the budgetary authority.
3. The Commission shall negotiate, and conclude, the requisite contracts. To this end it shall draw up a standard form of contract setting out the rights and duties of the parties and, where necessary, the conditions and procedures for any repayment of research assistance.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Schmid, rapporteur. — (D) The amendment reflects what the committee wanted. Allow me to add a word of explanation.

Originally, we tabled no amendments to the Council Decision because we believed that the Commission would be amending its proposal off its own bat, as it had undertaken to do. Yesterday, however, I heard from the Commission that it did not intend to make any amendments. This makes me all the more convinced that we must adopt this amendment which, by the way, is essentially in the form agreed by the Committee on Budgets, apart from the second sentence in paragraph 2. I would therefore ask you, Mr President, to let us — for the sake of fairness — vote separately on the second paragraph. All in all, though, I agree with the text.

(Parliament adopted the three paragraphs of Amendment No 10 by successive votes)

President. — On Article 4, Mr Colla and Mr Notenboom have tabled Amendment No 6 seeking to reword the article as follows:

During the third year an assessment shall be made of the programme which may result in revision of the programme in accordance with the appropriate procedures after the Advisory Committee on Programme

Management has been consulted. The European Parliament shall be informed of the assessment of the proposals for review on which it shall deliver an opinion.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Schmid, rapporteur. — (D) I am in favour, Mr President, because this is in keeping with the view of the Committee on Budgets.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 6)

President. — On Annex B, paragraph 1, Mr Colla and Mr Notenboom have tabled Amendment No 7 seeking to reword the paragraph as follows:

The Commission shall be responsible for the execution of the programmes. In the context of its exclusively advisory capacity and in order to contribute in this way to the optimal implementation of the research and development programme in the field of biomolecular engineering, the Advisory Committee may deliver an opinion on:

— the selection... (rest unchanged).

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Schmid, rapporteur. — (D) In favour.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 7)

President. — On Annex B, paragraph 5, Mr Colla has tabled Amendment No 9 seeking to expand the paragraph by adding the following:

..., who shall be one of the Commission representatives.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Schmid, rapporteur. — (D) In favour.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 9)

President. — We shall now consider the motion for a resolution.

(Parliament adopted the preamble and paragraph 1)

On paragraph 2, Mr Gautier has tabled Amendment No 4 seeking to delete the paragraph.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Schmid, rapporteur. — (D) Mr President, I am opposed to this amendment. I appreciate why Mr Gautier tabled his amendment. The point is to delete the sentence in the motion for a resolution referring to the possibility of the genetic manipulation of human beings. That does not form part of the programme, and in that respect Mr Gautier is quite right. On the other hand, I do not believe that our formulation could give rise to misunderstandings, and with a view to consistency with the decision taken by the committee — and also because this happens to be my own personal opinion — I must urge that the amendment be rejected.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 4 and adopted paragraph 2)

President. — On paragraph 3, Mr Gautier has tabled Amendment No 5 seeking to reword the paragraph as follows:

Considers a Community research programme in the field of biomolecular engineering to be useful because of:

- the contribution to the development of research and technology in Europe;
- the contribution of a research programme to the standardization of safety guidelines for recombinant DNA work;
- the social need for the medical application of biomolecular engineering.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Schmid, rapporteur. — (D) I am in favour in principle, Mr President, although the committee was not able to consider this point. I can make no recommendation based on the committee's view.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 5 and adopted paragraph 3 and then paragraph 4)

President. — I have three amendments on paragraph 5:

- Amendment No 12 by Mr Sassano seeking to reword paragraph 5 (a) as follows:

that no projects are selected which have already been the subject of intensive work and the results of which are known and available;

- Amendment No 1 by Mr Gautier seeking to delete the second indent in paragraph 5 (b);
- Amendment No 15 by Mr Gautier seeking to delete the sixth indent in paragraph 5 (b).

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Schmid, rapporteur. — (D) Mr President, I am in favour of Mr Sassano's amendment. His formulation is better than the original one. As regards the two amendments tabled by Mr Gautier, once again I appreciate his motives. His aim is to make the programme still more concentrated. In principle, that is the view taken by the committee, but, on the other hand, we must reach a compromise which has the approval of the committee. Without referring this matter back to the committee, I cannot recommend that the amendment be adopted.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 12, rejected Amendment No 1 and then Amendment No 15 and adopted paragraph 5 as amended and then paragraphs 6 and 7)

President. — I have two amendments on paragraph 8:

- Amendment No 14 by Mr Sassano seeking to reword the first indent of the paragraph as follows:

- publish invitations to tender for the projects not only in the Official Journal of the European Communities but also in those scientific journals which are widely circulated in each of the Member States;

- Amendment No 3 by Mr Gautier seeking to reword the last indent of the paragraph as follows:

- undertake a further initiative to harmonize the safety guidelines for research and industrial application.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Schmid, rapporteur. — (D) I am in favour of both amendments, Mr President. They represent an improvement.

(Parliament adopted successively Amendment No 14, Amendment No 3, paragraph 8 as amended and paragraph 9)

President. — On paragraph 10, Mr Gautier has tabled Amendment No 2 seeking to replace the words *three new A posts* with the words *a maximum of three new A posts*.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Schmid, rapporteur. — (D) Mr President, this was a contentious issue in the committee as well, where no unanimous decision was reached. The majority of the committee was in favour of three posts; the minority — which included the rapporteur — favoured two posts. On behalf of the committee, therefore, I must recommend rejection of the amendment.

(Parliament adopted successively Amendment No 2, paragraph 10 as amended, paragraphs 11 and 12 and the motion for a resolution as a whole)

*
* * *

President. — We shall now consider the motion for a resolution contained in the *Moreau report (Doc. 1-550/80): Decision on the adoption of the annual report on the economic situation of the Community.*

(Parliament adopted the preamble)

On paragraph 1, Mr Walter and Mr Wagner have tabled Amendment No 25 seeking to add the following at the end of the paragraph

is concerned at the consequences of the policies proposed by the Commission for 1981, which, while designed to reduce the balance of payments deficit to 26.8 million ECUs and inflation to around 10 %, will, however, result in a very low increase of approximately 0.8 % in the gross domestic product and in a fresh rise in the rate of unemployment to 6.8 %, or 8 million people unemployed.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Moreau, rapporteur. — (F) This text was part of the original report, Mr President. The committee rejected it, but speaking as rapporteur I am personally in favour of it.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 25 and adopted paragraph 1)

President. — After paragraph 1, Mr Deleau and Mr Nyborg on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats have tabled Amendment No 3 seeking to add the following new paragraph:

Points out the need to stimulate growth in order as a matter of priority to combat inflation, to coordinate the measures taken by the Member States to put a stop to the dizzy spiralling of interest rates, to permit the investment necessary for the growth of exports and to reorganize the economy taking account of the need for social harmony, energy savings and environmental requirements.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Moreau, rapporteur. — (F) To some extent this text repeats what has been said, but since it is in line with what the committee was able to adopt, I am in favour of it.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 3 and adopted paragraphs 2 and 3)

President. — On paragraph 4, Mr Walter and Mr Wagner have tabled Amendment No 26 seeking to reword the paragraph as follows:

Points out that the fight against unemployment and the creation of jobs must be stated as fundamental objectives in any economic policy; regrets that the Commission's proposals do not contain such a statement of priority;

Disputes the idea that a rise in unemployment is the price to be paid for combating inflation, as a similar increase in both is now being seen in several countries;

Points out that in most Member States the slowing-down of increases in wages and social costs has not been reflected in a fall in the rate of inflation, even if direct or indirect effects of the rise in oil prices are taken into account; there are therefore many varied causes of inflation, and all these causes should be tackled, not simply wage costs.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Moreau, rapporteur. — (F) Since this was part of the original report, I am in favour, although the committee rejected it.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 26 and adopted paragraph 4)

President. — I have two amendments on paragraph 5:

— Amendment No 16 by Mr De Clercq seeking to reword the third indent of paragraph 5 as follows:

— a strict policy of rehabilitating the public finances of most Member States;

— Amendment No 17 by Mr Walter and Mr Wagner seeking to insert the following new paragraph after the fourth indent of paragraph 5:

but considers that any economic policy, while maintaining the competitiveness of the economy, must also safeguard the purchasing power of the great mass of workers and people with low incomes; such a policy can only be fully effective if it is accompanied by measures designed to reduce inequalities.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Moreau, rapporteur. — (F) I am against Amendment No 16. The Commission has already tackled this problem in part and the text of the third indent was adopted by the committee. As for Amendment No 17,

Moreau

it was part of the original text but was turned down by the committee. I shall let the House decide what is to be done.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 16 and then Amendment No 17 and adopted paragraph 5)

President. — I have three amendments on paragraph 6:

— Amendment No 4, tabled by Mr Deleau and Mr Nyborg on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, seeking to delete the words *operated fairly well during the year 1980*, but in the paragraph;

— Amendment No 1 by Mr von Wogau seeking to reword the paragraph as follows¹:

urges the Council to introduce the second phase of implementation of the European Monetary System, in which the European Monetary Fund is to be established

— Amendment No 13 by Mr Hopper and Mr Purvis seeking to add the following at the end of the paragraph:

... in this regard, stresses the importance of now moving towards full European Monetary Union with an autonomous currency authority (see Ruffolo report Doc. 1-63/80).

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Moreau, rapporteur. — *(F)* I am against Amendment No 4 because the committee felt that our opinion on the operation of the European Monetary System was rather favourable. As for Amendment No 13, I am against it because the committee did not consider this point in the fashion indicated by the author of the amendment.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 4 and adopted successively Amendment No 13, paragraph 6 as amended and paragraphs 7 to 9)

President. — Mr De Clercq has tabled two amendments on paragraph 10:

— Amendment No 19 seeking to reword the first indent of the paragraph as follows:

it is becoming increasingly difficult to find employment for women and young people in the economy;

Amendment No 21 seeking to reword the fourth indent of the paragraph as follows:

— distortions of competition are being caused by the growth of the 'black economy' and by official subsidization of sectors of the economy in various Member States.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Moreau, rapporteur. — *(F)* I am against both amendments.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 19 and then Amendment No 21 and adopted paragraph 10 and then paragraphs 11 and 12)

President. — After paragraph 12, Mr Deleau and Mr Nyborg on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats have tabled Amendment No 5 seeking to insert the following new paragraph:

Regrets that the Commission does not attach more importance to the dynamic of exports in the general balance of economic growth.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Moreau, rapporteur. — *(F)* We did not approach this matter in this fashion in committee, and I feel that the way in which it was dealt with in the report is such that there is no reason for this amendment. I am therefore against it.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 5 and adopted paragraph 13)

President. — On paragraph 14, Mr Beumer and others have tabled Amendment No 7 seeking to delete the word *complementarily* in the third indent of the paragraph.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Moreau, rapporteur. — *(F)* Against.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 7 and then paragraph 14 as amended)

President. — On paragraph 15, Mr De Clercq has tabled Amendment No 22 seeking to add the following to the end of the paragraph:

... and that a general policy should be pursued which promotes rather than discourages private investment.

What is the rapporteur's position?

¹ Subsequently withdrawn by the author.

Mr Moreau, rapporteur. — (F) I am against the amendment because it repeats what has already been said in the report.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 22 and then paragraph 15 as amended)

President. — On paragraph 16, Mr De Clercq has tabled Amendment No 24 seeking to insert the paragraph immediately after paragraph 3 under the heading *short-term political measures*.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Moreau, rapporteur. — (F) Paragraph 16 deals with medium-term measures as well as short-term measures. I am therefore against this amendment.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 24)

President. — On paragraph 16, Mr Beumer and others have tabled Amendment No 9 seeking to replace the word *massive* by *balanced* in the first part of the paragraph.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Moreau, rapporteur. — (F) I should have been happy with this amendment if the word *massive* had been left in, i.e. if it had been phrased *balanced and massive investments*. If we just have the word *balanced*, there is no indication of the size of the investments, and for this reason I am against the amendment.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 9 and then paragraph 16 as amended)

President. — After paragraph 16, Mr von Wogau has tabled Amendment No 2 seeking to insert the following new paragraph:

Urges the Council to speed up the measures needed to eliminate persisting bureaucratic and technical barriers to trade between the Member States and to establish a genuine common market.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Moreau, rapporteur. — (F) Although the report did not go into this matter as such, in view of the discussion we had in committee I am in favour of the amendment.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 2)

President. — On paragraph 17, Mr von Bismarck and others have tabled Amendment No 10 seeking to reword the paragraph as follows:

Stresses that the Community, faced with a tragic level of unemployment must, working together with the social partners, give priority to concerted actions towards increasing employment opportunities, in particular:

- the creation of new job opportunities, especially in the newer high-technology sectors,
- the easing of job mobility by encouraging training and retraining and reducing or eliminating impediments to the unemployed taking up occupations for which they are qualified, wherever that opportunity may be located,
- the reduction of working hours, including systematic overtime, where this is linked with commensurate improvements in productivity, so that real incomes can be maintained and European industry's competitive position can be assured,
- the encouragement of part-time working, staggered time-tables and flexible working hours.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Moreau, rapporteur. — (F) I am against this amendment because it distorts to some extent the proposals adopted by the committee in paragraph 17 since it tries to bring closer together the various proposals which could have been made. For this reason I am not in favour of the amendment.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 10 by electronic vote)

President. — On paragraph 18, Mr Beumer and others have tabled Amendment No 11 seeking to delete the paragraph.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 11 and then paragraph 19)

On paragraph 20, Mr De Clercq has tabled Amendment No 23 seeking to add the following to the end of the paragraph:

... at this difficult time policy-makers must above all refrain from taking measures which serve solely to combat the effects of the crisis in the short term and thus lose sight of the real long-term causes and effects; painful sacrifices will have to be made however the crisis is tackled but they will be more numerous and much greater if it is not tackled in the right way.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Moreau, rapporteur. — (F) I am against the amendment as it repeats what has been said elsewhere.

(Parliament adopted successively Amendment No 23, paragraph 20 as amended and paragraph 21)

President. — On paragraph 22, Mr Walter and Mr Wagner have tabled Amendment No 18 seeking to insert the following new indent before the first indent of the paragraph:

— to establish a new international economic order.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Moreau, rapporteur. — (F) This was part of the original report. It was rejected by the committee, but I should like to say at this point that this is in fact an important vote because this amendment refers to our contribution towards the establishment of a new international economic order. We spent a long time discussing this in committee. I hope the House will vote in favour of this amendment.

(Parliament adopted successively Amendment No 18, paragraph 22 as amended and paragraph 23)

President. — Explanations of vote may now be given.

I call Mr Cousté to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

Mr Cousté. — (F) Mr President, there are positive elements in Mr Moreau's report; we drew attention to these during the general debate. Although the report has not been greatly affected in plenary session by the amendments — and I am sorry that the rapporteur did not see fit to support Amendment No 5 tabled by Mr Deleau — we nonetheless feel that it should be approved.

We shall therefore be voting for the report, albeit with the reservations expressed by our spokesman, Mr Deleau, to the effect that we should like to see a stronger growth element. In other words, we believe in the need for giving a boost to investment, giving effective support to exports and better protection to our traditional industries such as steelmaking, building, shipbuilding, textiles and the footwear and car industries. We should also like to see a stop put to spiralling interest rates, which are scaling new heights of lunacy.

To our mind, these are the first condition for restoring economic balance. At the same time as balance is being restored and assured, we want to see real steps taken to combat unemployment — which is causing so much suffering to so many people — and inflation. We shall therefore be voting for the report, and I think this

clear statement should be to this House's satisfaction and will underline our group's thinking.

President. — I call Mr Ruffolo to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Ruffolo. — (I) On behalf of the Socialist Group, Mr President, let me say that we are forced to vote against this motion, to which we really wanted to give our full backing, because of the exclusion in committee and the rejection here in the Chamber of two points which we consider of prime importance — I am referring to Amendment No 26 to paragraph 4 and Amendment No 17 to paragraph 5 — and the adoption of Amendment No 10 which replaces paragraph 17 by a text which in our view distorts the whole problem of the distribution of working hours and the duration of work.

It is unthinkable in our view that, at such a perilous moment in the economic circumstances of the Community, we should not be confirming the basic priority of the struggle against unemployment, the error of the stubborn and unwarranted idea that unemployment is the way to tackle inflation, and the need to protect come what may the purchasing power of the less well-off workers. In congratulating the rapporteur, who once again has produced an excellent piece of work, we must nevertheless with deep regret vote against the motion.

President. — I call Mr Bonaccini to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Bonaccini. — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, when he spoke yesterday, the Vice-President of the Commission, Mr Ortoli, told us that the approval of the annual report on the economic situation of the Community was one of the major acts of this Parliament — those were his exact words — and that this year we were considering the report in the expectation that the situation in 1981 would be just as difficult.

I have tremendous liking and appreciation for Mr Moreau's efforts, which I do not think will be recognized in the final outcome of this debate. I must say that the gap between the general outline and the result we are arriving at today is such a large gap in terms of form and content that the decision of Parliament becomes quite an easy one. The difficulty of reaching a majority opinion rather than a partial one, which Mr Moreau mentioned when presenting his report, seems at the end of the debate to be even greater and more obvious. We have even failed to consider one vital question; what is the Council going to make of our opinion? What response will it give, or has it already given, to the Member States on this? This is a matter of vital importance to this Parliament and for the sake of giving real meaning to our work.

Bonaccini

Another thing Mr Ortoli said yesterday with great feeling was that we had to bear in mind the situation of the less-favoured social categories. If this were all there was to it, simply bear it in mind, I do not think this would be much of an initiative for Parliament to be proud of. But there is more to it than that. We are talking about terribly down-to-earth matters like unemployment and the sacrifices which the circumstances call for and which need more than to be borne in mind but which require suitable decisions on the part of the governments and the Community institutions. We are not taking that approach with this document. Not only have we rejected the amendments mentioned by Mr Ruffolo, but we have even had Mr von Wogau's amendment withdrawn. We should have been more than happy to vote for this amendment calling for the introduction of the second phase of implementation of the European Monetary System. For these reasons and a number of others, we shall be voting against the approval of this document.

(Parliament adopted the resolution by electronic vote)

*
* *

President. — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-500/80) by Mr Glinne and others: Seat of the European Parliament.*

(Parliament adopted the preamble and paragraph 1)

After paragraph 1, Mr De Goede has tabled Amendment No 2 seeking to insert the following new paragraph:

Believes that the seat of Parliament should be located in the same place as that of the executive (Commission of the European Communities).

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 2)

On paragraph 2, Mr Zagari on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee has tabled Amendment No 1 seeking to replace the words *after consulting Parliament* with the words *after consultations with Parliament*.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 1 and then paragraph 2 as amended)

On paragraph 3, Mr Coppieters has tabled Amendment No 3 seeking to reword the paragraph as follows:

Declares that, if the Governments of the Member States have not reached a decision by the above date, it would have no option but to choose a place of work itself and to take the necessary steps to implement this decision as soon as possible.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 3 and adopted paragraph 4)

Explanations of vote may now be given.

I call Mrs Le Roux.

Mrs Le Roux. — *(F)* Mr President, we should like to make it quite clear that the problem of this House's seat must remain strictly within the province of the nine Member States. We do feel, however, that it is absolutely essential to remedy the current situation. What is at stake here is the living and working conditions of our staff — to whom we should like to take this opportunity of paying tribute — and the efficient functioning of this House as well as the effectiveness of our own work.

Public opinion in our nine Member States already finds it hard enough to put up with the disastrous policy pursued by the European institutions and the French government, and is rightly disgusted at the amount of money spent by dint of our present working conditions. Formal commitments have been entered into, and these must be respected by the governments. As Mr Georges Marchais said when the new Assembly first met, we reaffirm our wish to have Strasbourg chosen as the seat of the European Assembly.

We shall be making vigorous representations to our government to this end.

President. — I call Mr Penders.

Mr Penders. — *(NL)* Mr President, I am making this explanation of vote on behalf of Mrs Maij-Weggen and Mr Notenboom as well as on my own account. We voted against Mr De Goede's amendment. Although we agreed with the content of his amendment, we think it unfitting, dangerous and counter-productive to make that kind of statement in a procedural resolution.

President. — I call Mr Zagari.

Mr Zagari. — *(I)* Mr President, my amendment was tabled on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee, which felt it was needed, and the basic purpose of the amendment was not so much to underline the feelings shared by everyone in the House — and which are borne out by the reception the motion has had — as to indicate a procedure, so that we can avoid a potentially hard and damaging struggle with the Council and the governments. We felt with regard to this issue — affecting as it does legitimate interests and subjective rights and involving vast financial considerations and where in the final analysis Parliament and its officials are those directly involved — that it was neces-

Zagari

sary to adopt the formal consultation procedure which in any case already exists and which is the best course for saying what one wants to say when a motion like this is tabled. I shall take a closer look at the problems facing us when we get round to considering the report — which I hope will be as soon as possible.

(Parliament adopted the resolution as a whole)

*
* *

President. — We shall now consider the motion for a resolution contained in the *Ferri report (Doc. 1-506/80): Right of residence of nationals of Member States in the territory of another Member State.*

On behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee, Mr Ferri has tabled Amendment No 1 seeking to replace the whole of the motion for a resolution by the following:

The European Parliament,

- having regard to the debate¹ on the proposal for a directive on a right of residence for nationals of Member States in the territory of another Member State (Doc. 1-324/79), in the course of which the Commission representative stated, in absolutely unequivocal terms, that the Commission of the European Communities had (with one exception) accepted the amendments proposed by the Legal Affairs Committee and adopted by Parliament,
 - having regard to the written statement² in which the Commission announced that it has 'accepted' Parliament's amendments of its proposal for a directive,
 - noting that, despite the foregoing, the Commission did not originally incorporate³ two important amendments adopted by Parliament on the proposal for a directive, viz. that concerning Article 1 (on the definition of the concept of 'member of the family'), and that concerning the addition to the proposal for a directive of a proposal for a Council recommendation on refugees and stateless persons,
 - having regard, however, to the second, amended proposal⁴ submitted by the Commission on 22 October 1980, following the report (Doc. 1-506/80) adopted by the Legal Affairs Committee on 2 October 1980 and the discussion in committee on 21 October 1980,
1. Notes with satisfaction that on 22 October 1980 the Commission submitted a second, amended proposal incorporating Parliament's amendment extending the concept of 'member of the family';

2. Formally requests the Commission rigorously to comply with its undertakings given before Parliament and therefore, when it states that it agrees to amendments adopted by Parliament, to amend its proposals accordingly;
3. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Commission.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)

IN THE CHAIR: MR GONELLA

Vice-President

9. *Urgent procedure*

President. — I have received from Mr Pannella and others a motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-616/80), with request for urgent debate pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure, on the legal proceedings against *Le Monde*.

The reasons supporting this request are contained in the document itself.

Parliament will be consulted on this request for urgent procedure at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

10. *ACP-EEC Convention*

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

- report (Doc. 1-559/80), drawn up by Mr Wawrzik on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation on
 - I — a recommendation from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-97/80) for a regulation on the conclusion of the second ACP-EEC Convention of Lomé;
 - II — a proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-700/79) for a decision on the association of the overseas countries and territories with the European Economic Community;
- report (Doc. 1-522/80), drawn up by Mr Sablé on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation, on the outcome of the proceedings of the ACP-EEC Joint Committee and Consultative Assembly.

I call Mr Cheysson.

¹ Debates of the European Parliament, No 1-255, April 1980, pp. 105 *et seq.*

² Debates of the European Parliament, No 1-256, May 1980, p. 29.

³ OJ C 188, 25 July 1980, p. 7.

⁴ OJ C 292, 11 November 1980.

Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission. — (F) Mr President, please allow me first of all to thank the two main rapporteurs who were kind enough to permit me to speak before them, which is contrary to all the rules, because I have to catch a plane in half an hour's time.

The negotiations which led to the Lomé II Convention were difficult; the motion for a resolution and the report by Mr Wawrzik make this clear from the outset. The negotiations were difficult because they covered complex problems, and brought together two blocs of equal weight because of the regional nature of the approach adopted to the problems involved. Nonetheless, the negotiations succeeded. We now have this Convention. What we must now do is ratify it as soon as possible. In this respect, the latest information I can give this House is encouraging. The Dutch authorities will have finished their work in time to ratify the Convention and deposit the instruments before the end of the month. We hold out the same hopes for the Belgian authorities, and I hope that our Italian friends will, like Fausto Coppi the former cycling champion, sprint past the Belgians at the last minute. If this were the case, then the Lomé II Convention could come into force on 1 January 1981.

The results of the negotiations, Mr President, have been remarkably well analysed by the various rapporteurs, Mr Maher, Sir Fred Catherwood, and particularly Mr Wawrzik, who carried out a very comprehensive, I might even say exhaustive, analysis of the problem, covering all the aspects of the Convention, and placing them against their general background as indeed we must. I will not take the liberty of plagiarizing what he said in his report, nor shall I pre-empt what the various speakers will say in their statements. In particular, we all expect very much of Mrs Focke who was the rapporteur before the ACP-EEC Consultative Assembly. I shall therefore merely make some general remarks, Mr President.

This second convention of the same name, inspired by the same principles as the first, lays down a policy, or at least the nucleus of a policy, and the Commission is very pleased to note that this policy, as I think I can say, meets with the general approval of this House, and that the necessary criticism made of it is constructive, even if it comes from a group of Members whom we are not used to seeing adopt a constructive attitude when speaking of Europe. This is a real policy — this fact is acknowledged all over the world — and if proof were needed of this fact, then it can be found in the request to participate in this policy made by Zimbabwe, immediately after their heroic struggle for freedom. In this respect I am pleased to be able inform Parliament that, on 4 November last, Zimbabwe's act of accession to the Lomé II Convention was signed in Luxembourg. This answers the points made by Mr Sablé in his report, the recommendations of the Consultative Assembly and the points made in the motion for a resolution.

This accession was obtained under what I must admit were difficult circumstances, but its terms are satisfactory for our friends in Salisbury, as regards their access to Community markets in the meat sector and the quantities of sugar which we have committed ourselves to buy from them according to the terms laid down in the Sugar Protocol. This gives us an even stronger position in southern Africa. In my opinion, it is with good reason that all the motions for a resolution on this refer to Southern Africa, denounce apartheid, and pledge the support of Europe, which is so necessary for maintaining the independence of countries in this region, and also for supporting them when they wish to cooperate at regional level. In a few days time, I shall have the honour and privilege of representing the Community, side by side with ministers from the Member States, at the Maputo Conference, which should bring together nine independent southern African nations, who wish to participate in the cooperation, arrangements, and are counting on the whole-hearted cooperation of the Community against apartheid and the determination sometimes manifested by South Africa to dominate this whole region.

I am pleased to see, and I congratulate the rapporteur on this, that he situates Lomé cooperation policy against a broader background. Because we do not have on the one side Lomé and, on the other, nothing. Or, to be more precise, if all we had was Lomé, then very soon there would be nothing anywhere else. The rapporteur situates Lomé II within the framework of the policies you have recommended. Firstly, at world level, within the framework of the North-South Dialogue, progress must be made. Any such progress will be impossible if some Third-World countries collapse, if, as may happen, the world economy collapses for want of financial resources, in the atmosphere of growing restrictions and austerity which is now forced on us, an austerity which might well deal a fatal blow, in the true sense of the term, to the weaker countries. This is the real meaning behind our discussions, and the progress that must be made in financing on a world-wide scale: for example, full use must be made of the Bretton Woods instruments, before any structural alterations can be carried out; we must use methods for recycling capital, including those which the Community can initiate; we must increase government development aid, and provide additional facilities for investment from the Community, from the Member States, together with other countries, in particular the Arab countries. We shall shortly be having another meeting in Kuwait with all the Arab countries in order to discuss a broadening of the financial base, and above all funds made available by the countries themselves.

We must, therefore, face up to the problems of world trade, to those factors which, because of worsening or unstable terms of trade, present a basic threat to the countries of the southern Hemisphere. This is why the Community is so insistent on the question of raw

Cheysson

materials agreements. We have taken on commitments within the framework of UNCTAD, we have made declarations of intent, and now we must honour them.

Mr President, I should like in this respect to do something which is somewhat unusual, I should like to inform the House of a useful and opportune step taken by the Community, even if this cannot yet be termed a success. Just recently, the Community, in order to facilitate the reopening of negotiations on the cocoa agreement (I should like to remind you all that this agreement which was in force for many years had fallen into disuse and that the specialists were telling us that if we only considered cocoa, then any reopening of negotiations on the agreement should be avoided at all costs, because prices were following a natural downward trend, and that we should go along with this trend before worrying about future bullish speculation on cocoa) adopted, and as I have just said this is not very usual, a political stand on this matter. We cannot differentiate between our attitude to the cocoa problem and our concern at the whole raw materials question. We ourselves are sufficiently subject to the excessive play of market forces with other raw materials, such as oil for example. The Community succeeded in maintaining its cohesion. Might I quite simply add that if the Community had not existed, two Member States would definitely have adopted different attitudes on this matter, the same two countries which took a separate path from that of the Community during the special session of the United Nations in New York. It is the very existence of the Community which enabled the Nine to show a united front. An agreement on cocoa was signed on Saturday in Geneva. Unfortunately, our American allies did not feel able to countersign the agreement and are not included in it. The Community as such is signatory to the agreement, as are all nine Member States. Significant progress has been made even if I am forced to admit that this agreement is not in itself a good one. Nonetheless, we have it, and it lays down the line we must take. I owed Parliament this explanation in particular because of what the two rapporteurs, and above all Mr Sablé, had to say on this problem.

For raw materials, then, we are bound by the commitments made within the framework of UNCTAD. We must continue to apply the Generalized System of Preferences, and to use every means to assess the impact of our market on Third World development.

The rapporteur does not, however, merely situate this Lomé policy against the background of the North-South Dialogue, but also in the context of assessments made by individual Members, by Committees and by the whole House, and I am here thinking particularly of the work done by Parliament during the major debate on hunger in the world. The rapporteur quite rightly stresses in his motion for a resolution, the particular need to develop rural areas. He wants — and is quite right to want — Lomé instruments, whatever their nature, to be used first and foremost in

this way. He is aware that we are moving as quickly and as skillfully as we can in this direction. The fact is that 42 % of development Lomé II funds are scheduled to be used for the development of rural areas. Non-governmental organizations, mini-schemes and various types of agricultural cooperation — Mr Sablé made special mention of this — will all be encouraged along these lines.

On industrialization, the rapporteur makes quite clear the link between industrialization and our resources. He insists that there should be real Community policies. Here again, he would like to see the measures we take becoming part of the policies we wish to support. I think that I have some information on this topic which might interest this House, a report of the meeting of the Development Council which took place the day before yesterday in Brussels. Parliament should take all the credit for this, because if it had not adopted its resolution on hunger in the world, then the Council, as has so often been the case in the past, would have stubbornly refused to act. This time, however, the Council agreed in principle to multi-annual commitments on Community food aid. This cannot exceed 50 % of overall food aid, but it will be quite sufficient for the moment. In this way, food aid can be linked to organized development schemes, which is what you rightly wanted, and here the Council has listened to your views. We have also been empowered to act in future on setting up buffer stocks. Here too there has been worthwhile progress.

Mr President, I have just gone over some of the main points, which are made in much greater detail and in a much more arresting manner in the various reports before us today. As for ways of combining our policies, as Mr Sablé puts it, this is essential if we wish to avoid continual, open conflicts, whether between our policies on sugar, industrialization or on agriculture. This means — and the motion for a resolution puts it very well — obtaining support from public opinion 'The objectives... can be attained only if they are understood and actively supported by... (the whole)... population, all the more so given the prospect of a deteriorating international economic situation', the motion for a resolution states.

This is quite true. And on this topic, I shall refer to three points made in the motion for a resolution. Towards the end of his text, the rapporteur draws our attention to the need to observe certain working standards laid down by the International Labour Organization. You are aware that when the Commission made a general proposal on this matter, its concern was to show its determination that the development we are furthering should provide real benefits for the population concerned. This is stated in the motion for a resolution, and also very clearly shown in a draft amendment on this question. I ask you, is it right that with a subject of this importance, our nine governments unanimously — this is a rare occurrence, but in this case they are totally united — should have

Cheysson

succeeded in totally avoiding this question in all our exchanges in the dialogue with the Third World countries?

The motion for a resolution also goes in some length into the question of the observance of human rights. I shall not go back, before this House which has heard it so often, over the story of how we managed to get our partners in Lomé II to agree that respect for fundamental human rights should be included as one of the objectives and main guiding principles of our cooperation.

I should like to remind you that we merely managed — and this was no mean feat, even if not fully satisfactory — to ensure that the speeches which commit the two contracting parties and were made when the Lomé II Convention was signed, should use the same terms, agreed upon beforehand, to refer to such observance. Concern for this matter was one of the Commission's guiding principles, as you know, and I thank the rapporteur for having mentioned that we followed this principle. We were guided by our concern to ensure that the measures taken by the Community should never condemn the peoples of countries subjected to violations of human rights to any reinforcement or prolongation of the denial of fundamental rights. I have just quoted — quite inadvertently, of course — the exact words used in the resolution adopted on this subject by the Council as long ago as June 1977. You all have noted that the very principles stated above also appear in two of the three preconditions proposed by Parliament's rapporteur.

However, my statement does not contain the third precondition proposed by the rapporteur, because I freely admit that this causes us some embarrassment. You ask that all contact with the Government of a country where human rights are being violated should be broken off. This could, under certain circumstances, place us in a very embarrassing situation: if a contract exists, and by this I mean if the State concerned is covered by the Lomé II Convention, it might even prevent us from working and intervening effectively.

Mr President, very recently, and some of you are aware of this, the Commission itself adopted the attitude you are now recommending, for a country of West Africa in which atrocities had just been committed. We acted without hesitation. If certain Governments hesitated in their support of our action, it was not the ACP Governments. None of them were surprised to see us act as Parliament has recommended, as Parliament had more or less urged us to act. However, some European Governments, on the contrary, showed more circumspection and rather more surprise that we should bring concern over human rights into a Convention which they would like to see as strictly commercial or at most economic. The encouragement we derive from your reports and the

motion for a resolution which you will adopt tomorrow is extremely valuable. I thank you for it. Once again when North-South problems are involved, where relations with the Third World are involved, relations on which the long-term existence and internal balance of the Community depend, Parliament is playing a fundamental role. We see this in the joint assemblies. How pleasant it is to see for the first time — thanks to Mr Sablé — a report submitted to this House on work carried out jointly by Members of the European Parliament and by parliamentary representatives from the ACP States. But take care, as Mr Sablé says, that there is no contradiction between the attitudes you adopt here in this House and those you adopt elsewhere! The most important point, however, is that the European Parliament, which can more readily take the long-term view than can national parliaments and to an even greater degree national governments, should help by its interest, criticism, proposals, concrete suggestions and support to ensure that the long-term approach needed to North-South problems is adopted. The Lomé Convention is still inadequate as an example of such an approach, but since it is the only one of its kind in the world, it is of interest nonetheless.

President. — I call Mr Wawrzik.

Mr Wawrzik, rapporteur. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, let me begin by thanking Mr Cheysson before he leaves so that he can take our thanks with him for what he and his colleagues have done to give the Lomé II Convention the form which it now has.

(Applause)

This achievement can be put down not least to the fact that he is highly regarded by our partners and that they place great trust in him. Please accept our heartfelt thanks for this!

(Applause)

I am unfortunately forced to proceed in a somewhat unusual manner. I shall not now tell you what I had every intention of saying on the motion for a resolution. I consider it quite out of place, and this is true not just for this subject, but also for others which are dealt with in this House — for the rapporteur to have only five minutes speaking time on such an important matter. I should like what I have to say to be considered as a protest against the fact that all topics are dealt with here without distinction, by this I mean that no consideration is given to their significance. It is impossible to deal with one of the main elements of Community development policy in five minutes. I would have been able to gain a few minutes more, by obtaining permission from my Group to use some of their speaking time or that of other colleagues who are

Wawrzik

interested in development policy. But this is a fundamental question. No future rapporteur should have to beg around for a few minutes more when important issues are being discussed, and for this reason I call upon the Bureau of the President to take the necessary steps to ensure that in future such difficulties do not recur.

(Applause)

Please allow me to add one further remark. The Lomé II Convention is a very important subject. It is — as I have already said — the nucleus of Community development policy. We have on many occasions in the past discussed the Community's activities and projects in the field of development policy. However, I feel that this is not sufficient. I think we ought, in the course of the coming year, to deal with the whole range of views on development policy to be found in the European Parliament, and I myself shall, on behalf of my Group, table a motion for a resolution along these lines at the next meeting of the Committee on Development and Cooperation. I am sure that all the political groups will endorse this.

(Applause)

I shall also put before the Committee for discussion the idea that the views of the Committees on the length of time to be granted should in future be heard when speaking time is being allocated, because the total time allowed for discussion is too little. I do not, however, wish to stand in the way of the adoption of this motion for a resolution. The question must be settled during this part-session, and I can but urge you to vote in favour of the motion for a resolution. The Lomé II Convention deserves to be approved, because it is more than just another act of development policy. Within the framework of the North-South Dialogue, it is an example which can be applied beyond the frontiers of the European Community, and which ought to be viewed as a test case. This is why I should like to ask this House to vote in favour of the motion for a resolution, and to view my refusal to adopt a position on the motion for a resolution and on the report as what it is intended to be, that is to say as a protest against the fact that a problem of this importance should not be accorded a sufficient and suitable amount of time for discussion in this House.

(Applause)

President. — You are quite right Mr Wawrzik, when you state that the rapporteur ought to have more speaking time. You ought to remember, however, that a large number of Members are down to speak during this debate. This is a fact which we should not forget.

I call Mr Sablé.

Mr Sablé, rapporteur. — *(F)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to begin by adding my voice to the muted but firm protest made by Mr Wawrzik a few moments ago. It is quite unacceptable that for a subject of this importance . . .

President. — I am sorry to interrupt, Mr Sablé, but I should like to point out that the rapporteur did not use up the whole of the five minutes which were allotted to him, since he finished his speech very quickly.

Mr Sablé. — *(F)* Nonetheless I join in Mr Wawrzik's protest. The reason he did not use all his five minutes is precisely because he wanted to make quite clear his protest against the very short time allotted to him; I myself was restricted to five minutes' speaking time, and I am able to present my report properly today only because the Liberal and Democratic Group, to which I belong, was kind enough to grant me a few more minutes. Nonetheless, I wished to make clear that I am fully behind Mr Wawrzik.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the report which I have the privilege of presenting to you today bears little relation to those which the House generally has to discuss and adopt, since it does not contain the opinion of the European Parliament on a current problem.

The aim of this report is to inform Parliament and its Committees of the outcome of the work done by the ACP/EEC Consultative Assembly, in which no less than 118 Members of this House sit. It is not, therefore, by chance that so many Members are down to speak during this debate. This move was initiated by the Committee on Development and Cooperation, which felt that the present situation in which the European Parliament was not informed of the opinions of the ACP/EEC Consultative Assembly and of its Joint Committee, was both illogical and dangerous. This is more or less what Mr Claude Cheysson said just now in his speech, and I should like to add my tribute to that which Mr Wawrzik just paid him. He is indeed one of the founding fathers of the Lomé Convention, and I think this is common knowledge not just in Europe but in the whole world. This situation definitely carries the risk — this has been demonstrated several times in the past and even very recently — of seeing wide gaps appear between the policies pursued by the two institutions, that is the European Parliament on the one hand and the ACP/EEC Consultative Assembly and its Joint Committee on the other. To obviate this risk, one of the preconditions is that the European Parliament should be regularly informed of the outcome of the work of the Consultative Assembly. In addition to the risk of following diverging paths, there is also the problem of follow up to the work of the Consultative Assembly within the Community, where the European Parliament has a fundamental role to play as the stimulus for, and arbiter of, action.

Sablé

The second objective of this report is, therefore, to submit to the various Parliamentary Committees which deal with these matters the whole range of requests and orders addressed by the Consultative Assembly to the Commission and the Council of the Communities. After having examined them, the Parliamentary Committee ought, as we see it, to decide to what extent it is able to go along with the requests formulated by the Consultative Assembly, and also to grant them active support.

Having thus given the general background and the main aims of my report, I must now report to you on the outcome of the work done during the last session of the Consultative Assembly held from 24 to 26 September 1980. In the short time allotted to me I shall restrict my remarks to a few basic points.

On the subject of the resolution on the new institutional provisions of Lomé II adopted by the Consultative Assembly, and as a follow-up to the report submitted by Mr Jaquet, two points should be made. First of all, there is the fact that the Community must pursue a policy of consultation with the various sides of trade and industry on what measures should be adopted within the framework of development aid policy. Secondly, the Council of the European Communities ought, within the ACP/EEC Council of Ministers, to advocate the organization of such consultation with the various sides of trade and industry in both the Member States and the ACP countries. It would be useful if the Committees concerned could give their views on this point.

When it asked for a report on the problem of migrant workers and students from the ACP States to be drawn up and submitted to it, the Consultative Assembly broke new ground. This was in fact the first time that any concern for social affairs had been expressed within the framework of the Lomé Convention. This breakthrough succeeded, at least in part, since the negotiators of Lomé II did manage to include in an annex some provisions which, even if they are watered down, do at least give form and substance to the social affairs in the Convention.

The motion tabled by Mr Michel, and adopted by the Consultative Assembly in the form of a resolution, asks that these measures be extended to provide guaranteed personal, social and trade union rights to migrant workers and students, and an improvement in their living conditions. This Parliament must now — via its competent committees, one of which is the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment — tackle this subject in order to support the recommendations made by the Consultative Assembly and to monitor the implementation of this policy.

However, the major part of the Consultative Assembly's work was given over to an examination of the quite remarkable report drawn up by Mrs Focke. This document contained a complete rundown of what was

achieved under Lomé I, and an assessment of the outlook for Lomé II. Although Mrs Focke's weighing-up was very critical, it met with very wide approval in the Joint Committee and in the Consultative Assembly. I should like to add my personal congratulations, ladies and gentlemen.

The resolution adopted by the Consultative Assembly deals in turn with the problems of trade, industrial and agricultural cooperation, as well as with the political aspects of Lomé II.

Once a number of points of view had been reconciled, it was possible to protect the economic interests of the French Overseas Departments against the dangers of unfair competition from partners in the ACP States, by the combined application of Article 13, paragraph 3, and of the second Annex to the Convention.

I should just like to pick out two points which are a perfect example of the differences of opinion between Parliament and the ACP/EEC Consultative Assembly, this having been one of the main subjects covered by Mr Cheysson in his speech just now.

I have analysed the first point at some length in my report, namely Parliament's rejection of the Commission's proposals on modifying quotas for sugar producers within the European Economic Community.

The Joint Committee had in fact expressed a totally opposite opinion at Arusha, that is before the vote on this question was taken in Parliament. Conflicts of opinion of this sort are naturally very harmful both for the Members of the European Parliament who sit in the Consultative Assembly, whose credibility may one day be brought into question, and for the European Parliament itself, which is why I must reiterate the need for regular exchanges of information so that agreement may be reached on the stance to be taken.

I should also like to point out — again on the sugar question — that when the Consultative Assembly took note of Parliament's and the Council's rejection of the Commission's proposals, it expressed the view that by so doing the Community had only skirted round a problem which, come what may, will have to be reconsidered.

Another example of the differences which exist between the two Assemblies can be found in the recent vote taken by Parliament on the draft 1981 budget, a vote which was based on Mrs Focke's report. The Consultative Assembly had asked that the Commission departments be given sufficient staff to handle the implementation of the Lomé II Convention. Parliament, in its vote of 6 November 1980, rejected the draft amendments tabled by the Committee on Development and Cooperation which had requested, along the same lines, that the establishment plan for DG VIII of the Commission be increased. Here again there is a contradiction between the commitments made in the

Sablé

Consultative Assembly and the decisions taken by Parliament.

For lack of time, I shall merely remind you all that the Consultative Assembly also adopted a resolution on Zimbabwe, a resolution on southern Africa, another on cocoa, and yet another on developing fisheries in the ACP States, to which Mr Cheysson referred in his speech just now.

I should simply like all my fellow Members, and in particular the members of the Committees on Political Affairs, on External Economic Relations and on Agriculture, to acquaint themselves with the contents of my report, and with the above-mentioned resolutions.

I should like to conclude by saying that you have all, no doubt, noticed the brevity of the motion for a resolution, which was tabled by the Committee on Development and Cooperation. If this resolution is adopted, the competent Parliamentary Committees will be required to take note of the resolutions adopted by the Consultative Assembly, examine them thoroughly and look into ways of supporting them by including them in their own work.

Thus ladies and gentlemen our desired objective will be reached. We shall set up a permanent system for the exchange of information between the European Parliament and the Consultative Assembly of the Lomé Convention, and, if possible, gain the active support of this whole House for Community policies on development and cooperation with the Third World.

President. — I call Mr Maher to speak on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr Maher, draftsman of an opinion. — Mr President, I wish to state at the outset that I too support the comments of the chief rapporteur and I hope that at the end of the debate he will have a further opportunity of making the points he felt he did not have time to make adequately at the beginning.

Having said that, I had better make the best use of the few minutes that I have. I would begin by saying that in many of the countries with which the European Community has this agreement food shortages are a near constant fact of life brought about either by natural disaster of climatic origin or by man himself. For that reason I think that the whole question of food, its procurement and development, is paramount for these peoples because unless they are adequately fed, how can we expect them to develop at all? How can we have industrial development, let alone cultural development, if people are hungry? Food is the first and greatest necessity of life.

Of course we are all very blasé living in this part of the world because food is everywhere and we eat far too

much of it and, of course, as a result we have little regard for it. I often think it is a pity we do not see a bit of starvation from time to time and then perhaps we might value the common agricultural policy more realistically than we do.

Having said that, I make my comments on the problems in these countries not out of any arrogance but with the greatest humility, I sometimes feel that in this part of the world we tend to be a bit arrogant in the way we give advice to people living in what we call the underdeveloped countries as if we had all the answers. I think we have a great deal to learn from them too.

Having said that, we recognize in the part of the document for which I am responsible that food aid from this part of the world, or from parts of the world where we are fortunate enough to have fairly consistent climatic conditions and where we have the technology to produce extra food over and above what we need ourselves, has to be a more or less permanent feature.

Of course I fully accept that a great deal more can be done in these countries to help them become more self-sufficient, to produce more food for themselves, which of course is the final answer. But we should not make the mistake of ruling out food aid either in the short term — certainly not in the short term — or in the medium term or even in the long term. There will inevitably be a need to transfer food from the temperate zones of the world to those parts of the world where nature is such that it produces natural disasters every now and then. Droughts and floods: this is something man cannot control or contain so there will always be shortages of food.

Now in relation to the first part, we are emphasizing that we need to take a more positive attitude in this part of the world towards the surpluses that we have. In other words, we should plan to produce surpluses to meet the needs of people living in parts of the world where, through no fault of their own, they very often do not have enough to eat.

But instead of that, Mr President, we take a negative attitude. We have food aid only because we happen to have surpluses. We have food-aid programmes, just because we have the problem of getting rid of what we do not want ourselves. That, in my view, is negative. We need to be positive. We need to plan to produce more food, and I hope that during the time that will be spent in this Parliament by those — I think you mentioned, Mr President, 80 speakers and I am delighted to hear there is such an active interest in this problem — we are not going to have another mass of contradictions with the same people being prepared to stand up and do their damndest to eliminate every bit of surplus we have, to cut it out because they say it is too expensive, cynically declaring at the same time, that we have to have food to meet the needs of those poor people who are dying of hunger every day. It is

Maher

time the European Parliament came to terms with itself and it is time that it was honest. Either it says, right, eliminate the surpluses and then tells these people, we have no food to give you and do not expect it. Starve if you wish. Or we say, we plan to produce extra food year by year and we will supply this food to these people when they need it. If, as a result of this debate, Parliament did no more than come to terms with itself and began to face facts and tell the truth and be honest with itself, then, I think, something worth while will have been achieved.

Mr President, might I make another point? I think it is important — and I say this to the people in charge in these recipient countries — sometimes the food aid supplied does not reach the mouths that need it most. Sometimes it is intercepted along the way. Sometimes it is used in trade. Now I know the problems are difficult, but I think it is very important that those in responsibility in those countries should try to ensure that the people who are really in want are the people who get this food and not those who merely want to exploit others, as sometimes happens. And again I make that comment with humility.

Mr President, I think it is important too that if, looking towards the longer term, we want to create trading relations with the countries that we are now endeavouring to assist, then we must help them through every possible means to diversify their agricultural production, so that as soon as they can produce enough of the necessities of life to feed themselves and their children, the products they produce will be saleable on the world market. And so that they can meet a need rather than being put in that very weak position where they come as supplicants to the European Community or to other countries around the world and ask them, for God's sake take some product from us, not because you want it but because we have it to get rid of.

In that context, Mr President, I would make the point, very quickly, that we could have a conversion from sugar to the production of protein. I make a further point, Mr President, again very quickly, that we should help to establish cooperatives in those countries so that the people themselves will do more to become self-sufficient in future. No outside force is as potent as the people doing things for themselves. Mr President, I am sorry for exceeding my allotted time. Thank you very much for your understanding.

President. — I call Mrs Focke to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mrs Focke. — (*D*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to join my protest to that made by Mr Wawrzik against the pressure placed on us by the short amount of time we have to deal with such an important topic. At the same time, however, I should like to try to make the best of the few minutes' speaking time I have.

On behalf of the Socialist Group, I approve this Treaty, called Lomé II, between the European Community and 59, shortly to become 60, African, Caribbean, and Pacific States. I approve it because the fact that 59 or 60 such States have signed it makes quite clear that it is in their best interests. We approve it, because the fact that this Treaty, which is based on the Lomé I Convention, carries on a type of cooperation which has up to now had no parallel in North-South relations is contested nowhere in the world — not even in the Third World countries concerned. The form of this agreement is particularly comprehensive and incorporates the most varied instruments for cooperation in the sphere of development policy.

I agree with this Convention during this debate, which I personally — and I know many of my fellow Members are behind me on this — see as a ratifying debate, even though I am aware that our Governments do not place any such construction on it. All things considered our judgement of this Treaty is extraordinarily positive. However, I must also remind you that difficult and tough negotiations preceded this result, that many justified requests of the ACP States were not met, and that the desires and claims of this House and the views and expectations of my Group were not fulfilled either. I should just like briefly to go back to what is one of the most important positive aspects of this Convention, that is that Lomé II represents a new departure which should improve trade relations, and indeed a departure from the idea that simply opening up markets will lead to an improvement in those relations. This Convention tends rather towards creating a better relationship between trade, production and boosting sales. Another positive aspect which I could mention is the special emphasis laid upon rural and agricultural development, the development of mining and potential energy sources as well as taking into consideration the special needs of the least-developed and poorest land-locked and island States. I draw your attention to the fact that STABEX, which was one of the particular innovations of Lomé I, which acts as a safety device against loss of profits from raw materials exports, is extended, and, by including other products, improved and, by introducing a new regulatory system for mining products, called Sysmin, is given an added dimension.

I should like to refer in particular to two of the negative aspects of the Convention. Firstly the fact that the Fifth European Development Fund, which is the crock of gold which is supposed to finance all these projects in the future, is indeed increased, but only to an inadequate degree. When I think that we are talking about a five year time span, about a lot of countries, and about the fact that in the meantime prices will increase by leaps and bounds, but in particular when I consider the frighteningly increased weight of tasks and problems which we have to carry on behalf of these countries, then these 5.6 thousand million EUA represent less than the 3.4 thousand million EUA which were allocated in 1975 under Lomé I.

Focke

The second point which I deplore is that although some general progress has been made towards liberalizing trade, the Lomé II Convention still smacks somewhat unpleasantly of protectionist tendencies since our markets are not sufficiently opened up to farm produce which might compete with our own, because the protection clause is still a very real, if veiled, threat and above all because European industrial policy has not made sufficiently clear, nor given sufficient guarantees that it will try to keep in mind during its own development the furthering of development in the ACP States. This briefly sums up my criticisms.

In addition, we are of course also concerned here, as with Lomé I, with the particular problem of implementation of this Convention, which is in itself only a declaration of intent. Together with our colleagues from the ACP States in the Consultative Assembly we established what we felt to be the shortcomings of Lomé I. We are now faced with similar problems and tasks in the years to come for Lomé II.

Mr Sablé tried in his report to acquaint the whole of this House with the findings and experiences of Lomé I. He would like — and here he naturally has our support — above all to ensure that should be more cohesion, less contradiction, and more real results from decisions taken in that Assembly and here in this House. This is in fact a concern which is also very dear to my own Group. We have tried along the same lines to convert the decision on hunger in the world into actual figures in the budget and thereby give it credibility and make it logical. This was also our guiding principle during the deliberations in Committee on the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Wawrzik. With all due credit being given to the work which you, Mr Wawrzik, performed and which was exceptionally important and valuable, and also with due respect for the cooperative atmosphere which reigned in Committee a few claims still need to be met. They mainly concern the wording of the report, which unfortunately has remained unchanged, and which it is not our job to deal with here and now and which we can change nothing in, but it also concerns some of the points in the motion for a resolution.

The Socialist Group has for this reason tabled four draft amendments. In all four cases, it is exclusively a question of choosing between whether we wish to make decisions we have already taken more compatible with this decision, for example on the theme of human rights and on the theme of 'social living conditions in the ACP States' and to make more clear what is involved in this case, or whether we wish to accept what is perhaps a misleading and not entirely partner-like wording and to take the absolute minimum standards laid down by the International Labour Organization as the focal point for our preoccupations.

Mr President, we are ratifying Lomé II at a time when the relations between North and South are worsening all over the world, when the economic situation is constantly becoming more alarming and when many developing countries, even those with which we are dealing today, are faced with extremely pressing problems of survival, food supply, energy and balance of payments.

This is the very time which the industrialized countries, which have their own economic and unemployment problems to tackle, have chosen to cut back on their appropriations for development or feel obliged to set up protectionist barriers. We should like to recommend a quite different course of action. We have been aware for a sufficiently long time of the interdependence which exists between industrialized and developing countries to be able to lay heavy emphasis on the fact that increased cooperation on development problems, increased finances for development and more purchasing power in the developing countries means higher growth and more jobs at home.

In this connection, we must view Lomé II, we must demand as a result of all I have said, that the European Community should take action to ensure that the interests of the Third World are better defended and that North-South relations are improved. It is with this aim in view that the Socialist Group approves Lomé II.

President. — I call Mr Bersani to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

Mr Bersani. — (*I*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, I should first of all like to warmly thank Mr Wawrzik, state my support for his protest and sincerely congratulate him on the outstanding effort he made in preparing his report which in my opinion is rich and varied in content, containing both proposals and critical comments. He has made a first-class contribution to our deliberations on what has become by far the most important policy of the Community.

This debate is taking place at a very important time. First of all, we, as a Parliament, must approve the Lomé II Convention, and I too hope — as Mr Wawrzik and Mrs Focke have already suggested — that this will be the last time our task will be restricted to approving the text, this merely being an adjunct to the real ratification process, which up to now has been left to the nine Member States. For some time we have been insisting that, this question be clarified once and for all, since it is linked to other institutional problems and budgetary questions of which we are all aware. I shall therefore, merely stress this point without going into it further. I stress it because of the exceptional political import it has both in itself and for our Institution.

Bersani

Secondly — as Mr Sablé stressed several times in his excellent and comprehensive report, for which we all heartily congratulate him — this is the first time that problems of external agreements and of the functioning of joint or common institutions has been raised in this House. Let us hope that this will mark the beginning of a new tradition, because not only must we attempt to shed light — several other Members who spoke before me have drawn attention to this — on the negative aspects which we have noted many times, and in particular on the points which Mr Sablé brought up, but our main aim should be to seek to build up a positive working relationship, with commitments on both sides, a relationship which would be much more constructive from Parliament's point of view and from that of its specialist Committees. We have often had the feeling, and we have it again during this debate — I am forced to be quite frank on this matter — that this subject which, I must stress, is so important and involves all the policies of the Community, is regarded as the responsibility of a select few, of a small group of specialists, while Parliament as such shows no interest in the fundamental issues raised by our work. Well, Parliament — through the delegations it has created, via procedures which are unprecedented in the history of Parliamentary proceedings, via these joint structures — is directly involved, whether it likes it or not, in the decisions which we all have to take and I believe, therefore, that we will have to examine these institutional problems very shortly in a very different way. In addition, it is the institutional aspect of the Lomé Convention which is by far its most important element and also one of its most original. I therefore feel it is right that this time we should tackle the main lines of this problem, and thereby start discussion on a question to which — as Mr Sablé suggested — we should regularly return.

I now come on to a few general remarks, and I should like to say that I agree with the report and the motion for a resolution submitted by Mr Wawrzik for the reasons which I have just mentioned. Mrs Focke, on behalf of the Socialist Group, gave us prior information on a number of amendments. We shall examine them with the greatest possible care and attention, as has always been the case within the Committee on Development and Cooperation and in the organizations which deal with these very important problems. We devoted a great deal of thought — and in my opinion we showed a great deal of integrity — to Mrs Focke's report and we discussed it in the joint organizations. We examined the progress made under Lomé I, what its results had been and what its significance was as a marked innovation in the history of the European Community from the point of view of development cooperation policy. Today, we are faced with a new Convention which contains a great deal of new material: improvement of STABEX; the very important innovation, — at least we hope so — of SYSMIN; the problem of safeguarding the rights of

migrant workers — this to be extended to include students and the other categories already mentioned; the problem of agricultural development; the problem of reversals in trading policy which were extremely negative in their effect — I venture to say that this is the blackest aspect of the experience gained under Lomé I; and finally the problem of industrial policy and of co-financing. These are all new items, new basic structural factors in the Lomé Convention, and this shows that we are now in the presence of an agreement which is continually and constructively developing, and this is the very fact which in our opinion is one of its most interesting aspects, namely that Lomé continually throws up new ideas, that it never reflects self-satisfaction, that it shows a constant awareness of how inadequate are the solutions we have found, how slowly and how half-heartedly we react to world problems which are so tragic and serious. In the face of this reaction — positive but inadequate because of the totally insufficient funds provided in relation to what the situation requires, restricted, but interesting because it the range of instruments which are available for implementing this broad cooperation policy — there emerged, in my opinion, a new aspect, namely the human and social facets of Lomé. When we discuss the problem of human rights — we definitely ought to be moving towards further discussions on this matter — when we talk about social policy, meetings between the two sides of industry, protection of workers, problems of immigration, problems of cultural cooperation, and innovations in institutional cooperation policy, in developing cooperation between European non-governmental organizations and those based in the ACP States themselves, then we are touching on a whole range of new problems which show up in a new light the economic and financial structure of cooperation, which figures so prominently in first the Yaoundé Agreement and then the Lomé Convention. In my opinion, this is a new line which runs throughout all the policies scheduled under Lomé and other agreements which extend the involvement of the European Community as regards cooperation to more than 80 developing countries. This is a fundamental guideline because it takes account of new developments which have led to a redefining of the notion of development and to the abandoning of a whole range of purely technical and outdated terms, giving rise to a different and radically altered view of development and cooperation. I was recently reading a paper given to us at the FAO a few days ago, from which it would appear that economics itself is also modifying our potential for measuring, in terms of productivity, the extent to which education has developed and the extent to which public opinion can be swayed. We can thus see that this new philosophy, this new conception of development, is a fundamental part of Lomé II, and certainly makes up, together with its democratic and institutional aspects, an interesting ingredient.

We must, therefore, do much more. We must rouse public opinion, we should be aware that what we are

Bersani

doing is derisory in financial terms — for example, the cost of the Lomé Convention for each Italian is 10 lira per day — we must stir people's consciences in order to obtain reactions which are more appropriate to the problems, and we must continue along this path by making better use of and improving the instruments for technology, trade, industry and co-financing and the independent development of agriculture, of political life and of cultural and local life. At the same time we should be improving our cooperation with the institutions which represent the life forces of the societies we are dealing with, since this is the path to follow if we wish our establishment of relations to be respectful of their aspirations towards freedom, independence and autonomy, and it is on this basis that we can provide worthwhile joint cooperation.

IN THE CHAIR: MR MØLLER

Vice-President

President — I call Sir Frederick Warner to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Sir Frederick Warner. — Mr President, I was very struck by the phrase used by Mrs Focke when she said that we are here this afternoon to ratify the second Lomé Convention. That is precisely what we are here for. The second Lomé Convention is the most important document signed by the Community during the last three or four years. It is the most important international undertaking into which we have entered. So may I ask what is going on in this Parliament?

Fellow sufferers who are sitting with me here on these benches, the few of you who are here, look around you; the place is absolutely empty! We would have better attendance if we were discussing the harmonization of dog licences. We all know that. You, Mr Bersani, said that we have to shake up public opinion on our countries. But we don't seem to be able to shake our fellow Members. If we cannot do that, how are we going to shake public opinion? I ask you, what is wrong? Is it that we who deal with this subject are known to make very boring speeches? I do not think so.

The fact is that, although every Member of this Parliament expresses a profound human interest in the fate of the developing countries, they are not prepared to make their contributions. I, for my part, feel deeply ashamed of what I see around me here this afternoon. I therefore absolutely support what Mr Wawrzik said. I think it most unfair that he should have been given such a short time to produce one of the most important reports we have seen in the history of this Parliament.

I would just like to make a few remarks about his resolution. It is an admirable document and if you read it along with the Ferrero resolution you find that in the 18 months this Parliament has been sitting, we have been able to draw up complete guidelines for every sort of aid and assistance which we are giving to developing countries, whether it be development aid, rural development, industrial development, food aid or emergency aid. We have now, by means of comprehensive resolutions produced in the Committee on Development and Cooperation, covered pretty well the whole field. I hope that the Commission does not feel that this restricts it or unduly interferes with its freedom of operation. I hope that it feels, on the contrary, that those of us who do take an interest in this subject, have been trying to study it in depth and provide the Commission with real political backing for what it is doing.

The first point which emerges from this resolution, and on which I want to comment, is that at last we have some guidelines on the question of human rights. It is a question we all get asked at home: why do you give food to villains, why do you give assistance to rotten regimes? Well, we have never been able to get anything down about this. Now, however, we have very clear guidelines in this resolution, which are based on the Commission's own practice in recent years and which I think are of great value.

Secondly, I would like to draw attention to the point that nothing is said in this resolution about budgetizing EDF funds. This was something which was a major source of dissension between ourselves and the Council last year in the budget. This year we seem to have let it go. It is not mentioned in this resolution. I therefore draw attention to it so that we may note once again that it is of great importance for our authority. Our control and our powers in this Parliament are largely exercised through our responsibility for the budget and it is only if we are responsible for the expenditure of these monies that we can adequately comment on and control them.

My third point is that, when you have very long and complex resolutions of this kind, they inevitably overlap with what has been said in other resolutions. The work of the Committee on Development and Cooperation, as embodied in a resolution of this sort, inevitably overlaps with the work of the Committee on Agriculture, the Committee on External Economic Relations and other bodies, and therefore there is always a great risk of contradiction. We ought to try and eradicate that. I am not talking about a minute comparison of texts, I am not talking about editorial points. What I am saying is that we must be very careful not to say one thing clearly and firmly to the third world and then to turn round in another committee and say the opposite, clearly and firmly, to our own people in Europe. We have got to get the two things in line. For this reason I have introduced three amendments to the resolution.

Warner

The first deals with the problem of beef. There is a lot of discussion about this at the moment in the Committee on Agriculture. We have a structural surplus of beef building up. We have almost four hundred thousand tonnes in intervention: over a million carcasses. We are prepared to help countries who desperately need to export beef. For instance, in the case of Zimbabwe, we insisted, as a Parliament, in trying to get the Council to agree to a higher quota for Zimbabwe. To deal with a specific case is not too difficult. But to open the doors to an unrestricted import of beef when we have not the faintest idea where to put it, is not being honest or direct.

Secondly, Amendment No 12 deals with the import of agricultural produce. My worry here was that we had a very carefully phrased passage on this in the Ferrero report which said that all obstacles to the import of agricultural goods should be gradually reduced. The Wawrzik report asks for instant abolition. These are two quite different concepts and I think that we should stay with the original wording of the Ferrero report which was carefully worked out. The third point concerns sugar. We have a text here in the resolution which goes well beyond the position adopted in the Committee on Agriculture. What we want is to see the Community joining the International Sugar Agreement. That is what is important and that we must stress very strongly, but I do not think it is for us, dealing with the question of aid and development overseas, to dictate the policy on our own sugar quotas, and we certainly should not do so in conflict with the Committee on Agriculture. So those are my three resolutions and I ask you to look at them sympathetically.

I would only add that it is very pleasant to listen to Mr Sablé. The Consultative Council is beginning to develop a really useful life of its own. It is not just the talking shop which it used to be. Real contacts are being made, and if this is so, it is due to the efforts of individuals: Mr Sablé himself, notably Mr Bersani, who has always taken a leading part and some of the others of us who have been determined to turn the Consultative Assembly from being merely an exchange of unpolite remarks into a genuinely constructive body.

President. — I call Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli. — (*I*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, since all the speakers who have preceded me began their speeches with a protest or a bitter observation, I should like to begin mine by raising a point which is of concern to ourselves.

Ladies and gentlemen, for the last year this House has fully committed itself, in a wide range of seats of institutions, and in a large number of locations, from Arusha to Luxembourg, in the ACP-EEC Committee,

in the Consultative Assembly and in its various Committees, and has studied, and I stress this point, extremely seriously all the aspects of this problem, has dealt with the Lomé II Convention and backed this work up by holding a truly exemplary debate on the problem of hunger in the world.

As a result, I wonder if the lack of interest — which we must admit exists — is not the outcome of the fact that we do, indeed, do a lot of work, that we do our utmost and carry out a great deal of research into the problems, but that at the same time we are basically aware that our opinions are quite often disregarded and that they definitely do not have much political weight. As a result, I wonder if this is not the real heart of the matter, that is the political weight which the European Parliament can bring to bear by its decisions, because the reasons for this never depend on human nastiness, but always on political factors.

Having made this point, I should like to say that it is precisely by taking account of the powers of the European Parliament and, of the influence its work can have, that the problems, which Mr Sablé grasped so clearly in his report, can be made explicit and the need for closer cooperation between the ACP Consultative Assembly and the European Parliament highlighted. This interrelation is absolutely necessary if we wish to advance — I do mean advance and not reach our goal, because this will require more time — towards control by the Joint Parliamentary Assembly itself of Community measures aimed at filling the gap left by the fact that the Council has no obligation at all to entertain relations with the various sides of industry in the ACP countries. I should immediately like to say — and I shall not return to this point again — that one of our criticisms of the Lomé Convention stems precisely from the fact that, during the negotiations workers and employers were not consulted. The Sablé report — which I shall begin with before going on to say something about the Wawrzik report — refers to the general agreement reached on Mrs Focke's report in respect of the section criticizing Lomé I, whose shortcomings foreshadow the inadequacies of Lomé II. But what did this general agreement and the agreement of the ACP States on these criticisms really mean? As far as we in the Communist and Allies Group are concerned, I should like to state that, in my opinion, this meant that we, whilst feeling that the Lomé Convention gives us a certain status as a Community and as Europeans, are at the same time fully aware that there are still far too many loopholes in it. In my opinion — and I take the liberty of saying this to Mr Wawrzik, whom I nonetheless thank for the great care he took with his report and the wholehearted way he committed himself to preparing it — it seems to me, thus, that the new outline we need to give to Community policies so that a real development policy may be pursued, which is to some extent what emerged from our debate during the ACP-EEC Consultative Assembly, is not sufficiently stressed in this report, which as a result, in my opinion, goes against that general

Carettoni Romagnoli

trend, in particular because it fails to lay heavy emphasis on the modification which is needed in the Common Agricultural Policy. I agree with those Members who speak of a straight separation of the Common Agricultural Policy and development policy, in order to carry out the alterations needed in the Community's protectionist attitudes — which Mrs Focke talked about just now — and with reference to its tie-up with the disarmament policy we would like to see pursued.

These points, which we have evolved at a time of crisis for the Community, reflect, in my opinion, a real desire to achieve a redefinition of development policy, both within the scope of the Lomé Convention and outside it. Parliament's rapporteur says — if we look carefully — a number of important things, there is no doubt about that. But, in my opinion, what is missing from his report are the half-tones and subtle hues. What are missing are the priorities which would permit us — as I have just said — to adopt the new stance which has gradually been emerging from our talks.

I hope the rapporteur will permit me to make another remark, this time on my own behalf. He stresses, in Chapter V of his report, on page 82 of the Italian text, the need to improve the functioning of the world economic order. Even if I am willing to recognize, on the one hand, that we are not yet able to define what any new world economic order should be — this probably still has to be invented — I personally refuse — and I want to make this quite clear — to consider what now exists as an order, since it is nothing more than the historical outcome of a series of varied and heterogeneous agreements which caused an order of sorts, but which is unfair to be set up. The Italian Members of the Communist and Allies Group were, and remain, in favour of the Lomé Convention, because they work from the premise that positive relations with developing countries — even in the present state of world relations, even in the socio-political situation to which the EEC belongs — are feasible. And it is from this point of view, that is admitting the feasibility of this type of relationship, that we express our criticisms, which are admittedly strong and severe ones.

For example, we insist that everyone be fully aware that the Lomé Convention — I have said this on other occasions — is the Community's best visiting card, even if the word 'best' should in this case be seen in relation to the complete, or almost complete, absence of measures taken by any of the other industrialized countries, but I do not mean 'best' in any absolute sense, because a lot could be said about that. However, the fact that the contribution per inhabitant under Lomé II is scheduled to be less than what was planned under Lomé I, lights up a far from rosy picture. I should also like to add that we must not forget to mention the dissatisfaction expressed by many ACP countries. And we must also take account,

especially in the various European Assemblies, of the need, not only to progress, but — in my opinion — also to boost the quality of our relations.

Having said this, I should like from my seat here in this House and on behalf of my fellow Members, to welcome Zimbabwe which has now joined the Lomé Convention, and to greet its people warmly, by applauding the hard struggle they had to obtain their freedom.

Coming back to the main topic, we feel that the various votes which took place in the ACP-EEC Consultative Assembly — and here I am once more referring to Mr Sablé's report — ought to be very closely studied. Perhaps we ought to devote a little of our time to trying to discover the true meaning of these votes, whilst naturally — and I am the first to admit this — stripping this of all its value as political propaganda. Let us try to understand, therefore, the true meaning behind the signing of the Convention by these countries, both its positive and negative content. Let us try to understand what some of the policy statements issued really meant.

In conclusion, I should like to say, thereby adding my protest to that made by other Members, that a debate such as this deserves more time, even if we have been discussing the various arguments for the last year. This is our conclusion on the Lomé Convention and on this report: if we wish to avoid finding ourselves in the same situation at the end of Lomé II as that in which we were at the end of Lomé I, then we must all unanimously admit that the results are disappointing, and immediately devote as much attention as possible to the means for implementing Lomé II. This, naturally, means that the Community must make a great effort and that the ACP States must also make a great effort, and it also means that Parliament — and I stress this — must have a control function, the task almost of 'watch dog' with regard to development policy.

Mr Cheysson said a short while ago that in order to make progress in the difficult North-South Dialogue, we must seize every possible opportunity. There is no doubt that the implementation of Lomé II will offer us many, many such opportunities. With this aim in view, and with our firm resolve, we look upon this Convention and the vote on this report not with a triumphant attitude, however important we know it to be, and certainly not — I hope the rapporteur will excuse me once more — with the over optimistic attitude which emerges from his report, but rather with a cautiously constructive approach.

President. — I call Mr De Gucht to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr De Gucht. — (*F*) Mr President, I would first of all like to apologize for the absence of Mr Ponia-towski, Chairman of the Committee on Development

De Gucht

and co-operation who would have liked to speak in this important debate, but has unfortunately been detained elsewhere. This debate is taking place at a time when relations between industrialized and developing countries are in a stalemate. The North-South Dialogue is making little progress, and the energy crisis has hit the developing countries even harder than it has the industrialized countries. There are still just as many people dying from hunger throughout the world.

But while the EEC and its Member States inevitably have only limited scope for solving these problems, the same cannot be said of our relations with the African, Caribbean and Pacific states. Cooperation between the EEC and the ACP states involves reciprocal rights and obligations, contained in a five-year contract. This five-year period is of some importance. It gives the ACP States a better opportunity to plan their economies. The advantages of multi-annual food aid have often been pointed out. Another essential point is that the establishment of firm conditions for financial and technological cooperation over a period of several years allows for medium-term planning.

The content of the Lomé Convention is also significant. It covers virtually the whole range of instruments for cooperation and development. It contains, in particular, a section on trade and important chapters on financial and technological cooperation and on industrialization and agricultural cooperation, as well as institutional provisions. These various instruments have been improved in comparison with the first convention.

I would, nevertheless, like to stress how much importance we attach to institutional cooperation. I am thinking, in particular, of the ACP-EEC Council and the Consultative Assembly. With 60 to 120 members on the ACP side, and the same number from the European Parliament, these bodies have become somewhat unwieldy, and we therefore need to find ways of improving their efficiency. Despite its enormous difficulties, however, this pattern of collaboration is, nevertheless, virtually unique in the world and should enable us to develop, monitor and control our activities.

The Lomé Convention also has certain little-known advantages. It gives the ACP States a better understanding of their own problems, and allows them to improve their political cohesion. The difficult negotiations which led to the second Lomé Convention have demonstrated how successful this can be, since the ACP countries were remarkably united in their views. At the same time, the Lomé Convention allows the European Community to implement certain instruments of development cooperation which could later be introduced worldwide. The experience which the Community gains through its relations with what is a sizeable section of the developing countries, will be

useful in determining where it stands in, for example, the Nord-South Dialogue.

The second Lomé Convention is distinguished by a number of new ideas, as Mr Wawrzik points out in his excellent report. The export earnings stabilization system, STABEX, is far from perfect but it has to be admitted that, in general, it works well. When it is improved it should help developing countries to pull through a difficult period without too many extra worries.

Nevertheless, the system does little to diversify production structures, and even obstructs their development. So, to change traditional patterns of trade, and improve the production of finished and semi-finished goods, the European Communities should offer the same system for these products. It is worth remembering that the fact that the developing countries produce raw materials and foodstuffs which are at a permanent disadvantage under the terms of trade with the industrialized countries is one of the reasons for the perpetuation of poverty in these countries.

The new Convention provides for a support system for mineral products, SYSMIN, based on the STABEX system. This system should allow ACP countries to maintain their mining capacity on a profitable basis and to increase their potential. The system also has advantages for the EEC, which has a shortage of certain mineral products and has every reason to encourage investment in this sector in the ACP countries. However, the system is open to the same criticisms as STABEX, which perpetuates single-crop economies in developing countries. SYSMIN similarly encourages single-product systems in these countries. The energy crisis is making itself felt everywhere, but the effects on the ACP countries are likely to be particularly disastrous.

The Convention refers to the possibility of improving prospecting for and mining of energy resources. But, this depends on the implementation of a policy in this field. The same is true for the investment scheme contained in the new Convention. It is too early at this stage to make any judgement on these provisions. However, it is absolutely essential that the parties to the Convention are aware of the seriousness of our energy problems, and of the problems of investment, so that the provisions laid down in the Convention for this sector do not remain a dead letter.

I would like, finally, to draw your attention to two questions which I feel are important. I have the impression that all too often we tend to think of the Lomé Convention as, above all, a means of promoting trade between the ACP countries and the European Community. This is undoubtedly one of the most important aspects, but I think that inter-regional cooperation between ACP countries should also be encouraged. The ACP countries are less handicapped than the European Community by linguistic problems, while their economic situation should give them more

De Gucht

opportunity to plan their economies, unlike the European Community, whose industrial infrastructure was already well and truly established when it was set up.

This is why I am very pleased to see that the new Convention contains several provisions for encouraging closer cooperation between the ACP countries. These are in particular the STABEX arrangements under which the ACP Council of Ministers can extend the benefits of STABEX, on a case-by-case basis, to trade between ACP countries.

The funds provided for inter-regional cooperation have also been considerably increased. Mr Wawrzik and the Committee on Development rightly demand that sales promotion should extend to all exports from ACP countries, and that includes trade between ACP countries.

The negotiations leading up to the conclusion of the second Lomé Convention were difficult. They were difficult for the Community above all because of the present economic climate. There is a tendency to think that the Community went as far as it could; but I am not too sure about that. I feel that the public, our economic and social groups, and our political leaders need to be better informed as to the various reasons which led us to sign this Convention and that we should insist on its advantages for the EEC. It would be quite wrong to present this Convention as having been concluded between two parties of which one was making the demands and the other the concessions. That is a completely false view. This agreement is advantageous to both parties, and it is in our interests to explain this aspect of the situation to the public who, because they are not properly informed, sometimes tend to feel that development cooperation is one-sided. For example, it is not generally recognized that we have been able to save as many jobs thanks to the increase in trade with developing countries as have been lost through imports from these countries into the Community.

This brings me to the excellent report from our colleague, Victor Sablé, on the results of the work done by the Joint Committee of the ACP-EEC Consultative Assembly. This is an own-initiative report from the Committee on Development and Cooperation who felt that Members of this House in particular, and the public in general, were not sufficiently well-informed about the institutional cooperation between the ACP countries and the EEC. Mr Sablé's report will enable anyone interested to find out more about what was decided at the various meetings of the Joint Committee and of the Consultative Assembly and to bear this in mind with relation to the European Parliament's work.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it would be wrong to conclude that I think the Lomé Convention does not deserve any criticism. I am well aware that this Convention is far from perfect and that, for

example — as Mr Wawrzik stressed in his motion for a resolution — the export structures in the ACP countries have remained virtually unchanged. It is nevertheless a Convention which bears witness to a remarkable political will, both on the part of the ACP countries and on the part of the Community, and which can be considered as thoroughly acceptable. We must continue to strive to remedy the various negative aspects. Mr Wawrzik has highlighted in this report, we must continue to strive for a better convention which is closer to the legitimate aspirations of the ACP States. This Convention is far from perfect, but it does have the great advantage of being, for the present, the only one in the world which provides a more or less complete framework for cooperation between developing and industrialized countries.

President. — I call Mr Israël to speak on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

Mr Israël. — (*F*) Mr President the future historian of the European Communities will certainly see the Lomé Conventions as a tremendous act of solidarity, worthy of this Parliament.

There is one problem, however, which the Lomé Conventions have not really solved. That is the problem of the relations between the EEC and the ACP countries from the point of view of human rights. We have clearly been hesitant right from the start. Obviously, it is not because we imagine that the European Community can, under any circumstances, pass judgement on its allies on their respect for human rights, by trying to blackmail them with economic aid. This is out of the question. But my Group wonders whether we could not envisage setting up a framework for permanent consultation between the European Community and the ACP countries to determine how far human rights are respected, not only in the ACP countries but in Europe as well. There could be an exchange of information, an attempt to see how far certain problems can be rectified. This would be very like the procedure envisaged for Helsinki. You will no doubt say that this wasn't a great success. But there is a distinct possibility that we have a better understanding with our friends in Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific than with the Communist countries, which are both our partners and our adversaries.

Therefore, Mr President, I maintain that we have achieved a great deal with the Lomé Convention and that we must try to give more thought, above all, to the subject of human rights, because if we do not move forward we can only go back.

President. — I call Mr Pannella to speak on behalf of the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members.

Mr Pannella. — (*F*) Mr President, I would like to take the opportunity in the few minutes I have available to say, first of all, to Sir Fred Warner, and other colleagues who were surprised to see that there were so few of us here, that the way in which our colleagues in the Parliament show their concern about famine in the world and the ACP countries, is to make sure that it allows them to travel the world... If we were to meet in Tanzania, everyone would be there, but as we have to work here, no one can make it. It sounds cynical, hard even, but it's true all the same.

We, Mr President, are not satisfied with this report, not because there is little value in what it states or because it displays a lack of confidence in the future, but because it does not go beyond acknowledging an agreement which, for the reasons which Mr Israël has just pointed out, is not up to dealing with the economic, social and human tragedy which is going on in these countries. First of all Mr President, I think we must stop trying to buy an easy conscience on easy terms. I'm saying this for the benefit of the Commission as well as Parliament. When two-thirds of the overall volume of ACP trade is with just two countries, Nigeria and the Ivory Coast, we really should be giving it some thought. The principle which inspired STABEX might have been excellent at the outset, but when we see the agreements that have come out of the system restricted largely to tropical products, it is clear that the principle has lost a lot in practice. The general approach is good, but the practical results are not.

When we met at Luxembourg the representative of a country which could hardly be said to be revolutionary, Senegal, took the liberty of pointing out — and quite rightly — that the European Parliament was trying to move in two, or even three directions at once. Cynical though that is, I can't help feeling that it's true.

As regards the problems of human rights, a very dangerous ideological neocolonialism prevents us all from facing up to them. To say that those people don't deserve freedom, political democracy and so on, is one of the most shameful and also the most dangerous arguments, because this remark was also applied to fascist Italy: the Latin peoples, it seems, did not deserve political democracy; today, it is the African States, and this, in reality, is what allows the successors of Foccart to put people like Bokassa in power with those who will follow.

Mr President, I have said all I want to. We will vote against, not because the report is in some way contrary to the attitudes of our Parliament, but because it respects them. This is the Ferrero philosophy: it is, apparently, the Euro-Communist philosophy. It is the philosophy of good intentions, of an easy conscience on easy terms. I believe that in a few months this will become evident: out of the 60 countries associated under the Lomé Convention, at least 50 will see their economies gradually being destroyed. Our relations

will become worse and worse. Those who continue to claim that these agreements are sufficient are lying to themselves. Perhaps lying is not the right word. They are deluding themselves. A political instrument is good if it is a means of dealing with what happens and not just what happened in the past. In my view, this report acknowledges not just the Lomé agreements, but quite simply a failure which is getting worse and worse.

I think that we Italian Radicals owe it to ourselves to be just a little stricter with ourselves on this question, I think we must perform this act of humility by saying, perhaps without knowing what to put in its place, that you are deluding yourselves by adopting the position you are going to adopt, and by accepting the reports you are going to accept. This is why we will vote against.

President. — I call Mr Lezzi.

Mr Lezzi. — (*I*) Mr President, in making a few brief remarks on certain questions I count myself particularly lucky to see here with us the distinguished Commissioner Mr Vredeling, whom I had the pleasure of meeting during the life of the previous Parliament, in the course of the lengthy examination of the problem of clandestine migration. I shall return to this subject very briefly later. What I wish to say now is that people of all political persuasions have acknowledged the indisputable political value of Annex XV to the second Lomé Convention, containing the declaration on migrant workers from ACP countries legally resident in the territory of a Member State, covering working conditions, wages, and employment related social security payments to be extended to members of the family resident with the immigrant worker.

However, this declaration, although it constitutes a significant step forward, must be regarded — as, indeed, the ACP-EEC institutions regarded it — as extremely modest, particularly when seen in the context of the conditions for workers and their families, the proposals of the ACP-EEC institutions and the Commission's action programme. The inadequacy of the measures is also the result of the non-participation of the trade union organizations — as Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli reminded us a short while ago. We must now closely supervise the implementation of the measures and demand — as the resolution approved in Luxembourg and before that in Arusha states — that the ACP-EEC Council of Ministers should report annually on respect for, and implementation of, the measures adopted and should revise the whole package for ACP migrant workers, as decided — I was saying this a short while ago — in Luxembourg by the Consultative Assembly.

The Community and Member States must more decisively promote effective consultation and harmonization of national policies relating to the rights of ACP migrants, and must also ratify the ILO conventions. It

Lezzi

is also desirable that the Council of Ministers should at last adopt the directive on clandestine immigration approved by Parliament in 1978 on the basis of the Pisoni report. We do not wish to lapse into facile demagoguery, but neither do we wish to be involved in 'perverse' mechanisms which either continue the exploitation of clandestine migrants or claim to solve the problem by expelling them.

Although many Member States of the Community have measures to prevent the access of ACP students and trainees to universities and higher education institutes in their countries, student emigration is still expanding. This emigration must be controlled by coordinating and harmonizing national policies — while rejecting the repressive approaches typified by Stoléru and Bonnet in France or Rognoni in Italy — not only with regard to the right of residence, but also by encouraging the participation of students and trainees in drawing up study programmes, so that their training and specialization may correspond to the real need for independent development in their countries of origin, and in drawing up criteria for the revival of study scholarships, which can no longer be left to the discretion of individual governments.

This last subject was excellently dealt with in the Michel Report, subsequently in the plenary sitting, in the Sablé Report and in the overall approach of the Wawrzik Report. In Arusha and Luxembourg, we were not in a position to reach conclusions on the question of students and trainees.

I wish to express the hope that our commitment — the commitment of Parliament — may ensure that, when the question of cultural cooperation is tackled once more, this aspect will be at the centre of our debates so that we may be consistent with the approach — rightly adopted — of defence of human rights. If we wish to gain credibility, we must recognize not only the right to work, but also the right to study.

President. — I call Mr Michel.

Mr Michel. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I too would like to thank and congratulate Mr Wawrzik and Mr Sablé both for their excellent reports and for their series of motions for resolutions on the second Lomé Convention and the work of the Joint Committee of the ACP-EEC Consultative Assembly.

I would, however, first like to draw the attention of this House very briefly to the urgent need to pass the instruments ratifying Lomé II, which must in fact be deposited before 1 December if we want the Convention to come into force on 1 January. Now as far as I can tell, the Convention needs to be ratified by two-thirds of the ACP States, in other words at least 40 out of the 60. At the present time 37 have done so, but ratifications are still coming in day by day, whilst as far as the Nine are concerned there are still three

Parliaments which have not ratified, i.e. those of Belgium, the Netherlands and Italy. I gather, however — I have been assured that the first two, and certainly Belgium, will ratify during the next few days. I hope the same will apply to the others, but I felt I should draw your attention to this point.

The second point I would like to make relates to a question which concerns us in the light of our September part-session and the long debate we held on the problems of hunger in the world. In this very Chamber we adopted a resolution proposing both immediate aid — particularly food — and longer term aid using the vehicle of development programmes. During the days which followed we were in Luxembourg for the plenary session of the ACP-EEC Assembly. At that time I put forward a proposal in two parts, namely that we should firstly send our ACP partners the text of the resolution, the 'Ferrero resolution', and secondly ask them to let us know their views on all these problems, and on what ought to be done to get development going; to this end we proposed to create and *ad hoc* committee to produce tangible proposals for the next Joint Committee meeting.

We all know that we do not always have the facilities to reach agreements of this kind but this time, during the Luxembourg meeting the idea was passed to the appropriate committee. It was then discussed in the context of a report by the ambassador of Congo Brazzaville, Senegal ambassador, Mr Pannella and myself. Thus amended, this proposal was approved unanimously. I would like to ask what has happened to it. And I would like to ask whether or not we are going to get this committee working, using its good offices, as it were, to arrange an exchange of views, in a spirit of cooperation, on what should be done to strike at the roots of hunger and open the way to genuine development.

I must also say that, knowing our friends and partners from ACP States as I do, if we have still done nothing by February when the Joint Committee meets again it will be very disheartening for those who wish to bring about some change.

Indeed, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, if we look at the shortages afflicting this hungry world and continue to live in our own society of abundance and over-consumption, ignoring the famine and the permanent distress of a thousand million men, women and children, we have a great deal to answer for. We know what the solutions are, but we must ask ourselves whether we do not need to change our attitudes. Because if we go on living in a world where the economy is founded jointly on war and profit, I cannot see what we can offer to fire the enthusiasm of the next generation.

We must replace the economy of profit and war with an economy based on meeting needs — food needs, of course, but also the need for clothing, health, educa-

Michel

tion and training for young people throughout the world. It is in the fight for justice and for solidarity — solidarity with the poorest of the poor — that there is a chance of new hope not only for the youth of our own countries but also for the youth of the developing countries. We are looking for ways of giving new spirit to our young people, and it seems to me that it is in that kind of effort that the answer lies.

A third point I would like to make is to join the rapporteur, Mr Wawrzik and Mr Cheysson in stressing the points which remain — alas — not in abeyance but inadequately settled. We have talked enough about the question of human rights, I think. We must be watchful on every front, just as much at home as in the developing countries. I have often spoken about this, but talking about human rights is not enough; they must become part of everyday life, part of the normal way of things. You heard what Mr Cheysson said, that the Council is completely silent on this subject, especially as far as respecting social standards is concerned.

As you know, the social standards of the International Labour Organization are supposed to be universally accepted, but the reaction of the Council of Ministers to the Commission's proposals on the subject has been deafening silence. This is extremely serious, because the sin is that of omission, and this really does interfere with on the proper functioning of the institutions, insofar as it affects everybody's right to the most elementary justice.

I would finally like to refer to the question of cultural cooperation and say that in stressing the whole problem of migrant workers, on which I was rapporteur myself, we must also be concerned with students and trainees and remember that here we have responsibilities as individual States. We must shoulder these responsibilities!

At the same time, when we are speaking of a new international economic order I think it is up to us to set the ball rolling and take up the challenges with which we are presented.

Finally, I would like to remind you that if Lomé II was possible during a period of crisis it was thanks to the determination of Mr Cheysson and his team, who are working for an ideal of which this Community can be proud. There is nevertheless still a great deal of argument about Lomé and I think it fair to say that though the Convention may well be an achievement for European integration, the policy itself remains fragile and a number of governments are still willing to obstruct it and block the finance and manpower needed for its full implementation.

At the precise time that the governments of the Nine together with Mr Thorn are about to appoint the new team of Commissioners, I would like a little attention to be turned to the question of who will be the driving force in the future for Lomé and the necessary

follow-up to it. And it is my hope that the political lottery of task-sharing between nations will not entrust this mission to someone who has no feeling for the problems it involves.

The next four years will be decisive for the future of the Lomé Convention. Setting up the SYSMIN system, cooperation on industry and energy, the priorities given to rural development and setting up technical centres for agricultural and rural cooperation, consultation with the two sides of industry, protection for migrant workers, trainees and students — all of these imply an underlying determination to make it work, and we must hope that this task will be carried on by the man who has guided it so far; we hope that the Cheysson team will be able to continue and complete the work it has started so well. That, at least, is my own personal wish.

President. — I call Mrs Poirier.

Mrs Poirier. — (*F*) Mr President, I took on the task of drafting, on the behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, an opinion on the Lomé Convention and the OCT association agreement because for us French members of the Communist and Allies Group it is a particularly important and serious question.

So that I could prepare an opinion with a properly documented analysis I therefore set about obtaining as much information as possible. Figures and statistics were supplied to me by the Commission in Brussels, from Eurostat publications, from the ACP-EEC Council of Ministers report and from the replies of the ACP states to a questionnaire which I had sent to them.

The report I prepared on the agenda of three successive meetings of the Committee on External Economic Relations and was finally rejected without there being any debate on its content. I can assure the House that this draft opinion will be widely distributed and will in particular be sent to the ACP states for their information.

Having said that, how can I explain the attitude shown by the Committee of which I am a member? I think it is very simple: a lucid and unflattering analysis of the relations between the EEC and the ACP States is something which the overwhelming majority of this House finds intolerable. The arguments for and against were not actually considered. My report was rejected for partisan reasons, without discussion of its content, because the truth is embarrassing. One member of the Committee even admitted that he had only read the first page.

Exactly what were my colleagues refusing to discuss? First, colonialism. How can we understand current relations if we hide our eyes from the situation the

Poirier

colonized countries were in at the moment when the long years of bitter struggle finally brought them political independence? Traditional structures and civilizations completely destroyed, utter destitution despite their native wealth and considerable potential — that is what the European ruling classes left behind in the ACP States. The relationships they set up were based on the export of natural wealth from the colonies to the European markets and the import of manufactured goods, derisory labour costs, infrastructures restricted to meeting the needs of the colonists and of the movement of goods. While certain things have changed as a result of the independence of these former colonies and of the power which they represent in the world today, the fact remains that the basic structure of relationships has not been changed and that is quite simply because the former colonial powers, our countries, have continued in the same mould.

On the basis of the set patterns which resulted from colonialism they were able to maintain their economic domination and make the most of it. That is what neocolonialism is, and it is far from dead. Indeed, I have heard a number of honourable Members, of every colour in the political spectrum save Communist, saying that the words 'multinational' and 'colonialism' were offensive and confused the issued. But who finds them confusing and offensive? Or that there is a problem with corruption in a number of ACP governments, that the multinationals and private banks help in making progress, have a positive role to play, and that it is normal for them to be sensitive to market forces.

Those are things which nobody dares say in the presence of the ACP States but which are very revealing with regard to certain intentions. These things distract our attention from the struggle against hunger, from human suffering, *per capita* incomes of £30 a year, a life expectancy of 40 years and hospitals without water or electricity, with one doctor to every 400 000 inhabitants. These are facts, and it is my great regret that my colleagues on the Committee on External Economic Relations do not have the courage to look them in the face.

How then, are these facts reflected in the main sections of the Lomé Convention? First of all there has been no change in trade patterns — no geographical change, no change in the nature of imports and exports, no change in the range of products. The marketing networks are completely outside the control of the ACP States. They can do nothing about the contemptible prices they have to accept for their produce, neither can they do anything about the fluctuating rates forced upon them by foreign import-export businesses. And at the same time imported fertilizers, machinery and manufactured goods of all kinds continue to rise in price.

As for industrial cooperation, it is universally acknowledged that this has been a blatant, total failure. There has been no industrialization in the ACP countries.

There has been very little investment and mineral prospecting has even been reduced. There are undoubtedly political reasons for this but it is principally because capital from our countries is aimed, as in the past, at short term profit and there is simply not enough money to be made except perhaps in one or two labour-intensive industries. Multinationals prefer to arrange imports to the ACP countries rather than help them create their own means of survival.

And then, although many ACP States have extraordinary potential, because of their current destitute condition enormous investment would be needed for prospecting, improving infrastructures, increasing literacy, technical and professional training and improved health, and wages would have to be sufficient for manual workers to be properly nourished, all of which the profit motive prohibits.

What is more, all the EEC institutions in agreement in defending the legitimacy of profit seeking by private companies and private banks. Let us at least be honest and say that, that conflicts totally with the interests of the population.

If we now turn to agricultural cooperation, we find that the situation in the ACP States has deteriorated. The general trend in EEC-financed operations has been to develop cash crops. That has been going on for years at the expense of subsistence crops. Encouraging this trend has very serious repercussions because the ACP States then have to meet contracts tying them to export crops even if they ought to devote their resources and their efforts to domestic subsistence crops. Recent very, very modest developments in subsistence crops have gone hand in hand with expanded low price exports of food products. Some Sahel countries are exporting meat and fresh vegetables whilst their populations are dying of hunger. They can do nothing about it because they need the foreign currency to buy goods manufactured abroad.

The only people who gain from this disgusting game are the big private companies whose market penetration in the ACP States has been greatly assisted by the Lomé Convention.

After all, Lomé is also a means of supplying public and private money from the EEC countries through the EDF and, above all, the EIB, and they do nothing to counter the general trend I have just described. Quite the contrary: it can be said that all in all the EDF is a vehicle for private capitalism insofar as it finances infrastructure and social projects which are necessary to prepare the way for profitable schemes. This does not at all mean that the population is any better fed or any less poor, or that the recipient country actually gains opportunities for real development. The EIB simply follows market forces.

The Committee on External Economic Relations is unanimous in finding that quite normal, but let us be

Poirier

honest and admit that it would be pointless looking for any spirit of generosity or disinterestedness. The EIB thus plays a part in increasing the indebtedness of the ACP States, the developing countries, and this has been condemned by the non-aligned States at the United Nations.

Mr President, others before me have, in their own way, produced a short, admittedly incomplete analysis such as this, and made these same points. When I was preparing my report nobody in Brussels attempted to conceal from me that relations between the EEC and the ACP States were, as far as the EEC was concerned, an attempt to secure a return on invested capital. Other honourable Members have, elsewhere, been particularly critical of the Lomé Convention but what claimed to be damning indictments were just storms in so many tea-cups.

We were shown in Luxembourg, at the Consultative Assembly, just how wide the rift is between declared intentions and reality. The vote on the budget has given us further examples, and one by one the illusions fostered by practically every political persuasion in this Assembly are being shattered.

The conclusions to be drawn, Mr President, are included, albeit quite incongruously, in the document which has been circulated and I shall therefore not go into detail about them.

It is our view that the solution is to be found in a determined attempt to serve the fundamental interests of the peoples of the ACP States and of our own countries. There is no contradiction in that. This involves developing the whole human and material potential in all countries, with consistent, unselfish aid to the developing countries, aid funded partly at the expense of military budgets and the machinery of death; it means improving purchasing power, developing internal markets, satisfying the needs of hundreds of millions of human beings. Both in those countries and in our own it means making political and economic relations more democratic. It means a new international economic order, which is totally incompatible with the multinationals' domination so carefully cultivated by the EEC.

But even with the current state of affairs we made concrete proposals at the time of the budget vote. At the same time we are proposing amendments to today's motion which will be moved tomorrow. It is in such unequivocal and meaningful votes that we could express a true will to participate in developing those countries which were plundered to enable capitalism in Europe to flourish.

However, Mr President, in this as in other matters we French Communists have much less faith in the good will of the European Assembly than in the people's determination.

President. — I call Mr Skovmand.

Mr Skovmand. — (DK) Mr President, the Lomé Convention is one of the biggest myths of the EEC. It is said that 59, and in the near future, 60 developing countries will be members and that the Convention benefits them greatly. What is not said is that a large proportion of these 60 countries are very small, and that the Lomé countries together do not represent even 10 % of the developing countries' population. Thus more than 90 % of the world's poor are outside the Lomé Convention. Many live in extremely poverty-stricken countries such as India and Bangladesh but these are not allowed to join the select club. For special reasons it was decided in advance that only countries in Africa, the Pacific and the Caribbean could join. These countries can thus enjoy certain advantages many of which, however, are entirely gratuitous for the EEC since they are accorded at the expense of the other developing countries.

At the same time the Lomé Convention has an extremely damaging effect on the developing countries as a whole. It divides them, whereas they need to stand together to defend their common interests. Thus, for example, when the developing countries' attempt to obtain stable raw material prices miscarried so dismally, this was a result of the Lomé Convention. Some developing countries receive special advantages from the EEC which they are afraid to lose. *Divide et impera*, divide and rule, as the Romans used to say. For people in the EEC this policy can perhaps still present a short-term advantage, because in this way we can push the developing countries' prices below what is reasonable. But in the long term this is not an advantage, not even for us. It creates hardship and poverty in the developing countries and thereby threatens their stability. I do not believe, either, that ordinary people in the Community think this is a good policy, whether they live in Denmark, Holland or Germany. For this reason I hope that the Community will come to recognize as soon as possible that the Lomé Convention should be rescinded and replaced by international arrangements under the aegis of the UN.

President. — I call Mr Jalton.

Mr Jalton. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the first thing I must do is to congratulate Mr Wawrzik and Mr Sablé, whose reports on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation are a complete and objective appraisal of the second Lomé Convention and of the draft decision on the association of the overseas countries and territories to the Community and the outcome of the Joint Committee of the ACP/EEC Consultative Assembly.

It is a matter for surprise that the Lomé Conventions, following on those of Yaoundé and Arusha, should have had such little impact, particularly within the

Jalton

Nine, and that our colleagues here in the European Parliament seem to show so little interest.

These Conventions are nevertheless an attempt to revolutionize the relations which have existed hitherto between the rich, industrialized countries of Europe and part of the developing Third World. They represent a first step in recognizing the obvious fact that the economic relations between the former colonial powers in Europe and the overseas countries were a constant source of conflict, and that in the interests of world peace other policies were possible.

This attempt, which is linked with the process of decolonization since the Second World War, now seems to be irreversible. It is the starting point for the North-South Dialogue on which we are building so many hopes.

The Second Lomé Convention, which is intended to improve on its predecessor, is no more than a catalogue of proposals and requirements. The idea, it would seem, is to ensure future cooperation on the basis of a legal framework of freely negotiated contracts between equal partners. The general aim of the Second Convention is to be a development contract for the ACP States and the OCT. However, a contract can only be effective if both parties sign it in good faith and without ulterior motives.

We must not lose sight of the fact that for centuries the Third World countries were exploited as the colonies of our present European partners and that they have good reason to be at least prudent, if not distrustful. Their reservations may indeed be at least partly well founded when we think that European industry is not particularly keen to invest in the ACP States, allegedly on account of their political instability, and prefers, for obvious reasons, to approve investments in and transfers of technology towards, for example, the OPEC countries.

There is also the question of whether the EEC has the means to carry out its plans. To be more precise, the real question is whether the necessary financial resources will be applied in a climate of political determination. And even if the answer is yes, we must not think that all we have to do is to bring in the financial weight of the European Community to give guaranteed success to the Lomé Convention. We shall have to back up these purely economic relationships with cultural exchanges, the human element which can create the climate of confidence without which, despite the best will in the world, it will fail.

The present world economic order works in favour of a production system which does nothing for the real needs of the wealthy countries, and even less for the basic human needs of the Third World.

It is essential to ensure first of all that the profit from the economic exchanges provided for in the Lomé

Convention goes to the broad masses of deprived people in the ACP States, and is not siphoned off or misappropriated for the benefit of a privileged minority. In most underdeveloped ACP countries and OCTs there are significant natural resources which, because of their precarious economy and lack of technology, they have not yet been able to use. It should be possible for a new policy of aid and technical assistance to give such countries assured supplies of food and energy.

As far as the effects of the second Lomé Convention on the French overseas departments is concerned, it is our view that the outcome of the negotiations is unfortunate, not to say catastrophic. It seems to have been overlooked that the overseas departments which are an integral part of the European Economic Community, are also developing countries and that their natural resources are the same as those of the ACP States and the overseas countries and territories, which means that the economies of the overseas departments are threatened by direct competition from the ACP States. The EEC must therefore take account of the particular needs of the overseas departments.

We Socialists suggested to the French Government that they should include amongst the team negotiating the Convention elected representatives or people involved in their day-to-day work with the problems of the overseas departments, so that they could put their regions' case to a Community which had tended to ignore them for 20 years. The French Government took no notice of our suggestion and instead gave the job of defending the interests of the overseas departments to technocrats who were no doubt well qualified but whose concern for the future of the overseas departments was suspect to say the least.

We might for example have expected that the French negotiators would do their best to ensure that companies in the overseas departments would be eligible for loans from the EIB.

In a word, because the French Government failed to put forward a coherent development plan for the overseas departments to which the Community authorities could refer, the overseas departments have not been able to benefit from the considerable resources of this Community.

We Socialists shall endeavour in the European Parliament to put right the problems caused by this culpable Commission. We would moreover like to see everything possible being done to foster special relationships — in view of their geographical position — between the overseas departments and the neighbouring ACP States. We would also ask Parliament to institute close monitoring of aid granted to the overseas departments, which is taken in hand by the French Government without any guarantee being given that it will actually reach these underprivileged regions of the Community.

President. — I call Mr Narducci.

Mr Narducci. — (*I*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I think it is useful to add my protest to the many which have been made, because the more of these are recorded the greater, one hopes, will be the results, so that the next debate on such an important subject as this will receive the time and attention which it deserves, all the more so since it has been said — but it is useful to repeat it — that it is no small thing to assess the Lomé Convention together on the basis of the first report to the European Parliament on the results achieved by the Consultative Assembly and the Joint Committee. These are matters of great moment, about which Parliament seems to be ill informed — apart from those working on the subject — and which have met with little response from public opinion. Consideration of them is therefore far from pointless.

I would like to take the opportunity, not so much to speak at length on what has already been said and is contained in the reports by Mr Wawrzik and Mr Sablé — who deserve the sincere thanks of the entire Parliament — but to make a few observations on our role as Members of Parliament, in the context of relations with the African, Caribbean and Pacific countries.

The first observation, which was raised by the ACP countries themselves, and which has been mentioned here many times, concerns the need to coordinate our efforts in order to avoid working at cross purposes.

It has already been rightly said here that we cannot go on talking of sugar, rice or beef in one way in the Committee on Agriculture or other relevant committees, and in a different way in Arusha, Luxembourg or Sierra Leone, because our credibility is at stake, much more than we suppose or believe. If some of the positions taken up by European members of the Joint Committee were perhaps hasty, we must have the courage to say so, and not decide one thing in Arusha and something else here. Anyone who took part in the discussions at Arusha and Luxembourg knows that he adopted his attitude after careful consideration and in full awareness of the difficulty of the problems. We would like future action to be decided in full awareness of the facts and in a context of greater coordination with all the committees and with Parliament as a whole, for the European members of the Consultative Assembly and its Joint Committee are not a body separate from this Parliament, but the direct expression of this Parliament.

A second observation I would like to make — partly because the next meeting in February is not far off — is that too often some Members of this Parliament transfer to the forum of these meetings the political disagreements which are typical of this Parliament. The Consultative Assembly and its Joint Committee are regarded as a great stage on which to play out the controversies peculiar to this Parliament. This is

another risk which we must avoid, and we must try to express in that forum our views and convictions rather than our quarrels. It is dishonest to our partners to use them for our political ends. This is really ideological imperialism — a form of neo-colonialism.

Similarly, we cannot once more indulge, in Luxembourg, Arusha or Sierra Leone, in the procedural wrangles which already happen here on the pretext of safeguarding minorities, and too often hold up the work of this Parliament. In this case, too, there has been an attempt to transfer our disputes to that forum, and this is a real problem, because our relations with the African, Caribbean and Pacific countries are thereby compromised. I would like to confine my observation to this, precisely in order to contribute something to self-criticism on our part.

I would like to ask the Bureau of Parliament to regard meetings of the Consultative Assembly and its Joint Committee in the same way as a plenary sitting of Parliament, for it is unacceptable that we should be present in such small numbers because of the committee work and the work of other parliamentary bodies taking place at the same time.

I think that, if the protests expressed here serve as a stimulus to careful consideration, the next meeting with the ACP representatives will be more fruitful than earlier ones, and Parliament will really be able to express the best of itself, all the more so — this is my last point — because our relations with our African, Caribbean and Pacific partners are moving towards a field which has hitherto been largely unexplored — I refer to social relations, especially the question of students and trainees, and cultural relations which must be the cornerstone of future conventions in this field, for clearly cultural cooperation can give a new meaning and a new impetus to relations which cannot go on being merely economic.

If the political awareness of Parliament takes us to the next meeting with the ACP partners in this new spirit and with this new attitude, and if we can learn our lesson, admitting the mistakes made up to now, I think that the next meeting in Freetown will be a really important one.

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

Mr Martin. — (*F*) Mr President, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, I must protest strongly against the undemocratic manoeuvring there has been in connection with the Kirk report which we are about to examine.

I had better explain. At the committee meeting on Monday 17 November this report was rejected by the Committee in perfectly regular fashion. A quorum was present and the vote was properly taken: five votes in favour, five against and three abstentions. We were

Martin

surprised the following morning to learn that the fisheries working party was meeting without all its members having been informed. The members of the Committee on Agriculture were then summoned at the last minute for an 11 o'clock meeting. It was under these irregular conditions, after a night of chicanery and bargaining, that a second vote took place. When my friend and colleague Emmanuel Maffre-Baugé protested strongly, the chairman, Sir Henry Plumb, replied that the Bureau had given its blessing to what can only be called a coup.

I therefore wish to register my protest against these undemocratic machinations and I should like to hear the Bureau's explanation of the reasons which led it to authorize such chicanery.

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

Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul. — (*D*) Ladies and gentlemen, I wish to make a point of order with reference to the previous debate. I wish to do this because the chairman of the Committee on External Economic Relations, who at the same time is also rapporteur, was not called upon to speak. Otherwise I would have deputized for him and presented the committee's opinion. On behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, I would just like to clear up a point made by Mrs Poirier during the debate. Mrs Poirier was appointed rapporteur and her report was discussed on numerous occasions by the committee. Eventually it was unanimously — yes, unanimously — rejected, not for the reasons which she expounded here, but because there were fundamental differences in the assessment of the Lomé Convention. I would therefore like, if you will allow me, to point out that the opinion adopted by the Committee on External Economic Relations — and this is its position — approves the contents of the two association agreements because it feels that, because of their approach, their structure and the technical instruments used in their implementation, they contribute to solving the problems which must be overcome if we wish to create a new and just world economic order.

This is the position of the Committee on External Economic Relations, and we rejected Mrs Poirier's report, because it disagreed with this assessment. I would like, therefore, as Vice-Chairman of the Committee on External Economic Relations, to refute these criticisms, and in particular I would like to stress that although, according to Rule 42 of the Rules of Procedure, we were not bound to do so, we annexed to the opinion of the Chairman of the Committee on External Economic Relations, Sir Fred Catherwood, the points made by Mrs Poirier as a minority opinion. This is a special concession and clearly shows that we were willing to present these views to Parliament.

I would like, therefore, to reject outright the criticisms

levelled by Mrs Poirier at the Committee on External Economic Relations.

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

Mr Gautier. — (*D*) On behalf of the Socialist Group, I would like to comment on the criticisms made by the representative of the French Communists about the procedure adopted in drawing up Mr Kirk's report. It is true that on Monday the Committee on Agriculture rejected the draft report by Mr Kirk. However, since this subject has become urgent as a result of the Council's action, it must be dealt with in this part-session. All those involved were expecting the Committee on Agriculture to meet officially once again in the course of this part-session. There was no meeting of the Committee on Agriculture's Working Party on Fisheries, but a few people from all sorts of different groups got together before the meeting of the Committee on Agriculture and put forward motions and attempted to find out . . .

(*Interruption*)

. . . how a compromise might be reached between the various stances. The decision was then taken during an official session of the Committee on Agriculture, and it seems to me perfectly normal that the representatives of the groups should get together beforehand and coordinate their approach.

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

Mr Kirk. — (*DK*) I would like to support what Mr Gautier said as regards the procedure followed in dealing with my report in the Committee on Agriculture. I feel that the fact that on Monday when we dealt with the report there were only 13 members present in the Committee on Agriculture, while on Tuesday morning, when we cast a final vote on the report, there were 26 members present, refutes the criticism levelled by the French Communists. I do not feel that there was much interest in discussing the matter on Monday afternoon, whereas on Tuesday we succeeded in spite of everything in having almost half the Committee members present.

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

Mr Baillot. — (*F*) Mr President, I am amazed at what Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul said. At the end of the ACP-EEC debate she has come out with some conclusions which she should have voiced much earlier. This was not a point of order, if you ask me, but inadmissible interference in the debate. I am surprised, Mr President, that you allowed the honourable Member to carry on and make statements which no one can

Baillot

counter because the debate is over. Let me repeat that it is quite inadmissible in my view.

President. — The complaint made by Mrs Poirier should be referred to the Committee on Agriculture. Parliament did not take part in the committee's discussions and cannot therefore comment on these proposals. As regards Mr Kirk's report, I should like the procedure to be discussed when the report comes up on the agenda.

I call Mr Fanton on a point of order.

Mr Fanton. — (F) The reference is to the Rules of Procedure where they affect the meeting of the Committee on Agriculture which was mentioned.

Mr Gautier gave reasons which are perhaps genuine but it would be rather unfortunate — and I am expressing my feelings on the matter — if committee meetings were to be convened as this one was. When we parted in the evening, no one knew that there was going to be a meeting of the committee the following morning, and it was only when I left my office at half past eleven and arrived here that I found a summons to the meeting.

I do not know how far the committee bureau is to blame in this matter, but I do not think it is proper, once a decision has been taken by a committee — even if we not agree with it, and that can well happen — to question matters. We could all have got together with a few friends during the night to talk about New Zealand butter — the report on which had been adopted by a narrow majority the evening before — and then tried to get some members of the committee to take another look at the report. When the votes have been counted, I do not think it is proper to go over the matter again.

I do not deny that it is important to discuss the fisheries problems today. However, Mr President, since we were told by the Chair yesterday — or was it the day before yesterday? — that it was inadvisable to have committee meetings while the House was sitting, I should be happy if we could keep to this rule a little more in future and not get involved in the kind of thing that undermines the credibility of the reports which are presented to the House. In closing, I want to say that, on this occasion, I acknowledge that there were some problems, but we do not want the same sort of thing to happen again in future. If it does, we shall have nothing to do with it.

President. — I can tell you that meetings of the Committee on Agriculture this week took place with the permission of the President.

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

Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul. — (D) Mr President, I just want to say, for the sake of those who have been complaining, that I was ready to stand in for the rapporteur, Sir Fred Catherwood, and outline the opinion of the Committee on External Economic Relations, but the rapporteur was not called and so I had only one opportunity to put forward our views.

Furthermore — and this has nothing to do with procedure, my dear sir — I should like to make it clear to you that, when the matter in hand is being clarified, it would be better if we did not spend time on procedure. It might have been better if you had listened.

President. — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

11. Fisheries policy

President. — The next item is the joint debate on three reports and an oral question on fisheries:

— report (Doc. 1-597/80), drawn up by Mr Kirk on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on the

I — a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) 754/80 of 26 March 1980 concerning, for certain fish stocks occurring in the Community fishing zone, the fixing for 1980 of the total allowable catches, the share available for the total Community and the means of making the catches (Doc. 1-433/80), together with a corrigendum and an amendment

II — a regulation concerning the distribution among the Member States of the total catch possibilities available to the Community in 1980 of stocks or groups of stocks occurring in the Community fishing zone (Doc. 1-350/80), as well as two amendments;

— report (Doc. 1-560/80), drawn up by Mr Clinton on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on the common fisheries policy;

— report (Doc. 1-537/80), drawn up by Mrs Cresson on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on the

proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-363/80) for a regulation laying down certain measures for the conservation and management of fishery resources applicable to vessels flying the flag of certain non-member countries in the 200 nautical mile zone off the coast of the French department of Guiana;

— oral question with debate (Doc. 1-515/80), tabled by Mr De Pasquale, Mr Papapietro, Mrs Barbarella, Mr Vitale, Mr D'Angelosante, Mr Cardia and Mr Ceravolo to the Commission, on the problems of fishing in the Mediterranean.

I call Mr Kirk.

Mr Kirk, rapporteur. — (DK) Mr President, I wish to present my report on two proposals from the Commission. One proposal did not give rise to any important problems. It concerns the increase in TACs for herring in the Skagerak-Kattegat area and haddock and whiting in the North Sea. There were no great problems about this in the Committee on Agriculture since 1980 is almost over, and no great interest has been shown in the question of increasing these TACs. In addition to the question of principle, there has now been a new scientific investigation which shows that the TACs could be increased, that our biological basis for fixing quotas if we start distributing catches in the first half of the year is not sufficiently reliable. We have taken note of this in the Committee on Agriculture. The other Commission proposal attracted far more attention in the Committee on Agriculture. It is a proposal on the distribution of catch quotas amongst the Member States in the Community fishing zone. Let me say at the outset that here in Parliament we have often had occasion to debate the Common Agricultural Policy and we have often expressed our strong wish to see the introduction of a common fisheries policy. Each time our debate has resulted in our calling on the Commission to put forward a proposal. This is what is happening today. With this proposal from the Commission we are taking a very big step towards a common policy. Unfortunately we must inform Parliament that it was not possible to have the Commission's proposal on structural measures within the fisheries sector completed in time to allow us to discuss it also here this evening, but it will probably be possible to do so at the next part-session. Still there is nothing preventing us, in my view, from looking at the Commission's proposal as a single unity, both the proposal concerning the distribution of quotas, the problems relating thereto, and the proposal on the structural policy which is under consideration by the Commission since August.

I should like to say that it is with satisfaction that I present my report as rapporteur of the Committee on Agriculture. The distribution of the common resources between Member States is, as I said earlier, an important step in the right direction. I feel that it must be the task of both the Commission and Parliament, as the two institutions which fully represent the Community and the interests of Community citizens, to ensure that the Member States support them in the establishment of this common fisheries policy.

To a large extent and in spite of the national interests with which we were confronted, the report supports to a large extent the Commission's proposal on the distribution of quotas. I believe that in its proposal the Commission has reached a fair balance between the basic criteria which the Foreign Affairs ministers agreed on 30 May this year should form the basis for the common fisheries' policy, i.e. the traditional fishing pattern, priority for less-favoured regions as set out in The Hague Declaration of 1976, and compensation for catch losses in third country waters.

It is clear that the Commission has arrived at a political decision. It is also clear that some of the members in the Committee on Agriculture want to shift the balance. But broadly speaking, I must say that there was acceptance of my report as regards the fact that we should uphold these criteria and the balance arrived at between them. It is acknowledged that to disturb the balance between the criteria could very easily result in extensive damage to the Community's traditional fishing pattern in all waters. It is clear that both the Commission and Parliament have a heavy responsibility to avoid disturbing the traditional basis of fishing for all Community fishermen.

But in spite of what I said earlier about our being able to support the Commission's proposal to a large extent, there are a few questions which we raised in the report and which we believe were not handled correctly by the Commission in view of the developments which have taken place in the Community fishing pattern in recent years.

One issue is that when making its calculation of the traditional fishing pattern the Commission took 1973 to 1978 as the reference period. In selecting this period it did not take adequate account of the restrictions which were accepted by eight of the Member States under the Berlin compromise in January 1978. I therefore ask the Commission to revise its proposal in the light of this fact.

There is also another area to which we draw attention in the report. This is the weakness in the manner in which our quota system is drawn up. The Commission in its proposal operated on the basis that some of the small fisheries in some countries should be aggregated with some of the bigger fisheries which the Member States have in different zones. That means therefore that if a Member State is deprived of a small quota in a certain zone, that Member State does not have the right to move about and fish in that zone for the fish species in question. But the fish do not follow some imaginary line. They swim around freely in the sea. It is clear that if one accepts the attitude adopted by the Commission in its proposal it means suddenly precluding fishermen from being able to follow the fish into zones bordering on those where they have their biggest fisheries.

I therefore ask the Commission, as we have also done in the report, to bring the proposal into line with the realities which Community fishermen have to work under. Another area to which we refer in the report is the question of the valuation of the various fish species. The Commission has made it clear that the calculation to cod equivalent has not an objective basis but is based on an agreement entered into with the Faroes some time ago.

If instead the Commission had used the only objective basis we have in the Community, namely the official minimum prices as a basis for calculating cod equivalent,

Kirk

lents, the value of the fish would have been fixed closer to its market value. The Community's minimum prices are fixed on the basis of data collected at representative harbours over a three-year period. It must be fairly clear that if the Community's fisheries policy is to be able to form the basis for a real common policy then it does not help if one introduces politics into the calculation of cod equivalents. Thus one must follow the objective method available and which cannot in any way be regarded as politically motivated, but rather motivated solely by the real market conditions, the value of fish in the Community.

It must be clear that if we establish a fisheries policy in the Community and ensure that this policy is on a Community and not on a national basis, then in future we will have to phase out quotas as the most important conservation instrument in our conservation policy.

The point was made during the discussions and is expressed in the report that the quotas can be an obstacle to the Community fishermen enjoying equal opportunities for exercising their profession, for where some of the most important fish species for consumption are concerned we must realize that the Community's technical conservation measures are not adequate. The fact is that today in our fisheries for consumption we have a net mesh size of 80 mm which does not ensure the most appropriate exploitation of, for example, cod and plaice stocks since this mesh size is not only used for haddock and whiting, but is used also in the cod and plaice fishing industry. In future therefore we must have differentiated net mesh sizes in the consumer fishing industry so that we can limit the need for quotas as a conservation measure for these fish stocks. I do not say that we should abolish quotas. I say that we should limit their use as a conservation measure. This would ease some of the problems we face when we must repeatedly negotiate the distribution of quotas between the Member States.

Finally, I recommend the report to Parliament on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture. I genuinely hope that we can help to take our share of the responsibility for establishing a common fisheries policy. I am afraid that at the moment the situation is such that solidarity plays a very minor role. But as rapporteur for this report I should like to request that we members of Parliament at least show our solidarity.

President. — I call Mrs Kellett-Bowman on a point of order.

Mrs Kellett-Bowman. — With the greatest respect, you did mention a few minutes ago that we would have to break for dinner. Now you have just said that you have 30 speakers on your list. We lost a very great deal of time during the voting. Must we break for dinner under these circumstances?

May I respectfully ask you another question? Are we

likely to reach the Pearce report tonight, because if not, although many of us would wish to wait for the fishing debate, we do not want to have to wait for a debate that may not take place?

President. — If we keep to our speaking time, it might be possible to discuss the Pearce report this evening.

The proceedings will now be suspended until 9 p.m.

The House will rise.

(The sitting was suspended at 8 p.m. and resumed at 9 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR: MR B. FRIEDRICH

Vice-President

President. — The sitting is open.

I call Mr Clinton.

Mr Clinton, rapporteur. — Mr President, as one who has been involved in one capacity or another for some years in discussions, negotiations and efforts of various kinds, trying to arrive at an agreement on conditions for a Community policy on fisheries, may I say that I am very pleased that we have now reached the stage of being able to present to Parliament what I feel is a comprehensive report dealing with all aspects of the fishing industry. I am pleased too to be in a position to say at this stage that the Committee on Agriculture has reached a large measure of agreement on the report before us.

Some amendments were made in the committee to my original report. A number of these amendments I readily accepted. But one or two others, I felt, seriously impaired the report and, if not changed by Parliament, would I believe make it much more difficult to get agreement on a common fisheries policy.

I am thinking particularly of the contentious matter of fishing limits which for so long was mainly responsible for holding up any progress towards a common policy. Members will be aware that both the United Kingdom and Ireland made a very strong stand on a 50-mile exclusive coastal band. And only very recently have negotiations reached a point where these Member States have been prepared to consider a 12-mile exclusive limit. I sincerely hope that no Member of this Parliament wants to see negotiations coming to a standstill again on the issue of reducing these limits still further.

I know that common policies in other sectors have not

Clinton

easily been reached but I think it must be correct to say that negotiations on fisheries are the longest in the EEC's history. To my knowledge and regret these negotiations have been going on for many years with until recently very little signs of early resolution. And may I say straight away that I in no way place the blame on Vice-President Gundelach or on the members of his small staff because I know that Vice-President Gundelach has been among the most committed people in Europe in regard to progress on a common fisheries policy and I know that his staff too have been working hard on a very limited budget.

And I am sorry to say that this also seems to be the case for 1981, because the provision for fisheries certainly does not give one the impression that we in Europe are going to do something worthwhile for fishermen, who have been in such a poor position for the past year or two.

But so many lengthy sessions have been held in the Council of Ministers on fishing that people outside the industry find it difficult to understand what it is all about. But by those closer to the industry the many difficulties and complexities with which negotiators have been faced are reasonably well understood.

Adjustment to the new 200-mile fishing limits brought with it enormous problems, both inside and outside the Community, in addition to the fact that the past year has been a disastrous one for fishermen in the Community generally, and particularly so in regions heavily dependent on fishing. All this emphasizes still more the urgency of getting agreement on a common fisheries policy in time to meet the deadline set, that is January 1981.

It is indeed no tribute to the Community that there are such serious problems in the industry and such widespread loss of confidence among fishermen. There seems to be little or no control over cheap imports which have depressed the fishing industry within the Community to a point where there is now a drastic drop in incomes and a loss of faith in the ability of the Community to solve anything. The fact that no adequate steps have been taken to safeguard the future livelihood of those engaged in fishing and the uncertainty which prevails regarding the future shape of the common fisheries policy makes it difficult, if not impossible, for the industry to plan its future and to make clear and correct investment decisions. All this has got to be changed, and changed quickly. This is an area which, if properly managed has, I believe, great potential.

As I said already, the report before the House is a comprehensive report, not only laying down the principles on which a fisheries policy should be based, but also specifying the objectives and indicating the measures that must be taken if these objectives are to be achieved.

The report is, I think, clear and concise and I feel it is unnecessary to go into it in any great detail. It deals with all the current problems and disruption in the market and the measures to be taken to regain stability and confidence. It sets out the conservation measures so vitally necessary for the whole future of the industry and the control measures that will have to be introduced if the farming of the resources of the seas is to be effectively and efficiently carried out. It stresses the necessity for top-class management of the fisheries sector, including production, processing and marketing. It also deals comprehensively with the social and structural aspects of the industry. It draws attention to the important role of fish farming, aquaculture and the need for on-going and thorough research into all aspects of fishing and processing, together with education and training programmes. Finally, it calls for a far-reaching fisheries policy with developing countries. This is a very brief outline of what is contained in the report.

In the course of the work done — I might mention this — by the Committee on Agriculture prior to producing this report, a number of important papers were produced on many aspects of the fishing industry by members of the committee from all parties and a variety of interests. We were fortunate to have among our membership practising fishermen, members representing areas very dependent on fishing, those who are very interested in the social aspects and, may I say, even those who worked with the Commission trying to cope with the problems of the industry. This has made my job as rapporteur a very pleasant one and a very easy one.

May I express the hope that colleagues who have taken the trouble to study the report will be convinced that, taken together with other reports and investigations that have been carried out, much valuable material has now been provided on which the Commission, the Council and Parliament can reach an early decision on a common fisheries policy. All that is now needed is an appreciation of the urgency and the necessary political will.

I would like to summarize now the measures that are urgent and absolutely essential if the present problems in the industry are to be overcome. Indeed, I am not describing these problems in any comprehensive way, I am just mentioning a few matters that need attention, and need it quickly.

Producers' organizations must be given an important role and all aid should be channelled through them. Producers' organizations, certainly in my country, feel that they now spend most of their time legislating against their own members. I think that this is an unfortunate situation. I think about 85 % of them are organized into producer organizations and those who are outside the organization now find that they can go and make more profitable deals on the side. I would ask the Commission to look at this particularly and

Clinton

ensure that this does not continue and that in future it is going to be unprofitable to be outside these producer organizations.

There is now no effective protection for European fishermen from imports from third countries of fresh and frozen produce, and I believe that Article 22 of Regulation 176 needs a more effective trigger mechanism. At present the damage is done before action is taken, and this is very disturbing to fishermen who are going through extremely hard times. I think it arises from the fact that, first of all, their own Member Government is slow in accepting that what they are saying is correct, and by the time it gets to the Commission and by the time they take action the imports have destroyed individual areas.

Steps should be taken to ensure that fuel costs are the same in each Member State. At present there is a vast difference. My own country, Ireland, pays the highest price in the Community with the exception of Italy. It is felt that national subsidies are being paid in certain Member States and not in others and this, of course, leads to unfair competition and a lot of discontent among fishermen. And EEC withdrawal price levels bear no relation to required market prices.

Last but not least the unanimous view held in the Committee on Agriculture is that when a common fisheries policy is being framed, priority consideration must be given to the position of the small inshore fishermen. I cannot, of course, speak for all the Member States, but I do know that in Ireland prices have not increased for the past three years and in some cases have actually decreased and decreased substantially. Conservation measures that we all know to be absolutely necessary have hit the small fisherman more than others — the man with the small boat who cannot decide to fish further out to sea and for different species of fish that perhaps might keep his livelihood going.

I mention these few aspects of the difficulties being experienced by fishermen today just to bring people down to earth and to the realities of the situation that exists throughout Europe today for fishermen and to stress once again how important it is for all of us to cooperate and to try as hard as possible to get a common policy for fisheries in Europe and to get an attitude of mind that sees that this is an industry that is worth supporting and that Europe has not supported up to the present time.

(Applause)

President. — I should like to point out that rapporteurs may only speak for five minutes in Thursday night sittings. I would appreciate it if this could be adhered to.

I call Mrs Cresson.

Mrs Cresson, rapporteur. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the report which it is my privilege to present to you on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture is concerned with a Commission proposal for a regulation laying down certain measures for the conservation and management of fishery resources applicable to vessels flying the flag of certain non-member countries in the 22 nautical mile zone off the coast of the French department of Guiana.

This conservation and management policy was introduced in 1977; the measures to be taken are laid down each year. The Committee on Agriculture regrets that the 1980 regulation was adopted by the Council before the European Parliament was given the opportunity to draft its opinion. This constitutes a violation of the Treaty and harms relations between the institutions.

Let us now, however, turn to the essence of the problem. Fishing is the mainstay of the economy of Guiana. However, Guiana and the ACP countries make a very limited profit from the fish stocks which live in their territorial waters as these stocks are largely exploited by the developed countries and the fish is exported to the developed countries often without being processed at local level. The Committee on Agriculture approves the Commission's desire to fix the number of licences to be granted to third countries and to control the number of vessels and days on which fishing is allowed, and asks the Commission to examine the possibility of encouraging the creation of a fishery organization in the West Indies which includes management and scientific research.

A fisheries policy must be established which is linked to development policy, and there must initially be a local processing industry which can deal with the volume of fish and prawns caught. A number of observations can be made on the Commission's proposals. Firstly, the Commission proposes an overall quota of 2 555 tonnes for the Community, but does not state how the proposals for sharing out the quotas between the Member States on the one hand and French Guyana on the other are linked. At present, some licences require their holders to land their catch in French Guiana. It is recommended that this practice should be extended; the prawn processing industry is becoming increasingly important for the economy of Guiana.

Let us consider the income which would result if the total of 3 000 tonnes of prawns which the Commission is proposing as the total catch authorized in Guianese waters were all processed on the spot. 3 000 tonnes marketed at 47 290 per tonne gives us 141 870 000 F. From this sum must be subtracted the cost of processing, which is 3 400 F per tonne. By processing 3 000 tonnes of prawns, the net income for Guiana would be 131 870 000 F, or more than 13 000 million centimes. The importance of the proposals approved by the Committee on Agriculture for the French

Cresson

department of Guiana is clear.

But if the Commission rightly limits the number of licences and encourages processing in Guiana, it is particularly important that it should be informed of the number of licensed vessels which do not land their catch in Guiana. It is very fortunate that the processing capacity in the country is developing. It is desirable for the Community and the French authorities to develop this capacity. It is also desirable that this processing capacity should not be entrusted to one single concern, which might then set up a monopoly and thus limit the opportunities open to Guiana as well as the Community authorities' means of control over licences.

The main countries concerned with prawn fishing in Guianese waters are, obviously, the department of Guiana itself, the United States, Korea, Japan, Surinam, Barbados, Trinidad and Tobago. The quota allowed to the United States was reduced in the Commission proposals. It might be asked whether it is necessary to maintain this quota in view of the fact that it has not been possible to reach an agreement guaranteeing Community fishermen access to American waters. The Committee on Agriculture welcomes the increase in the quota allocated to Trinidad and Tobago, and is concerned at the reduction in the quotas of Barbados and Guiana. Also the Commission has decided that Brazil will no longer have access to Guianese waters; the Committee on Agriculture wishes to know what kind of relations exist between the Community and Brazil as far as fisheries are concerned. It suggests that common measures on prawn stocks should be established with Brazil, in the light of the size of the catches made in the waters off North Brazil for stocks in Guianese waters.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Committee on Agriculture asks you to approve this report, which approves the Commission's proposals with a number of suggestions and questions. Is it necessary to point out that the overseas departments are part of the Community? They have many specific problems which I spoke of recently in a report on the agriculture of these departments: problems of poverty, inequality of income, rents and various abuses.

As far as fisheries are concerned in the department of Guiana, I think that the Commission's excellent proposals will be followed by the development we expect if three conditions are observed: effective control by the Commission over the use of licences, processing of catches on the spot but not as a monopoly concern and, finally, an overall fisheries policy for the region linked to development policy through the work of a number of Commission departments.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr De Pasquale.

Mr De Pasquale. — (I) Mr President, 14 months have passed since this Parliament, unanimously and on an initiative from us, asked the Commission and the Council to proceed to the rapid conclusion of a fishery agreement with Tunisia and to open negotiations with Libya and Malta.

After all this time, is it permitted to ask what notice has been taken of that vote? What have you done and what conclusions have you reached? Or do you perhaps share the opinion of Mr Vilain, the authoritative Commission official, who declared at a press conference in Tunis that the votes of the European Parliament have no value?

The fact remains that the dossier has been shut away in Mr Gundelach's drawer and that in the frequent contacts between the Commission and the countries on the other side of the Mediterranean the problem of fisheries has not been further discussed.

The Commission which, it is said, is a collegiate and autonomous organ, has never discussed the matter. While the Council and its organs have met with the greatest speed during these last few weeks in an attempt to make up for the delays before the January 1981 deadline, they have dealt with everything except the very difficult situation in the Mediterranean. It has to be said that the Italian Government, for its part, has been as dumb as a fish at all these meetings.

It is also known that at the Council meeting at the end of October Mr Gundelach spoke to ministers about negotiations on fisheries with non-member countries and then spoke of the problems discussed with Canada, Iceland, Mauritania, Spain and Finland but made no mention of Tunisia, Libya and Malta. It cannot be denied, Mr President, that the measures, proposals and disputes which have occupied the minds of Community Ministers and Commissioners in recent years in connection with a common fisheries policy have been concerned exclusively with oceanic and overseas fishing. The very different situation in a closed sea like the Mediterranean has never been examined.

Overpopulated Community and non-member countries are contained within a small area around this sea; the varieties of fish are completely different from those of the oceans; it is impossible to apply the Community system of catch quotas; there are serious difficulties to applying the 200 mile rule to national waters. A policy aimed at the conservation, reproduction and rational exploitation of the fish resources of the Mediterranean would require special rules based on cooperation with non-member countries, on the fight against pollution, on specific knowledge of the biology of this sea and on a series of Community measures on structures and marketing specifically intended to meet this situation.

We consider that the behaviour of the Council and Commission deserves censure not so much because it

De Pasquale

affects specific Italian interests but because it reveals ineptitude and lack of sensitivity in tackling the serious problems of a new Community policy for the Mediterranean. There are now tremendous tensions in the Mediterranean area caused by the worsening of the conflict in the Middle East, the failure to resolve the problem of Palestine, the energy crisis and the uncertainties confronting trade partners on the other side of the Mediterranean in the face of the Community's enlargement to 12 members.

It is, however, unacceptable that this critical situation should be used as a pretext to postpone any partial agreement. It is very clear that if we are to reopen and renew economic and political cooperation in the Mediterranean we should begin with those economic sectors where mutual interests exist and therefore, firstly, with the protection of the sea, which is a common interest, and with an agreement for exploiting its resources. But the Community has done and is doing nothing to implement the Barcelona Convention against pollution, which it signed with all the Mediterranean countries, and is not attempting to reach multi-lateral agreements for development in the economic sectors indicated in the Convention as the first possible areas for common action: fishing and tourism.

However, we are about to reach an expiry date which will make it impossible to continue to evade our responsibilities. The financial protocols relating to the cooperation agreements with the ten countries of the southern Mediterranean (Algeria, Tunisia, Morocco, Egypt, Syria, Jordan, Lebanon, Israel, Malta and Cyprus) expire in 1981: we shall therefore have to renegotiate them.

We Italian Communists will strive in all councils to ensure that ever wider cooperation agreements are reached with the Mediterranean countries that genuinely promote the independence and economic, social, civic and cultural development of those countries. We are also aware that peace in the region depends on this. But we insist that matters regarding fisheries should be an integral part of these agreements.

The tendency of the EEC negotiators, more desired than actually carried through, to remove the fisheries sector from cooperation agreements, as recently happened with Yugoslavia, is unacceptable.

And let it not be said that our partners do not want to deal with fisheries along with the other matters, as this is not true or, at least, is not completely true. The countries on the other shore of the Mediterranean have never had serious, detailed proposals based on mutual advantage put to them. If this had been done, the governments concerned would have had no reason to reject them. No government is so blind that it fails to realize that fish are a resource which should not be squandered, in the interests of improving the quality of food. This is so much the case that Tunisia, Libya,

Algeria and Egypt have declared their willingness to set up 'joint ventures'. Tunisia has even presented a series of proposals on the nature of joint ventures, the showing of costs, the destination of the fish, and fishing zones.

What response has the Commission made to these offers? None. The Commission has proposed rules for aid to joint ventures. But they are totally inadequate. For the Mediterranean fleets it is almost like a dismissal. It seems to be saying: I'm giving you a bit of money, now go away for good. It isn't a matter for the Community. The joint venture is a private affair.'

We need quite a different approach.

Joint ventures can start up, operate and discharge their functions only if cooperation agreements have already been concluded to support, assist and direct them towards the establishment of a Mediterranean fishing industry, technologically equipped for the task. This would help non-member countries which have seas with plenty of fish but are not able to exploit them by themselves. But it is also in the interests of workers in the Community since it would increase employment, professional skills and the protection of union rights.

In Sicily or elsewhere there may be some shipowners with a nostalgia for the past. But Sicilian fishing, even in international waters, has now become so uncertain and chancy, not to say costly, that the owners cannot but agree on the need for new agreements which give security because they are based on mutual advantage. So far ten fishing boats have been confiscated in Tunisia, two in Libya, and two in Malta, and the fines to be paid vary from 60 to 130 million lire per boat. We cannot continue like this.

Mr President, we are convinced that a serious commitment by the Council, the new Commission and the governments concerned can resolve this problem to the advantage of all. We need that wish and determination, which have unfortunately been lacking up to now.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Josselin to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Josselin. — *(F)* Mr President, will the Council finally respect the undertaking which it gave in May to reach an agreement on fisheries before the end of this year? There are some signs which point to this. I have said too often that fisheries are a matter for priority in Europe to refrain from welcoming this.

But there are more serious aspects. I think that the social unrest which has occurred in many European countries this year, and the severe struggle of French

Josselin

fishermen this summer demonstrate the urgent need to find a satisfactory solution. In the face of one of the most serious crises they have ever known, the combined effect of the increasing shortage of fish, the diminution of fishing rights and reduced stocks in Community waters, an unprecedented increase in production costs — both as regards increased fuel prices and increased costs in shipbuilding — and, finally, in the face of a market which has been completely disorganized by the speculation of large national or international groups, European fishermen, and not just the French, have been thrown into great confusion. There is no doubt that unless a solution is found quickly, we run the risk of witnessing further confusion, more violence and more poverty.

It seems above all — and I welcome the fact that this has been understood — that not only do we need an overall fisheries policy, and not just management and conservation of stocks by sharing out quotas, but we also need to take account of the problem of supervision and inspection, the organization of the management of markets and social problems.

On this matter, I hope that Mr Gundelach will perhaps tell us more about the social measures which the Commission proposes to put before the Council, and which I understand have already been the subject of a communication to the Council.

It would also be interesting to know this very evening what measures on market organization the Commission intends to have adopted. Today we are debating only three reports, and the oral question of our colleague Mr De Pasquale. We shall not this evening discuss the report on reorganization, which raises many questions, certainly proposes some answers, but does give rise to some anxiety concerning the possible consequences for employment. This is regrettable, as we should have debated the matter as a whole. Unfortunately, the Committee on Agriculture did not envisage that we would get to the end of examining this report, and we shall therefore discuss it on a future occasion.

I shall not dwell on the problem of the overseas departments and the OCT. Mrs Cresson has just spoken extremely well about them.

On the matter of the reports by Mr Clinton and Mr Kirk, I shall merely point out that it is more difficult to reach agreement when you have to share out a cake — and I am referring to the allocation of quotas — especially if the cake is shrinking, than it is to agree on a number of principles, which Mr Clinton set himself to do.

I must admit that Mr Clinton's report has a certain number of positive aspects. It covers more or less all the subjects, and if it is not possible to agree with all the points he makes, we should at least recognize that he has the important merit of dealing with the whole fishing sector.

The first point which Mr Clinton wished to emphasize was the market, and in this he was right as this is the matter which raises the most immediate problems. We must agree in denouncing the dumping which has taken place. As for the desire for more realistic prices, I consider that it is no doubt necessary to refer to the market, but that reference to production costs seems preferable to me in order, precisely, to guarantee the incomes of fishermen. We must also agree with him on the protection he suggests through a modification of the customs system for imports.

Another positive aspect is the desire to include producers. But — and in my view this is quite a fundamental question — does the political will exist to combat speculation? I am not sure that the prevailing liberalism is compatible with this need.

Finally, as this is a question of conserving resources, I am glad that emphasis has been placed first of all on employment and that a certain caution has been expressed about analysing the scientific data too closely, since a lack of biological models and of knowledge about reactions between different species cause us to be cautious in our interpretation of this data.

The report indicates the efforts made to limit the effects of industrial fishing on stocks of the noble species. I agree that efforts have been made. I think we should do more than this, and I welcome the fact that the Committee accepted the amendment I proposed which asked that before 1 January 1983 a ban should be placed on fishing for industrial purposes of all the species fit for human consumption.

If the principle of licences seems necessary, to cover *inter alia* the protection of fishermen, I should like to point out some of the difficulties which arise when applying it. There is a danger of excessive red tape, and I think that it is certainly preferable and necessary to envisage progressive application, according to the size, zone and type of fish, and possibly before applying this measure generally.

As regards social and cultural consideration the stress placed on the regional dimension must please me as an elected member for Brittany. It must indeed be possible for the regions to see the consequences, particularly for employment, of the effort of adaptation they will be required to make.

The report was right in pointing out that supervision is the joint responsibility of the Member States and the Community. This collaboration is necessary. We should encourage the mixing of staff in my opinion, and I welcome the encouragement given to the maritime control centre.

Moreover, while the report does refer to the processing industries, it might have done so in a little more

Josselin

detail, as the subject merited this. As regards the warning against a return to purely national structural policies in the absence of a Community policy, I wish to emphasize my support for harmonizing structural policies but also my opposition to a levelling down especially of social measures, and to certain specific problems, such as a fuel aid, which is more necessary for some fishermen than for others.

It would also be impossible not to support Mr Clinton when he recommends that a special research effort should be made. In the same way, we must also approve the establishment of a common fisheries policy with the developing countries. I think that this is an excellent subject for North-South collaboration.

Yes, there are many positive aspects, but it does not seem to me that the difficult matter of fishing zones has been resolved in this report. The solution proposed i. e. access to the three-mile zone and especially the opportunities allowed up to 12 miles and the special measures purely for coastal fishermen do not seem to me likely to win the full approval of fishermen in regions like mine, who have long been accustomed and forced to go elsewhere for the fish they no longer find in their home waters. Here we have the whole problem of historical rights, which for us is vital, and if we do not turn our back in development, we can only accept it as long as guarantees are offered. This is not the case today. I await what happens to the amendments on this point before deciding how I shall vote on the report, and my French Socialist comrades will do the same.

As regards Mr Kirk's report, we must remember the difficult context in which we find ourselves since only the day before yesterday the Council of Ministers failed to reach agreement on the Commission's proposals. The situation is rather unreal as the proposals we are discussing this evening are not those which the Council of Ministers itself will be discussing.

Like Mr Kirk, I welcome the increase in authorized catches. This clearly shows the caution which must be shown in dealing with scientific data. Account must be taken of the experience of fishermen, but also of economic and social considerations, and I am thinking of employment in particular.

I am not however sure that, as regards the allocation of catches, the proposal made shows a real desire for fairness. France's catches are reduced by almost 20 % compared with 1979, and if the problem of compensation exists it has not necessarily been raised correctly as the payment of this compensation does not seem to have been divided fairly between all the other countries.

If Mr Kirk's report rightly states that a conservation policy cannot be based purely on the quota system, since these quotas exist and are at present in use we

are obliged to attach importance to them. This matter has not been appraised with enough precision, and I regret this, even if the Commission has acted fairly in proposing to share out the consequences of reduced catches, including the preferential zones.

The initial report has also been distinctly improved by the introduction of the need to give priority to fish which are consumed at present. I think that there is a great need to protest against the present system of ancillary prices which are paid, in my view to an excessive degree, to those countries which use a very large part of their catch of fish for industrial purposes, for the manufacture of fish meal.

On the matter of herrings, and in reply to accusations often made that French fishermen fish for herring without authorization, it must be said that it is unrealistic to keep France at zero rating for catches of this fish, and I hope that new proposals which will be made will satisfy what I consider to be the legitimate claims of French fishermen, especially those from Boulogne.

To sum up, Europe must make progress in the fisheries sector, but this sector can also help Europe to make progress. We await the social measures which have been promised with impatience; the Socialists will be particularly vigilant on this point, and be sure that the fishermen will as well, just as they will be vigilant over the controversial sector of reorganization. We shall return to the consequences of the proposed measures for employment.

We shall also have to discuss the relations between fisheries, energy and the environment.

We shall soon discuss the Commission proposals, already examined by our Assembly within the Committee on Transport and the Committee on the Environment. These proposals concern the struggle against pollution and the prevention of pollution from hydrocarbons. I hope that Parliament will give this matter all the attention it deserves, since if fish have to be protected in order to protect fishermen, to protect fish we must first protect the seas and oceans.

President. — I call Mr Tolman to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

Mr Tolman, European People's Party (CD Group). — (NL) Mr President, I think a word of thanks for the address of Mme Cresson and to Messrs Kirk and Clinton for the work they have done is in order, in dealing with these far from simple matters. Reading the document makes one aware that one is dealing with an extremely complex matter, and that all the questions posed are not going to be answered within the scope of this one report. But even though it does not cover the whole field, I still find this a remarkable piece of

Tolman

work. It is obviously the result of a great deal of deep thinking.

Mr President, time does not permit us to go into all the problems in detail. I will therefore confine myself to a few general remarks of especial importance to the fishermen and also to the development of European fishing regions. Our aim must be to protect the livelihood of the fishermen, and this can be a starting point for us. Again, we must not lose sight of the employment aspects of this problem. The number of fishermen may not seem great to some people, but there are still some 140-150 000 involved, and, what is more important Mr President, is that this problem is a vital one to those parts of the Community that are highly dependent on fisheries.

I think I have to say that the fisheries policies carried out in the Community have scarcely got off the ground and have not been developed to the extent that might have been expected. There was not enough willingness to make concessions. However, I have had the feeling in recent weeks, happily, that we were beginning to see things starting to move. Where there were once eight countries there are now, fortunately, nine. I believe that the UK has now come around to a more positive way of thinking. In the latest discussions, it is evident that we are over the technical details, but that the problems of overfishing and quotas have not yet been solved.

Mr President, I would like to touch on a couple of points on these matters, which time does not allow me to go into in more detail, but I think that reorganization of structural policy — which will have to have a lot more attention in future — is a matter of central importance. I feel that care is needed here. If we place too much emphasis on the development of fisheries and state that only limited increases will be required for this, there is a danger that unrealistic expectations will be aroused.

Now a brief word on overfishing, Mr President. I am in agreement with those who find that fishery policy with regard to fish for human consumption should have priority over industrial fisheries. The problem of quotas is going to be the hot potato of the future. We should therefore be looking for controls in an atmosphere of trust and good will.

I should like to make one more point, and that is the question — on which Mr Clinton has already touched — of herring fisheries, and in particular of North Sea herring fisheries. We know that, in the past, there have been alarming reports about this area being fished out. Mr President, I rather doubt that, the reports of these biologists were indeed based upon hard data. But it is a fact that herring fisheries have virtually come to a standstill, and I now read in the Belgian press that the North Sea is overflowing with herring; this may well be an exaggeration, but the truth must lie somewhere between. I concede that a limit is necessary, but we

have now reached the time — and I would stress this — that herring catches must once again be permitted. For social and economic reasons, Mr President, a total ban on herring fishing is unacceptable. There are strong political pressures at work here, in my opinion. We can of course expect the report of the biologists in February/March of next year, but it is my opinion that we must take some decisions now on this matter, and I am thinking in particular of countries like, Belgium and the Netherlands, which are hit especially hard by this ban on herring catches. There must be an end to this uncertainty; the people have a right to it, and the fish-stock situation will now permit it. There must be trust again — the fish are back, and, fortunately, there are still fishermen to catch them.

Mr President, for the moment I shall not go further into the various amendments. We have our opinions, and where we do not agree with the report, they will show up on the voting tomorrow.

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

Mr Battersby. — Mr President, today, for the first time this year, fisheries have been given an almost reasonable time and an almost respectable slot on the agenda. We have to keep trying, because fisheries are too important to be pushed to the end of the day with a very small House. This does not give it the importance it really deserves.

Secondly, may I thank Mr Gundelach for coming along this evening? We do appreciate the effort. It is not easy to come all the way to Strasbourg at such a late hour to be with us: he does appreciate the importance of this matter, and we are very grateful to him for coming along.

Fisheries is a very complex sector — perhaps the most complex we have to deal with in this Community. It is one which differs in almost every respect from agriculture: the working environment is completely unpredictable and very dangerous; the sea does not permit any mistakes; the financial risk in an industry which harvests every day is extremely high; the industry is beset by problems of sovereignty, history and so on; it is an industry more sensitive and more vulnerable than most to fluctuations in oil prices, which you will see from these reports. No wonder that it has taken five years for the Member States to come, as we hope, close to agreement on a common fisheries policy that shall be fair to the merchants, fair to the processor, and at the same time a policy which will ensure a permanent resource of good, fairly-priced protein for our people. Greater progress towards an agreed solution has been made over the past year than over the whole period of the last Parliament, and I think a lot of that is due to Mr Gundelach. However, there are still compromises to be made, there are still national interests to be accommodated. There always will be in

Battersby

this Europe of ours, but I do call on the parties concerned — that is, the Council, the Commission and this Parliament — to reach an agreement by the end of the year. The Council must not fail our fishermen at the last fence. We are nearly there: so please keep going!

Mr Clinton has produced a most excellent and very professional report, one which gives considered and practical guidelines. It is a document which I recommend to the Commission and the Council to study very carefully. A lot of work has gone into it. I also recommend that they study the appendices, which have been prepared by other members of the Fisheries Working Group.

Of course, with an extensive document of such complexity, some paragraphs inevitably need fine tuning if we are to avoid future complications. Certain proposals go counter to the Treaties. In this instance, I am referring to paragraph 7 (c) of the report, which I consider must be amended as it stands. This paragraph appears to be proposing a three-mile fisheries limit and a free-for-all outside the three-mile limit. Now, this is counter to Articles 100 (1), 100 (3) and 101 of the Act of Accession, which gives France (especially Brittany), Denmark, Greenland, Ireland and the United Kingdom a 12-mile limit in certain regions and lays down 6 miles as the minimum. This applies, of course, to the French Overseas Departments, to Guiana. Moreover, if this paragraph were adopted, it would set a precedent for any Mediterranean policy: it would set a precedent for the Adriatic, for the Aegean. But this is not what we are trying to say. I am sure of this. The intention is to protect, wherever necessary, local inshore fishermen and communities particularly dependent on fishing for their existence.

Now Amendment No 2, which I and my colleague Mr Provan have tabled, aims to underline this concern whilst moving away from this three-mile idea. What I am saying there is that for certain dependent areas protective measures may be adopted by the Community for local fishermen. These safeguards should include the designation of fishing zones exclusively reserved for boats operating from the local area, and should also include limits on the sizes of boats allowed to fish within certain areas. You see, we have to protect the livelihoods of small independent fishermen, who form the great majority of our 140 000 fishermen. This figure will be over 180 000 full- and part-time-fishermen when Greece comes in.

The great majority of the 22 000 or so British fishermen, 23 000 French fishermen and 62 000 Italian fishermen are all inshore people, and I strongly recommend this amendment to you.

I would also like to ask the Commission in regard to inshore fishing what it intends to do about beam trawling within six or in certain cases twelve miles. I would just like to explain the problem here. This type

of gear, by its very design, does not allow small fish to escape. And why does it not allow them to escape? Because it clogs with seaweed, so instead of having a mesh you have a rather solid bag in which you catch everything. It is a destructive measure inshore and it threatens the very existence of small fishing communities. It is a technical matter and I consider it should be banned in inshore waters where you have weed.

One further point concerns paragraph 25. The last paragraph says that we should arrive at a ban on industrial fishery, meaning the directed fishing of human-consumption species for fishmeal. This ban already exists, and I personally welcome it. To make this more explicit, Mr Kirk has proposed Amendment No 1, which confirms support for the existing ban whilst recognizing the need to utilize certain small non-edible fish for industrial purposes. These fish are not eaten, they are not usable and they have to be used, otherwise you break the whole ecology of the system. I strongly recommend Mr Kirk's amendment, as I do Mr Provan's amendment, which is Amendment No 10, to paragraph 5 of Mr Kirk's report.

There are certain other amendments which seek to clarify the text. Most of them are eminently sensible, and my Group will support them. However, there are some, especially those from the French Communist Group, which are to be deplored, such as Amendment No 32 to the report. This amendment urges rejection of the Community's plans to enlarge the Community to include Spain and Portugal. We are trying to be objective. We and the fishermen, I am sure, deplore the use of these eminently practical, sensible and unbiased reports as a platform for narrow party propaganda.

I should now like to turn to the Mediterranean. The Mediterranean is part of Europe, and I welcome the initiative of our Italian colleagues in drawing attention to this. Fish are not only caught in the North Sea. More than half our fishermen will be working there when Greece enters. About 100 000 men, mainly small operators, with little political clout: they are too busy fighting to survive in a sea which, for all the glossy travel brochures, can be very, very cruel and very vicious. The Commission must, in the New Year, get down to working out a supplementary policy relating to the Mediterranean fisheries, which in many respects differ considerably from those of Northern Europe.

Having said that, my Group, subject to the acceptance of the drafting amendments I have mentioned, supports Mr Clinton's report. I must again congratulate him on the excellence and comprehensiveness of his document, and also thank our limited staff for the very hard work they have put into it.

Mr Kirk must also be congratulated on his report. In our opinion, it is vital that the Commission and the Council take it into account whilst they are coming to a decision and not afterwards. There is a growing

Battersby

expertise in the Fisheries Working Group and a growing understanding between the Parliament and the Commission and this report gives a fair picture of the Working Group's overall view on the pattern evolved for fixing total available catches and distributing those catches. The methodology has still to be improved; the interrelation of species must be studied much more precisely, and more sophisticated measures must be used to supplement quotas. The criteria are all laid down very clearly. You have to respect the traditional and existing fishing patterns; you have to respect priority for dependent regions; you have to respect the need to compensate for losses in third waters, and you have to respect two unspoken factors: the fishermen and the resources. When one talks of the need to compensate for losses in third waters, one has to remember that the great deep-sea fishing-fleets of Europe, especially those of Hull and other places, have been gravely reduced in numbers and in fishing opportunities since the cod war. They have to be compensated. Men put their money and their lives into the business, and they have got to be properly compensated.

I should like finally to turn to Mr Tolman's remarks on the herring. I must emphasize that it is very unwise to reopen a herring fishery in the North Sea. We have only some inconclusive evidence and we are trying to form a long-term herring fishery. We nearly killed it once — the Norwegians killed their Scandia Atlantic herring by over-fishing — and to open it up now on evidence which is not backed by ICES would, in my opinion, be suicidal. We therefore propose the deletion of any reference to a TAC for 1980, and I urge you to support Mr Provan's amendment. (He cannot be here tonight because he is with the Canadians talking about fish.) Quite honestly, this is not on, we must not destroy this particular stock.

Finally, Mr Gundelach, we have still not got the marketing document. I know that Document 724 is available, but we have not received it, and if we are to do our job properly, would you please help us to have it so that next part-session we can debate the final points in the fishing policy, which are the structure and marketing.

President. — I call Mr Papapietro to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Papapietro. — (I) Mr President, in view of the very short time at my disposal, I shall make some very rapid observations on the Clinton report. We shall support this report, as it is the first document to tackle all the problems of fisheries since the introduction of a new international law, increased fuel prices and the reduction in the number of fish available posed increasing difficulties for this sector. In this Chamber we shall shortly, the discussing also the proposals from the Commission to the Council on revision of the structural policy for fisheries.

I would now make the following observation: in our opinion, Community policy on fisheries has been based up to now essentially on the needs of a certain kind of fishing, that is, fishing in the Atlantic, in the ocean, in short the type of fishing which so far has most felt the effects of the difficulties which have arisen in this sector. Therefore the measures we should adopt must be suitable — and from this point of view we can already anticipate the judgment on structural measures contained in those proposals — remembering that Community measures have sometimes harmed that other type of fishing, that is, fishing in the Mediterranean. As one example of this, let us consider Italian fishing, where we find this paradox: there is a high proportion of pelagic species — tuna, anchovies, sardines, etc. — the consumption of which is continuing to fall, while the consumption of the more sought-after fish, which we have to import from abroad, is rising. We are among the countries which eat less fish, and the importing of fish from abroad is one of the factors which upsets our balance of payments.

Community support measures make this problem worse instead of solving it, since in order to guarantee a minimum income small producers ask for Community aid, waste their fish and the situation gets worse as regards both consumption and resources, as well as financially.

A big publicity campaign is being launched in Italy to encourage the consumption of other types of fish. We therefore consider that paragraph 66 of the Clinton report should be discussed here since — as Mr Battersby, the chairman of the sub-committee, has rightly said — when Greece enters the Community the ratio between fish from the ocean and Mediterranean fish will no longer be the same. We must therefore make a serious attempt to tackle this problem, and I think that we should keep four points in mind. First of all, market equilibrium, which I mentioned earlier; then aid for storage and for the conservation, distribution and marketing of these typical Mediterranean species; conservation of resources — and we support what is said in the Clinton report about licences — and finally limited authorization for a certain type of fishing, for a certain size and zone, and the preparation of the Community intervention mechanism; the strengthening of producers' associations and, last of all, the international relations mentioned by Mr De Pasquale. That is all I want to say about all this.

It seems to me that we should examine the problems of Mediterranean fishing along these lines. These problems will become increasingly urgent since we are concerned not only with finding a new balance and consolidating a sector but with the very possibility of development and therefore of making the most of this very important resource.

President. — I call Mr Neilsen to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr J. B. Neilsen, Liberal and Democratic Group. — (DK) Mr President, I would particularly like to make a couple of remarks concerning the proposed amendment. First of all, it is very important to stress on this occasion that there is now a proposal from the Commission for a common fisheries policy, and that this must be followed up and agreed in Council. The Commission must stick to that.

I have often had occasion to speak here in the Assembly on the fisheries question and in favour of a common fisheries policy, and of a coherent fisheries policy. Now we have before us a solid proposal, and there is a great temptation to avoid going into a large amount of detail, and pushing it through to Council as quickly as possible. This I think is very important — it is indeed the top and the bottom of what I have to say.

Nevertheless, I would like to add a couple of remarks concerning the two main considerations and to some of the proposed amendments. I think that Mr Clinton's contribution has been brilliant; his report is an extremely comprehensive and solid piece of work. There is only one point — point 25 in part three — where I feel perhaps it is a little strong, and this is its recommendation of a direct ban on industrial fishing. This is a rather harsh formula. I do not want anyone to misunderstand me — fishing for human consumption has to have absolute priority. This has to be so, if we are to make the most of the scarce resources of the ocean.

Clearly however there are different types of fish used for industrial purposes and if we are to aim at balanced fisheries, so that the species remain in balance in the ocean, there will always be a place for some sort of industrial fishery. I completely disagree that it can be done to a formula, as declared in the Communist amendment to the Kirk report. Now I do not know whether it has been correctly rendered in Danish; according to proposed amendment No 7, it was required that fishmeal be produced from fish that were washed up from the sea and that were not required for human consumption. Mr President, I doubt whether the translation can have been correct, for I can see no way in which fish washed up from the sea can be handled profitably.

But to get back to more serious matters, I repeat that a major priority must be given to fishery intended for human consumption. I could also mention one thing in this Communist amendment that has given me some cause for amusement, and this is where they suggest that quotas for flags of convenience should be stopped. Now I have gathered the impression from conversations with fishermen that a lot of the flags of convenience are those of communist nations! This is an impression I have obtained from conversations with fishermen. This proposal from the Communists, therefore could perhaps be very interesting and important.

On the more serious problems involved in dealings with third countries, I would like to say that, in this

area as in others, we must obviously — as the Community in general does — show a reasonable degree of liberal adjustment to world trade. But, at the same time, this should also accord with our internal policies, with the price levels we establish, and with the controls we set up to protect our own industry. And I would especially note that we should at all times avoid exchanging Community fishing rights in a way that allows other countries to export fish to us. This I have to warn against.

To go on to another subject, I would like to say that while it is right to apply scientific procedures and to fish on the basis of modern biological principles, at the same time there will obviously be a need to produce more detailed rules for control. I have therefore been pleased today to hear Mr Kirk explain these details, and state that both quotas and net sizes should be involved. There have been times when I have been concerned to hear, during the course of debates, declarations that we should entirely go over to net size as a control mechanism. I do not think this would be possible since there are many different sizes of fish, and therefore a need for different methods of control.

There is another point concerning Mr Provan's amendment on North Sea herring fisheries. I am one of those who, like Mr Battersby, are afraid to make too early a start. Although we are at a time when, according to some reports, there seems to be a certain improvement in North Sea herring stocks, it could well be that if we start fishing them too early, we will have cause to regret it later. I have, therefore, considerable sympathy for the amendment proposed by Mr Provan.

It is now therefore extremely important that the Commission maintains its excellent proposals, and that the Council will be able to agree with them.

President. — I call Mr Davern to speak on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

Mr Davern. — Mr President, I should like to start by complimenting Mrs Cresson, Mr Clinton and Mr Kirk on their excellent and detailed reports.

Fishing is something that is vital not only for each individual constituency concerned but also for the continued existence and prosperity of many small communities. I do not need to remind Parliament of the totally inadequate fishery policy currently in existence in the EEC. This was adopted prior to the entry of Denmark, the United Kingdom and Ireland. It was based on the needs of the original six Members, and Luxembourg, of course, does not have too much interest in this matter. The 1970 policy contained two elements: structural and marketing. The structural element contained *inter alia* a provision that fishing vessels from any Member State would have the right

Davern

to fish in the maritime waters of other Member States. However, let me remind you that when the United Kingdom and Ireland joined the Community, they obtained a derogation, after much long hard bargaining, from this right-of-access provision in respect of a large part of our exclusive fishery limit of 12 miles. This derogation was to remain in effect until 1982, with a provision for a review of future arrangements before that date. This derogation is essential for British and Irish inshore fishermen, who have no other choice of employment.

Some Member States are adamantly opposed to the idea of any coastal State having exclusive fishing rights, but that depends on what rights they have themselves and what alternatives they have in regard to employment of their fishermen. It has been the policy of my country's government, and rightly so, that an adequate coastal band reserved to fishermen is essential for the cultivation of stocks, and our national laws applying to those fishermen are far more strict than European laws and indeed far more strict than those of many countries that protest against our lack of conservation measures. In the interests of Community fishermen as a whole and also to ensure the expansion of the fishing industry, particularly the inshore fishing industry, the Community has repeatedly accepted on social and economic grounds the need for an expansion of the Irish fishing industry and of British inshore fishing. Many deprived areas in Ireland need this very badly, as does also, to take only one example in Britain, the port of Lossiemouth in Scotland, which is deeply affected by the regulations being applied here.

It goes without saying therefore, from my point of view, that the right-of-access provision is the most important aspect of the common fisheries policy. Indeed, I will be proposing amendments to Mr Clinton's report which were included in Mr Clinton's report originally. His vast experience as a former Minister in Europe may prompt the conclusion that his previous proposals were correct, and I hope that this House will support those amendments, if only in recognition of his wisdom and experience.

Early conclusion of the present negotiations for a common fisheries policy is essential to overcome the lack of confidence which is rife among Community fishermen today. It has undermined the fishing industry in general and stopped the investment so badly needed by these people who do not have large capital available to them. It is difficult, however, to forecast when an agreement can be reached. This week again we have seen no agreement in Brussels after months and months, although rumours from that meeting give grounds for hope that we are closer to agreement. It is difficult to forecast anything in Europe, but I would hope for a little more from the Ministers in regard to fisheries within the next two weeks.

Some Member States are seriously concerned about the agreements with non-member countries, such as Norway and the Faroe Islands. I would object to concluding agreements with them before we agree between ourselves what we can or cannot do to each other. We must not start being generous, being grateful, being magnanimous to other people until we agree amongst ourselves. It is far too common a practice in this Community not to discuss the internal matters but to discuss all the other matters that we have no say over, because the former oblige you to make a decision. Unfortunately some decisions are unpopular and we have to fall out with other people, but we must come to grips with our problems and make our own decisions in their regard.

I hope that the requirements of Member States can be met, and I think that if we support Mr Clinton's report and Mr Kirk's report, with the amendments we have suggested, we will have the basis of a common fisheries policy. Parliament will thus have shown the people of Europe that we are concerned for their interests and that we will lead the Council of Ministers and the Commission forward to a more unified and more determined Europe.

President. — I call Mr Gundelach.

Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission.
— (DK) I would first like to thank Mr Clinton very much for his very complete and sensible report. In my opinion, it is one of the best that have been written on the common fisheries policy. Also, Mr Kirk must be thanked for a very clear report on the difficult subject of the allocation of resources between member countries, and Mme Cresson for her report on fishery conditions in French Guyana. And of course there is the contribution of Sr de Pasquale, which has given me the opportunity to correct the fundamental misunderstanding that the Mediterranean region has been the Cinderella in attempts to create a common fisheries policy. There has been a more time and money spent, Sr de Pasquale, on the problems of the Italian fishing fleet than on those of some other Member States. I shall come back to your criticisms, but they are quite wide of the mark.

It is exactly four years since the basic principles of a real common fisheries policy were laid down, to the great surprise of the foreign ministers meeting at The Hague, where the now well-known Hague Declaration was signed. This declaration established that the Community should act as a community in dealings with third countries in all matters concerning fish catches and other fisheries-related subjects. It established that certain regions of the Community which were very dependent on fisheries, and where many small fishermen were in precarious situation, should enjoy special preference. And finally it was agreed to have a joint fisheries policy.

Gundelach

Over these four years, it has been possible to deal with third countries on the basis of the Hague Declaration, but all the time it has been on the basis of arrangements made almost on a day-to-day basis, with resulting lack of security for the fisheries concerned. It has been possible to place some limitation on the industrial fishing of certain types of fish which are suitable for human consumption. It has also been possible to set up a series of long-term arrangements for Mediterranean fisheries, especially on the basis of wide-ranging economic common projects with West African countries, which have ensured continued fishing by Italian and French vessels off West Africa under acceptable conditions. This is the same form of agreement that has in general been tried with Tunisia, and which may possibly be concluded with Tunisia, if only the Council will provide the means at its disposal in terms of structural policies which are necessary not only for joint agreements between firms — which are also included — but also for wider arrangements between countries such as Tunisia. I must therefore agree with Sr de Pasquale that the possibilities are there. We have created possibilities with our negotiations, but what we lack and want from the budget authority — i. e. Parliament and the Council — is that the means at their disposal are made available so that we can realise the possibilities for the wide-ranging discussions on fisheries we are now aiming for.

In this connection, I would like to point out that fisheries in Yugoslavian waters are not being impeded by the Community's taking over competence for fisheries. For reasons of its own, Yugoslavia has chosen not to enter into talks with the Community on fisheries, under the strongly political conditions that obtain in Yugoslavia. Neither Council, Parliament, nor the Commission has wanted to constrain the country in any way, but we have nevertheless, with the Commission's intervention and the provision of finance by the Community, managed to maintain Italian fisheries in Yugoslavian waters. It is against this background, Sr de Pasquale, that I must assert that Mediterranean fisheries have certainly not been given second place in our attempts over these confused four years to smooth the path of a common fisheries policy. In practice, we have had more breakthroughs in the direction of a long-term policy for the Mediterranean than has been possible up till now for the North Atlantic region. I fully agree that more needs to be done, but this required the political will of Parliament and the Council, and I see no sign of this. The Commission with its limited resources has done what it can, but it needs to be backed up by Parliament and Council in their capacity as budgetary authorities.

In these four years, which, as I have said, we have more or less struggled through, there has naturally been considerable uncertainty about the fishing industry. Uncertainties about where new investment is going to come from, which direction we should be aiming for, how adjustments are to be made, and what should be expected in the future. The picture has been

further confused by rising costs, especially as a result of increases in oil prices. And all this in an industry that has seen, in this confusion and uncertainty, a fall in real incomes. The difficulty of maintaining a traditional fishing industry has increased. In the same period, there have been steadily rising imports of fish from third countries, which have increased their catches by extension of fishing limits to 200 nautical miles, an example which the Community has not followed. In this respect, the Community has to follow where others lead. These other regions have less demand for fish, because they are often thinly populated countries with large areas of sea at their disposal. These large new catches have to be disposed of to ready markets, of which the Community is a prime example; we have seen our fish imports rise, often with a resultant fall in our own fish prices.

This situation is naturally unacceptable. It has always been the Commission's understanding — and has always been the position we have taken in debates in Parliament and in Council — that this situation must be stopped by the creation of a fisheries policy which is not only a policy of resources — that is, of rules about the way in which fish shall be caught, with what sort of equipment, at what times, in what quotas, and what TAC's, but also a policy of structure — that is, of how fleets and their catching capacities are to be adapted to current resources. How can the fishing industry be helped to adapt to this new situation? This affects the rules for national support policies. What is a common policy worth if it can be undermined by a completely different support policy of the particular national region? Everyone admits that some Member States have completely different financial possibilities for helping their fishing industries and that we cannot have a common policy which does not include common guidelines for national support policies.

This implies a change and an updating of current market policies, which were established at the beginning of the seventies at a time when we did not have a complete administration for the conditions of the whole fishing industry, and 200-mile limits were unheard of. Our fleets fished Icelandic and Canadian waters, as well as the North Atlantic. They fished to the south near the coast of Africa, for preference, and in just a few years large fleets from the UK, Germany, France and Italy have mainly turned back to fish the regions around our own coasts, to a large extent in every case. The marketing organization existed then in an entirely different situation from today, not only in these respects but also in the cost structure of the fishing industry. It cannot be maintained completely, and so must be updated. This must ensure reasonable protection for the industry under the current conditions. This is not to say that we are going to create a Europe closed to the import of fish. We need fish for our secondary industry. We can use a considerable amount of imported material, but we have to make sure that Europe does not become a dumping ground, a place where everyone wants to get rid of his

Gundelach

new-found catching capacity in whatever *amounts* and at whatever prices he likes. The result will be that, whatever we do with regard to common financing or a nationally-financed structural policy, whatever we might do with regard to conservation of our fish stocks, these measures will be undermined by massive exports from other countries which do not have the same concern for conservation as we now have in the policy that we are establishing on a European basis.

There was a time when I said in this assembly that we in Europe were not so ready to protect our fish stocks as some other North Atlantic states. Today, I am in the fortunate situation — or perhaps in the relatively more fortunate situation — of being able to report that we in the Community are more conservation-minded than seems to be the case in most other North Atlantic states. The result is that our fish stocks are on the way up again, and this brings me to a topic that was mentioned yesterday in debate and in the documents. It is true that we have had an improvement in herring stocks. Just because there is such an improvement, we should consider carefully before we campaign for a renewal of fishing that we do not go back to where we started, and where we were for three years, of having heated discussions — in this Parliament, too — about whether it was right to have a ban on herring fishing in the North Sea. We have struggled hard on the Commission side to maintain this ban, and we have been proved right since the herring stocks are once again on the increase. We must think very carefully, then, before throwing away three years hard work. I must ask for the greatest possible care in this area.

In the new situation there is reason to stress that in the greater part of the period after the first steps towards a common fisheries policy were taken, especially this year, there has been considerable movement towards a common fisheries policy. At the beginning of the current year, Council was able to agree TAC's for 1980, and make a provisional order for regular reporting. On May 30 the Council of Ministers, in connection with a series of decisions on budgetary questions, agricultural policy and other matters, agreed that a decision on a common fisheries policy should be reached by the year's end. The principles of this policy were also laid down, namely that the so-called Hague preferences, which I have already referred to, should be respected, that traditional fishing patterns should be taken as starting points for the calculation of quotas, and that compensation should be made to certain Member States for loss of fishing rights in third country waters. In June and July the Commission produced new proposals on structural policy as well as proposals for the allocation of quotas among Member States. The last proposal was the subject of Mr Kirk's report. I am sorry that structural policy is not part of the debate today, for I am in fundamental agreement with the main point of view of Mr Clinton's report.

As I have already indicated, there is a lot more to a common fisheries policy than a few quotas and control

regulations. It has to include everything that bears on the fishing industry. It will therefore include marketing possibilities, marketing policies, structural policies, and what are referred to as access problems, and we must agree to go all the way with this fishing policy. And we have to agree this during the course of the next week. But, as I have said already, we are already on the way to this because in September the Council agreed for the first time an important element in fisheries policy, namely orders for conservation measures with immediate provisional effect. In the same month, the Commission produced a report containing guidelines for an update of the marketing organization. Then in October, the Council agreed on orders for control arrangements to ensure that the conservation measures would be carried out and remain in force. Again, in the same month, the Commission produced detailed proposals for changes in the marketing organization and a report on the social aspects of the fisheries sector. Finally, the Council has just had a meeting in which the most important problems of quotas and access were the subjects of debate.

On the social problems raised by M. Josselin, I would just like to say that they depend on arrangements to ensure working conditions as well as retraining and other social problems facing fishermen in connection with the need for the fishing industry to readjust to new conditions. The main elements of the structural policy are already known and will be discussed later, but they depend chiefly on the disposition of our fleets relative to resources within our authority. It will cost money to cut down fleets and to redistribute ships to meet the conditions under which fishing takes place today. New experimental fisheries must be opened up so that new fish resources can be discovered; there will be possibilities for joint research programmes, and also possibilities for negotiations with third countries, not least those in the Mediterranean region and in Africa, but also in other places too. In connection with Mr Kirk's report, we have also discussed questions concerning the so-called industrial fisheries. I would like to make it quite clear that the Community has already made the necessary decisions for major reductions of *by-catches* of types of fish that can be used for human consumption, and for the banning of catches of these types of fish for industrial purposes. There are other types of fish, mentioned in one of Mr Kirk's amendments, which under no circumstances can ever be suitable for human consumption as food, but which turn up in large quantities in the fishing ports of the world and can therefore be used for industrial purposes. There is no problem here, but there is a problem with the allocation of quotas. How will it be possible to allocate the amounts of fish for human consumption released for such use as a result of these new restrictions on the catching of edible fish for industrial purposes? Should they be allotted to the nations concerned in industrial fishing, or allocated among others? This is one of the outstanding problems in the Council's treatment of the quota proposals of the

Gundelach

Commission. The other consists in ensuring that losses to third countries are distributed equally and fairly among Member States.

I must therefore point out to M. Josselin that he is not correct when he says that the solution to the outstanding problem of quotas will not be found on the basis of the Commission's proposals. They will be found on the basis of the Commission's proposals with further discussion of the two topics I have underlined. Once these two problems have been solved, then in my opinion it will be possible to obtain a reasonable compromise within the Council, a reasonable compromise that will be acceptable to all interested Member States.

We now come to the formerly very sensitive problem of access. Here I have to observe that I am not in agreement with the point in the Clinton report, nor I believe is Mr Clinton himself. The Commission has for several years produced a proposal based on the *treaty of acceptance* concerning the introduction of an overall twelve-mile limit in the Community as way round the common access problems of the treaty, but it is an exception clause that takes account of historic rights. The discussions within the Council therefore are to determine these historic rights and the conditions under which they apply. In my opinion, these discussions will have a positive result. We have suggested, as Parliament will know, fishery projects, especially in regions dependent on a single type of fishing and where there are sensitive conditions, or where particular groups of people are badly affected. But these projects have to be simple, and they must also be non-discriminatory. It is my firm opinion, regarding these two main principles, that a solution can be found in Council, and I call upon Parliament in its various statements to maintain the political realism that has characterized its own debates on this and earlier occasions.

I will conclude by reminding Members that there is a considerable degree of consensus in the Council of Ministers on the main lines of the Commission's proposals. In fact, the points on which agreement has not yet been obtained, even though they are important and now and again somewhat technical, are limited and raise no doubts about the main lines of the Commission's proposals. In view of the amount of work that was necessary to get this degree of unity, the existing proposals should not be thrown overboard, but used as a basis for discussion. A new political initiative is more important than a new proposal, to quote the Clinton report, page 16, point 8.

IN THE CHAIR: MR ZAGARI

Vice-President

President. — I call Mr. Almirante.

Mr Almirante. — (I) Mr President, I am speaking instead of Mr Buttafuoco who apologises for his unavoidable absence this evening. He is the most qualified of the members of the Italian Right to speak on this matter, in particular because he is Sicilian.

Having said this, Mr President, I should like to know why Mr Gundelach spoke half way through the debate, so having the opportunity to reply to the representatives of the political groups but preventing us, who are clearly not so important, from receiving a reply. I protest about this method of proceeding, which I consider discourteous not only for those of us who are not attached to political groups but also for colleagues in the political groups who have thus delegated the right to speak solely to their spokesmen. This does not seem a democratic and correct method to me.

In view of the fact that in replying to Mr De Pasquale's question — which has our full support — Mr Gundelach gave very unsatisfactory answers, I wish to reply to that specific part of Mr Gundelach's speech. First of all, the Commissioner gave no reply to a precise statement, which was that a high-ranking official of the Commission apparently said openly in Tunis that the European Parliament counts for nothing and that therefore Tunisia should not worry about objections from here.

(The speaker breaks off)

Mr Gundelach is unfortunately not following my speech at the moment . . .

President. — Please carry on, Mr Almirante, as the time at our disposal is extremely limited and there are still a lot of speakers on this subject.

Mr Almirante. — (I) To continue, I wish to say that secondly the Commissioner said that the Commission has done a great deal about the problems of Mediterranean fishing. I should like to know exactly what has been done, since what Mr De Pasquale says is absolutely correct, that is, that not only did we discuss the matter 14 months ago but we took some unanimous decisions: nothing has been done.

Thirdly, the Commissioner has tried to throw on to Parliament the responsibilities which belong to the Commission, the Council of Ministers and also, unfortunately, the Italian Government; he has said that the political will is lacking in Parliament. But Parliament demonstrated its political will in a resolution adopted unanimously 14 months ago! The Commissioner has also implied that the political will of Parliament, the Commission and the Council of Ministers should be

Almirante

expressed solely by increasing the budget appropriations for this item. We are in agreement on the need to increase the budget appropriations, but I do not think that we can solve problems which have cost the lives, the hides of many Sicilian fishermen in terms of amounts and money. I think this is primarily a political problem, and that the Commission and the Council of Ministers should be reminded of the need to respect human rights, and human life, which is in danger in the Mediterranean.

I must conclude by saying very rapidly that the section of Mr Gundelach's report on Yugoslavia was also unsatisfactory, as it is the exact truth that the recent agreements between the EEC and Yugoslavia leave aside the problems of fishing in the Adriatic, while we Italians know perfectly well that those problems too — which I want to outline with the greatest objectivity as I wish to maintain good, indeed very good relations with Yugoslavia — cost sweat, money and blood. Let us not forget it, and let us try to work honestly and seriously.

President. — I call Mr Gautier.

Mr Gautier. — (*D*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, although it is getting rather late, I would still like to make a few points concerning the reports of Mr Kirk and Mr Clinton. First of all, I have some remarks to make on the subject of access, which has already been broached by Mr Gundelach. Access is often equated with the question: how many exclusive national zones are actually to be created? Because this — as has been noted in the discussions today — is clearly a great problem for Ireland, the UK and certain other countries. My Group colleagues have kindly brought along a report from the House of Lords of August this year. With the President's permission, I would like to quote from this document. After two pages dealing with the question whether the exclusive zones should be 50 or 12 nautical miles, the conclusions of the House are as follows:

If inshore waters are open to all vessels registered in the Member States then larger fishing vessels can seek alternative inshore fishing grounds when returns from their usual waters are inadequate and the local short range fishing vessels have no remedy. Examples of this happening were cited to the committee. The committee believes then that the common fisheries policy ought to include provision for exclusive access in some areas and preferential access in others for local fishing communities to those inshore waters on which they so particularly depend.

Here we have the thoughts of the House of Lords on the subject of access, and I have to say that I find this position extremely interesting, and the document itself well worth reading. I believe that in the Clinton report we also have the principle of free access to Community fishing grounds, but would then make arrangements to protect those fishermen who are dependent on exclu-

sive zones or exclusive catching rights. Such protection must of course extend to all Community fishermen. There can be no question but that protection must be available to all dependents in the Community, and not only to those who, because of the size of their boats, can travel to other parts of the coast even though they may have the same nationality and in the end bring about the same result. On this point, therefore, I can say on my own behalf and on that of many of my party colleagues who have supported the amendment to the Clinton report, that we are in agreement with this part of the text.

The second problem is the marketing organization. We have not yet finished with the Commission's proposals in Parliament, and I doubt that we will have done so by the end of the year. After the decision on isoglucose it is greatly to be hoped that this time the Council will act more wisely and wait for the opinion of Parliament. With regard to market organization, I should just like to make a few points. First of all, a market organization must ensure that fish rejected by the market are not destroyed, but that arrangements are made for them to be further used for human consumption. This is also mentioned in the Clinton report, and we look forward to the clear expression of this point in the Commission's proposals; I can only add that, should such a scandal as we had in Germany over the red perch recur, the Community would lose all credibility.

Another point is that the prices and pricing structure of a market organization must never be set up so as to give the fishermen a guaranteed income. Any organization must be set up from considerations not only of scarce resources, but much more importantly, so that the resources may one day be replenished. Furthermore, we also want to prevent fish coming onto the market at high prices and being difficult to dispose of. Market organization must also ensure that the price is not an emergency or reserve price, and that it does not derive from the milk sector or in other market organizations for agricultural production.

A third point is that the structure of European fisheries is certainly very diverse, and this must also be taken into account in market organization. In the case of my own country, I can report that many of the people employed in the fishing industry are in fact involved in fish processing, and that the Federal Republic, especially in the North Sea ports, must import over 50 % of its fish for processing and marketing.

It is obviously unacceptable to have imported fish artificially expensive when Community fishermen are not in a position to produce adequate amounts of fish themselves. This is another point that must be taken into account by any market organization. We have also noted in Mr Clinton's report that all regional characteristics must be considered. One would of course like to see this come about, and these are criteria that I personally would wish to see the marketing organization use.

Gautier

The fourth point is also mentioned in Mr Clinton's report. I am speaking of the report by Mr Kirk on quotas, and on the question of industrial fisheries. No member of our committee would have anything against the idea that fish should be caught for industrial purposes when they have no other use. However, it is always a matter for great care that excessive quantities of fish that could have been used for human consumption are not taken. It is for this reason that we have Community controls. But we have rules about auxiliary catches and also a poor control system in the Community. We want to ensure that there is a gradual reduction in the number of consumable fish taken for industrial use. That is the object of the exercise in the Clinton report.

On the subject of quotas Mr Gundelach has confined himself to the problem of calculation, without referring to the allocation of extra quotas. Fish caught for industrial use are taken as a reference quantity in the calculation. Now the reference quantity — as you will know as well as — is the most critical criterion in the redistribution of fish. The Committee on Agriculture takes the view — and Mr Kirk must also make this quite clear — that these fish should not be incorporated into the calculation of the reference quantity. If therefore quotas should in some form be free, it would be possible to maintain the new distribution, and hence a further set of criteria have been established by the committee. The problem with all these criteria is that we have to manage a shortage, but this is usually simpler to manage than a surplus. The crisis in the steel sector has shown us very clearly how difficult it can be to manage a surplus. What we have to do in the fisheries sector is to ensure that the effects of the shortage are spread as fairly as possible. This will of course be regarded rather differently by fishermen, depending on where they fished previously. If for example they fished Canadian or Icelandic waters, they will view the current situation in a different light from those who normally fished within EEC waters in the past. We have therefore, like the Committee on Agriculture, once again stressed three major criteria in the knowledge that the Commission has not always regarded them in the same way.

There is one more point for consideration. If the Council still does not accept the proposals of the Commission and the Commission is required to produce new proposals within the next three weeks or so, then — and I have to say this — the fisheries policy will again not be dealt with this year, and then we the Parliament will have the right to determine whether all criteria have been appropriately dealt with in the new Commission proposals regarding the distribution of quotas. Parliament will certainly not be able to consider this before January, as the new proposals will not be available before then. The same is also true as regards marketing organization. So it is certain that the Council will have to exercise considerable patience before a coherent fisheries policy can finally come into being.

President. — I call Mr Giummarra.

Mr Giummarra. — (*I*) Mr President, colleagues, I should also like to make a point about the decision of the presidency to allow Mr Gundelach to speak before our colleagues had finished speaking. By this lapses, the Commissioner has shown that he reserves his position on the points made by other colleagues who will speak in this evening's debate.

The positive reports of Mr Clinton, Mrs Cresson and Mr Kirk have given colleagues an overall picture of matters concerning fishing and the means which are indispensable for supporting and developing this sector. Indeed, the long series of negative factors which have had an adverse effect on the process of developing the fisheries sector, causing the income of European fishermen to fall considerably, has become a valid basis for encouraging the adoption of Community resolutions on a European basis. The decrease in reserves of fish because of excessive, disorganized and occasionally uncivilized exploitation, the extension of territorial waters to 200 miles by countries with a coastline, the gradual and inevitable increase in the price of oil, all of these factors — I was saying — with the decision to exclude Community fishing vessels from the traditional fishing zones which are now reserved for Ireland, for Canada and for Norway, have made it urgent for the Community countries to reach agreement on overall fisheries policy.

Only in this way is it possible to achieve the essential aims of a reasonable and assured income for fishermen and of an increase in jobs, while safeguarding resources of fish through suitable controls and making the most of the products by taking concrete steps to reorganize the market in such a way as to meet the onslaught of low-price imports from third countries and finally by adopting a suitable structural policy able to equate structure to the technological advances of the most modern shipbuilders.

Certainly, this global Community fisheries policy is running into a whole series of problems which have been mentioned here also. These problems are substantial, for example the allocation of catch quotas and the definition of rules for access to Community waters for the 200 mile zone within the context of safeguarding the legitimate interests of the countries with coastal waters.

These problems which seem to affect or to obstruct all the measures of the Commission and the Council have been tackled afresh and with some determination since the so-called 'hot summer' in France, which seems to have stimulated the Commission to delay no longer in laying the foundations of a European policy for fisheries.

Giummarra

So, honourable members, we ask why the French 'hot summer' was able to rouse the Community institutions, to the point of causing consideration of intervention measures in the sector to be initiated and of bringing about the commitment to lay down — let us hope — within the current year all the norms of the common fisheries policy.

I consider that there is only one reply. Not only the blockade of the French ports and the use of the army but also the vast coverage by the French and European press of the events and the protests made the public aware to such an extent of the importance of the basic problems of fisheries that it became a matter of urgency for the Community institutions, and for the Commission in particular, to decide on possible fields for intervention in order to give concrete assurances and to reply fairly to the pressure of the French fishermen and shipbuilders.

In my opinion, Mr President, the attitude of the Community authorities and of Mr Gundelach towards the problems of fishing in the Mediterranean has unfortunately been very different. These problems affect Italy, and in particular the islands. It is certainly true, honourable members, that these problems are special in some ways because of the failure to establish an exclusive Community economic zone of 200 miles in the Mediterranean, the special structure of the Italian fishing fleet and the limited area within which the Italian fleet can operate, which are the origin of clashes of interest with Yugoslavia, Tunisia, Libya, Malta, Albania, Algeria, Morocco and even Egypt.

It is, however, also true that the clashes, tensions, disputes, struggles or outbreaks of real international piracy which the Mediterranean has witnessed in recent years while the Italian fleet has been fishing, have been relegated by the Commission to the rank of the modest, even if recurrent, manifestations of tiresome guerrilla warfare between poor countries. It would have been much fairer to consider these events as symptomatic of deep suffering which required suitable therapy and urgent and decisive action. The failure to establish fishing agreements with Yugoslavia — on Mr Gundelach's reply to this is very disappointing — a matter falling entirely within the terms of reference of the Community, demonstrates an inertia which must be pointed out especially as these agreements were not at the right time made part of the agreements which define the Treaty between the EEC and Yugoslavia and negotiations are still proceeding very slowly, even though Yugoslavia has indirectly put forward requests on which discussions could easily be based.

What cannot be accepted, however, Mr President and honourable members, is the lack of attention — in spite of the efforts this evening by Mr Gundelach to justify the inertia of the Commission and shown by the Commissioner himself — given to fishing agreements with the Mediterranean countries. They have been treated passively, distantly, almost bureaucratically,

with none of that enthusiasm and political commitment which sweep away caution and resignation and the mere noting of difficulties and lead the parties concerned to engage in conclusive and valid negotiations resulting in an agreement.

This is what led to such a contradictory and entirely blameworthy policy, shown by the fact that while the need is proclaimed to widen our horizons and to develop a wide-ranging policy in the fisheries sector, with negotiations on fishing agreements with countries like Senegal, Cape Verde, Guinea, Bissau, or even with agreements which have already been sealed with two of these countries, on the other hand undertakings are neglected which would be easier to negotiate even though they would have a wider social and economic impact because they affect the lives, freedom and incomes of Italian fishermen, who operate in particular in the southern part of the Mediterranean basin.

Apart from the palliative of the joint venture, no information has yet reached Parliament about the offers which the Community has made or intends making to the countries of the Mediterranean basin, or about the advisability of dealing with fishing in the disputed areas in the context of cooperation agreements. The news of confiscations of Italian fishing vessels following the decisions of Parliament demonstrates the difficult position of the Italian fishing fleet and shows how little the Commission is committed to resolving the problems which confront fishing in the Mediterranean.

Honourable members, I should like to hope that there will be signs of reform and indications of a new attitude following the unanimous wish of the Parliament shown in the request contained today in Mr Clinton's motion for a resolution, paragraph 66 of which deals with the delicate matter of fishing in the Mediterranean and the implications for the sector arising from the enlargement of the Community to include Greece.

The difficulties of the fleet are unjustifiable and serious and Sicilian fishermen should not be forced to add to the difficulties and disadvantages of living in a poor region and a difficult area with bitterness at the lack of attention or, even worse, the mistaken attitude which looks, as it should, at cooperation with countries outside the Community when drafting or implementing a common European policy but which must also ensure that the less favoured regions within the Community receive at least that minimum of solidarity which helps to reduce distances and to make up for disadvantages.

President. — I call Mr Kirk.

Mr Kirk, rapporteur. — (DK) Mr President, I would like to add my thanks to those of the other speakers

Kirk

for Mr Clinton's report, which I think is an outstanding piece of work that will solve some of the problems that face us. I would also like to say that I have put forward four amendments, as I find there are some points which do not accord with the factual situation. I feel that when Parliament produces a report for the Council and the Commission it must be as factual as possible, and also in line with current conditions prevalent in the policy that we are at this moment carrying out. I shall not go further into this.

I think that we are now at a critical time, certainly for Danish fisheries. We are in the position of having a remarkable proposal from the Commission, which has been attacked by many of the Member States, and we have also heard many representatives here in Parliament attack it on the grounds that industrial fishing quotas have not been worked out in the way that quotas of edible fish used for industrial purposes were worked out at one time, or in the base period of 1973-78.

We have also heard Mr Gundelach say that one of the outstanding problems is the allocation of quotas released by the new restrictions which have been made in the Community's fisheries, especially its industrial fisheries. But can it be right that we find ourselves in a situation where some fishermen have adapted themselves to the new restrictions, with consequent self-justification of their own fisheries, and that now, four years later, they are being penalized for that, with the catches they have taken hitherto, and that they now take for human consumption, should be denied them? Isn't this the situation? I should like to ask the Commission how people will react when the results of these restrictions on fishing for human consumption, mesh sizes of 80 mm, become generally accepted and result in large catches for Member States. Will they also ask that the resulting increased catches in edible fish be divided equally between all, or will they then change their criteria?

I should also like to make another point, which is perhaps a special problem for a small Member State like Denmark. This is the question of the manner in which the total catch is worked out for individual countries. Denmark, for instance, consists of a very large island, Greenland, up in the North Atlantic, plus of course the southern part of the country, which borders on Germany. It is clear, then, that the way the catch is calculated will include the catch from Greenland waters. At the moment the situation is, fortunately, that the catch of cod from Greenland waters is increasing. Therefore the result should be that a large quota would be allotted to Greenland. But the result is that the total allocated to Denmark will increase in the form of cod-equivalent. At the same time, however, this means that fishermen in Denmark itself have not got better possibilities. If therefore the total Danish catch in Greenland waters increases by 25 000 tons and we are then told that we can just go and reduce our North Sea catch by the same amount, this will

obviously be of no benefit to the fishermen in the North Sea area, even though there are better possibilities for Greenland.

I would like to call this to the attention of the Commission. It is one thing to prepare a common fisheries policy that Member States feel they can be happy with on paper, but it is quite another for fishermen with fishing areas in different regions when they cannot go from one region to another. Clearly, a North Sea fisherman cannot just go off to Greenland to fish for his cod.

In conclusion, I would like to warn against the proposal which we have heard from the Presidency of the Council of Ministers. This would mean that Danish North Sea fishermen would have to reduce their activities to half of what they have been. It would mean that only 700 Danish North Sea trawlers will be able to operate during three months of the year. I do not believe that this Community can carry this burden. I do not believe that the Community should take responsibility for cutting out so many jobs in Danish fisheries. Therefore I back the Commission's proposal, and I support Commissioner Gundelach in taking the line that the Council should try to view the whole problem, not from the point of view of Member States but from that of the individual fishermen.

President. — I call Mrs Le Roux.

Mrs Le Roux. — (*F*) Mr President, the decisions which will be taken at the end of this debate will have extremely serious consequences for the economic future of many regions and for the life and work of tens of thousands of sea fishermen and hundreds of thousands of workers whose livelihood depends on fishing.

In the various measures taken over the last ten years, the EEC has already hastened the crisis in this sector in France. The demands which the Commission is now making in the name of protecting resources are exorbitant.

In our amendments to the resolutions of Mr Clinton and Mr Kirk and in the motion for a resolution which we have tabled we put forward proposals which will genuinely protect fish, as the policy organized today in fact leads to considerable wastage.

For it is said that priority must be given to fishing to provide food for human consumption, whereas it is in fact the catching of fish for fish meal which is encouraged and is being developed: an increase of 25 % in 6 years. A large part of this fishing to provide fish meal has no quota and is not supervised. So meshes finer than 90 millimetres are banned in order to protect the whiting and in the same place a 15 millimetre mesh can be used to catch young fish.

Le Roux

Not only is the growth of young fish placed in jeopardy but also a link in the food chain necessary for the growth of the carnivorous species which we ourselves eat is removed.

The catch allocated to French fishermen is limited, still in the name of protecting resources, and at the same time, out of 10 tonnes of fish imported into France 4 come from the Community, which allocated the equivalent quotas to our partners.

The practice of flags of convenience is widespread and is encouraged by the allocation of large quotas. These are Norwegian ships fishing under British, Canadian and Irish flags and Spanish ships fishing under British and Irish flags.

Finally, huge quantities of fish are thrown back into the sea or destroyed in the ports; noble species are turned into fish meal, while at the same time imports from third countries are encouraged, in particular to allow agri-foodstuffs trusts, in Germany above all, to use fish for processing at prices below the EEC withdrawal prices.

And this is what is called a policy for protecting resources, this is what is used to justify the completely unfair allocation of quotas!

Up to 1970, France caught about 20 % of the European tonnage; since then, the quotas allocated to our country have continued to fall: to about 15 % from 1973 to 1978, and now the Council proposes to substitute the figure of 11.6 % for the 12.2 % proposed by the Commission. This figure takes no account either of the needs of France, or of means of production or of the productivity of our fishing fleet.

The Commission proposes to allocate six times fewer fish per fisherman to the French than to the German Federal Republic. A fair estimation would give us 300 000 tonnes. If you consider the quota in terms of inhabitants, we are allocated 25 times less fish than Denmark, and in this case a fair allocation would be 260 000 tonnes per year instead of 120 000 tonnes. This may explain Mr Kirk's haste for the vote on his report, which supports these quotas in a completely illegal way.

Therefore, whatever basis is used for the calculation, the fair quota for our country should be 20 %. Moreover, I repeat that this was the quantity fished by France before the European policy devastated this sector. This disastrous policy has contributed to the reduction in the number of our fishermen by one third. In 1970 there were 36 000. Now there are not more than 24 000.

On behalf of the French coastal regions, and on behalf of the workers concerned in this matter, I and my French colleagues in the Communists and Allies Group demand that the quotas be re-examined and

redistributed: 20 % and 200 000 tonnes of cod and equivalents are the minimum figures acceptable to our country.

Other measures which tend to go against the interests of French fishing must also be halted. Free access to fishing grounds is constantly being threatened. Historical rights must be guaranteed. The advantages given to imports which compete with our products are enormous. They must be abolished. The reference price for fishery products must be fixed to keep pace with increased production costs. In the short term, this means an increase of at least 30 %. This is what producers want.

The policy of reorganization, that is of de-restricting fishing vessels and subsidizing larger ships, and in particular the spread of the policy of advanced bases, makes unemployment and working conditions worse, and leads to the closing of many canneries in our country. The aid envisaged has also been allocated unfairly: 40 % to Great Britain as opposed to 10 % for France between 1972 and 1977. And over the next five years, the German Federal Republic will pocket 36 % of the funds, Great Britain 21 % and France only 9 %.

Finally, we again wish to question the plans to enlarge the Common Market which will also make the position of fishermen worse in both the EEC countries and the countries seeking membership. We must not decide on a few illusory so-called social measures to cover up the cracks but must refuse to enlarge the Community.

Some people here propose to increase the role of the EEC in the management of fisheries. We say that each State must retain full sovereignty in this field. Each must be able to negotiate agreements between States independently. Each must be able to fix the amount of fuel subsidy it grants. Each must have sole responsibility for organizing producers and, finally, each must retain control over supervision of its maritime area.

The policy followed so far and the plans which have been proposed are disastrous. If Europe interferes further, this will worsen the crisis of the fishing industry. This blue Europe which has been proposed is the counterpart of the Europe which has been imposed on the textile workers and the metalworkers; this array of measures will scuttle the French fishing industry to the profit of the big shipowners and the multinationals. Together with the workers of the fishing industry, we refuse to set up this Europe of sharks.

President. — I call Miss Quin on a point of order.

Miss Quin. — Mr President, I wonder if you would make a ruling, or give some indication, as to whether the New Zealand report is going to be taken tonight, because some of us are waiting to participate in that

Quin

debate. If it is not to be taken tonight we should quite like to get some sleep before having to come back here first thing tomorrow morning.

(Cries of 'Hear, hear!')

President. — Miss Quin, the number of Members scheduled to speak is so large that I think we shall only have time this evening to complete the fisheries debate.

President. — I call Mr Nyborg.

Mr Nyborg. — *(DK)* Mr President, I would like to say that a fisheries policy is clearly desirable; indeed, it is not only desirable but absolutely necessary. It was therefore a disappointment to learn that the last meeting on fisheries did not end in agreement on a common fisheries policy. The Commission has set the scene and written the script for the Council.

Let me therefore join with previous speakers in stating as strongly as possible that the Commission should keep to its sensible proposals and put it to the Council that they had better do something about it and settle on a common fisheries policy so that our fishermen know whether they are going to be able to work. Whether they can organize and invest. Because the stop-go policies we have had up to now give them no chance at all to settle down to work in a secure atmosphere.

For conservation, for the environment, and for many other reasons, we should establish a fisheries policy not for individual Member States but as an EEC plan. Fortunately, there is a good measure of agreement here too, and has been ever since the meeting at The Hague. For myself, I can both support and recommend Mr Kirk's report on catches and their distribution. I would like especially to call attention to point 5, which is very positive, and I am in complete agreement with Amendment No 10 proposed by Mr Provan. I would also call attention to the fact that the principles on which this is based have been developed by a marine biologist, Dr Ursin, who has produced a special model of the North Sea whereby it will be possible to extend fisheries considerably if only it is properly applied.

Control arrangements for an EEC plan are therefore needed. What will also be necessary is that individual Member States should not be allowed to evade the regulations, as we have seen the UK do. It is far too time-consuming to bring Member States to the Court of Justice, and again it creates uncertainty for the fishermen.

Again, I have to agree strongly with other speakers who have pointed out the need for more research to provide new fishing prospects: deep-sea fisheries,

long-line fisheries, and the various types of fish-farming. And as there have been many national voices raised in the debate this evening, I will add mine by pointing out to my dear colleagues in Parliament that fisheries are probably more important to Denmark than they are to any other EEC country. Seen in terms of gross national product, or in terms of exports, there is not another country in the Community where fisheries mean so much as they do in Denmark, the land I come from, and which I represent in this Assembly.

President. — I call Mr Woltjer.

Mr Woltjer. — *(NL)* Mr President, by and large I can be brief since my part colleagues Mr Gautier and Mr Josselin have already described how the Socialist Group will in general regard the reports of Mr Clinton and Mr Kirk. I will therefore confine myself to just a few remarks. First of all, I think it is of the utmost importance that we both, Parliament and Commission, try to ensure that a common fisheries policy comes into being, and to avoid growing still further apart. Before the summer recess I listened with interest to Mr Gundelach when he set out his ideas in general terms for a common fisheries policy, which at the time was to come into existence before the end of the year. What struck me most forcefully was the extent of Mr Gundelach's determination to get this policy into practice. I have the greatest respect for this in view of the magnitude of the problems within the EEC in agriculture and fisheries at the present time. What is more, I had the feeling also that Mr Gundelach was not ignoring the problems of the Member States, but was also trying just as hard to find solutions to them too. I have found the same spirit in our own committee, where we have tried our very best to come to an agreement with Mr Clinton and Mr Kirk on this point. But not an agreement of the least common denominator; every effort has been made to reach a genuine compromise. This spirit has cheered me enormously, as we know well enough in the Agriculture Committee how often we have deep discussions and try to reach agreement, knowing how the mission of Parliament is diminished in this way. As a Parliament, we must try together with the Commission to get a solution to the problem. And it is clear that the will now exists with regard to fisheries. I would also like to make another point. Mr Gundelach has said very clearly in his speech that we must exercise great care over North Sea herring fishing. In this I completely agree with him. It is most important that we do not go back to the methods of fishing which were used in the past. The herring situation is improving, and we must use every, possible means to ensure that overfishing does not occur again. It is for this reason that I have paid particular attention in the fisheries working group to reaching agreement on quotas for herring in the North Sea. This is in the Kirk report too. Why? To try once again to get large quotas out of it? Not at all! I want to make it absolutely clear that that is not my intention. I fully agree that the North Sea herring situation must improve still

Woltjer

further. But I would like to see a quota, a small catch allowed within the limits of present growth. The herring stock must go on increasing, but it is possible to introduce a quota slowly, while at the same time allowing stocks to go on increasing.

There is not a surplus of herring, but it is coming about slowly — and you will know that the biologists are discussing this — to the point where it will again be possible.

Why do I take this position? Because we have to be terribly careful in this area. And I have to make a serious plea here for us all to remember that we are dealing with the fate of a great number of people. It is as many other speakers have remarked. It is about fishermen, about people sitting and waiting. They have lost their traditional markets. And of course Mr Gundelach knows very well how important the herring is to the Netherlands, for consumers as well. Therefore I maintain that we have to give the people affected, slowly but surely and under controlled conditions, another chance.

Another aspect of this is that the herring quota in the Skagerrak is in the meantime being increased, as I have recently discovered. And there is a clear biological relationship between the herring stocks of the Skagerrak and the North Sea.

I would like to know whether Mr Gundelach is of this opinion. It seems very unjust to those waiting for a small North Sea herring quota that a larger amount of fish may be taken from the Skagerrak, and then to find that not even a small quota may be taken from the North Sea. Once again I am of the opinion that, given all these factors, it is of the greatest importance to exercise care — as you yourself have said — to check whether a North Sea herring quota is possible. That is the aim of the text of the Kirk Report under discussion, no more no less. This is what I have pointed out and what the majority of the Committee on Agriculture have accepted. I hope that the suggestion will also be interpreted in Parliament in the same way and will reach the same level of acceptance. That is of very great importance to us. These were the points I wanted to make.

President. — I call Mr de Lipkowski.

Mr de Lipkowski. — (F) Mr Gundelach, you have said that we are on the way to a Community fisheries policy.

In the light of the Council's performance and your proposals, one might doubt this. Moreover, the violent demonstrations of the French fishermen show that the people concerned have few illusions about the development of this blue Europe. We expect the Council to prove at least that this really is a joint policy. And with this in mind it seems inconceivable that we should

accept the fact that Great Britain might reserve its vast coastal areas exclusively for British fishermen.

The Commission's proposals are astonishing to say the least. If we naturally agree that there should be an overall reduction in quotas in line with the need to preserve stocks we cannot allow that the Commission should penalize French fishermen as it has done. The quotas allocated to us by this incredible proposal are in fact 30 % down on the 1978 decisions. No French fisherman will accept such an imposition.

You 'wrapped up' your reply by saying that a compromise was possible, but there will be no compromise on this score, and the French Government stated this very clearly at its last meeting. In the same way, we cannot accept reductions in fishing for human consumption while Brussels is at the same time encouraging industrial fishing for the manufacture of fish meal, which should, in fact be banned. In any case, if we are moving towards a reduction in productive capacity in order to conserve resources, it must be said that a reduction of this kind will only be tolerable if the Council introduces a policy of structural aid. This is why we are in favour of establishing plans for fishing which allow better management of the seas in accordance with the quotas allocated. These plans for fishing must, of course, not be identical for all the fishing enterprises in Europe, and the proposals in Mr Kirk's report risk giving preference to some enterprises which might seriously upset the fishing of French fishing vessels.

At the commercial level, we must establish a common organization of markets which is more effective than the one which has been in existence since 1970. This is why we are asking for a real up-dating, beginning with guide prices. These no longer correspond to reality. It is very strange that the Commission proposes to up-date them on the basis of an average over three years. The evidence shows that this would not help in any way to catch up with market prices.

The price of most species must really be brought into line with returns from ships. The same must be done with withdrawal prices, which are not sufficiently high to encourage fishermen to belong to producers' organizations. They are, however, of primary importance for the regulation of the market.

Finally, as for the system of reference prices as organized at present, this seems purely theoretical. It must be raised substantially in order to penalize imports which come into the Community at low prices. These imports represent totally unfair competition for our producers, and at the same time favour certain processors in Northern Europe. The Commission has so far had the option of closing the frontiers in certain cases. It is very regrettable that it has not exercised this option.

de Lipkowski

Finally, we regret that the Commission continues to refuse to adopt special measures to help to reduce the price of fuel for fishing. Fishermen, especially small coastal fishermen, are suffering very badly from the increase in energy costs. Mr Clinton's report is quite explicit about this, and shows that fuel costs represent on average about 25-30 % of the running costs of a fishing boat, and that the price of fuel in France has risen 570 % since 1974. This means that the position of the Commission in this respect is a dangerous one, tolerating as it does distortions of competition by more or less open subsidies from some Member States to their fishermen. A direct Community fuel subsidy would be better. This is the subject of the amendment which I and my group have proposed, a direct Community aid, in accordance with the EEC rules and in line with the desire for harmonization, in order to help small coastal fishermen to meet the difficulties they face. Without this, they will disappear.

President. — I call Mr Enright.

Mr Enright. — Might I assure you that I have made no press release beforehand and therefore I will not be reading out a long dossier and will make my points as telegraphically as possible.

Coming from a party which is supposed to be insular, which is supposed to be inward-looking, I have been quite appalled by two speeches in particular which have been made this evening: one by Mr Giummarra, who talked about Senegal and Guinea Bissau and the needs of Italian fishermen, which seemed to me to be the most insular speech of the lot and which also showed a total lack of knowledge of what has been done in the fishing industry in relation to the Third World, about which I want to talk briefly later on. He talked about Senegal, he talked about Guinea Bissau, and he said that nothing had been done. This Parliament and the Commission have done a great deal and I congratulate for once Commissioner Gundelach on what has been done in that area. I think it has been done efficiently and well and I think we need to monitor it in the future.

And I am delighted to see so many of the French Communists in our midst tonight to listen to what is said about their remarks.

When Mrs Le Roux started talking about French fish and how they go along, my goodness me I began to think of the singing of the Marseillaise underseas by the French fish as they swam and the lack of realization as also happens in the United Kingdom on many occasions, but certainly on the part of that remarkably insular lady that fish in fact are born in one place, do actually swim to another place and then may die in yet another place and in between can be caught all over the place, was I thought quite remarkable.

And the amendment that they have down to say that Spain and Portugal should not come into this Commu-

nity again really displays a narrow nationalism which is not in keeping with this Parliament and which is certainly not in keeping with the report that Mr Clinton has produced. I think that report provides a very good basis for an agreement on fishing and I am sure that is why Commissioner Gundelach spoke about it in such glowing terms.

I would like to add to that that perhaps the Council of Ministers might follow the example of this Parliament on sensible compromises and conciliation and solutions because we do manage to get over our sillier people within this Parliament in the end in terms of reports like the Clinton report.

I will now make some very telegraphic points. First of all I would like to back up those people who have asked for a 12-mile limit and then in particular to have a preference area beyond. I think that argument has been well put and I will not repeat it as I had intended to originally.

I would like to talk about the structural measures which are necessary because the structural measures in the report talk about technology principally and the new technology in this area is extremely important, I do not deny that, but what is equally important — and we have seen this in the steel industry, we have seen this in the textile industry — is that social measures should be taken beforehand and sufficient money devoted to that. That is terribly important indeed and I do beseech the Commission to put all the pressure they can upon the Council to agree to those sort of measures.

I also welcome very much indeed the reference in the text to a fisheries research centre, which is needed not only for Europe but also for the Third World. I was delighted to see, and this is principally why I am speaking tonight, the decision to put in that resolution the relationships between ourselves and the developing countries because it seems to me, having done two fishing reports in this area, that that is a crucial area.

I would beseech the Commission again to urge upon the Council that they say that individual governments should not be going out and producing bilateral agreements with, or giving bilateral aid to, the African, Caribbean and Pacific States, because some of us have seen the damage that that does. It should be done at a Community level. It is only at a Community level that it makes sense.

If you go to Tanzania and look at their fishing fleet at Dar-es-Salaam you will see that they have engines from the Swedes, engines from the British and engines from the French and, as a result, they have 750 different types of gear level and an assortment of technology with which they cannot cope, whereas the comprehensive development which can and has been achieved in the rural area, and could very well and competently be achieved in the fishing area, would

Enright

give the level of technology which is required, would be 150 % more efficient and certainly would not leave fishing fleets out of commission up to as much as 75 % on occasions on the African coast. I think that is very important indeed and I do urge it upon the Commission.

Finally, I would like to say that we must not look upon this as a matter simply and solely for the Community. The Community has agreements with Norway in particular and Norway is very keen to have even closer links with the Community and to have links at a higher level. This is not sufficiently known — certainly in the British press it is not stated; Norway is treated as some kind of separate entity with no links. I think it is very important that Norway gets those closer links and that we integrate them into that fishing agreement. This is one of the crucial areas and I would say very much the same about our Canadian friends, who are here today. I have spoken as briefly as possible, Mr President, and I thank you for your indulgence.

President. — I call Mrs Ewing.

Mrs Ewing. — May I first, like the other speakers, thank all these rapporteurs and particularly Mr Clinton, and echo the praise that they well deserve. May I thank also all the people who have been engaged in this painful process for many years, including the fishermen who have taken months from their profession to participate in negotiations. One of them from my area died at the talks in Brussels this week. I feel that he is perhaps a casualty that is understandable when you think how long this haul has been.

May I first make an appeal to put a stop to the imports which are swamping us. I will leave it at that. I do not need to spell them out. It is a ridiculous situation and it is harming everyone. All the Member States agree on that. Could I make an appeal also, in the light of Commissioner Gundelach's answer to me in May, when we noticed that many Member States are giving subsidies in one form or another, that we all are treated the same. I am not against France giving a few subsidies. I am in favour of the same being done for everyone. But more serious than the fuel subsidy is the interest rate differential which has sent many fishermen to sea when they should not be fishing and has cost many lives. In my former constituency three boats from the small number of fishing towns that I then represented were lost.

The toll is high because of the uncertainty. Now we are all desperate to end the uncertainty, and there is always a moment of danger at the end of long negotiations when you would settle for almost anything. That is one of the things I would just like to warn the Commissioner and any other Members who might agree with me against. I think we cannot lose sight of elementary justices.

I would like to see the EAGGF grants rationalized. It seems absurd, for instance, that Northern Ireland is treated in a different way from Scotland. They are both parts of the same Member State. But that is happening. I feel we should insist on a tight control of fishery inspection, which is something I have appealed for often, as Commissioner Gundelach knows. This is needed to end a lot of the suspicions that fishermen very understandably have of one another, particularly concerning herring being landed here and there when it should not be, and so on. And I think if everyone agreed to a tight fishing control system where there would be mutual rights of inspection, this would at least dissipate some of the suspicion.

On a very individual point could I ask Commissioner Gundelach why it is that Scotland does not have the same Hague preference treatment as Ireland, since it seems in a very similar situation, where the development of the fleet is concerned. Could I associate myself with the remarks of Mr Battersby and Mr Enright and thus save a lot of time.

But I would like also to say something about the speech of the French lady. She does not seem to understand a very elementary fact when she dishes out phrases like 'multinationals'. The in-shore fishing industry of Britain, which is crying out for justice, is not a multinational industry. It is a share industry where the fishermen have shares in the boats, and this lady does not seem to grasp this, although I have told this House that many many times already. We need to have coastal state preferences because we lost half of our rights. The UK share is 66 % and the Scottish share is 66 % of that. And having lost fishing grounds in third countries we are in a difficult situation.

If anyone is crying out for justice it must be Scotland in particular and the UK in general. We have given the Community the great chunk of the waters about which we are arguing. And we are the people who conserve the fish in those waters. Whether or not it is very palatable for the other Member States to listen, it is a fact of life. The fishermen wanted to pass on their boats to their sons and grandsons. And it was for that reason, not because they were any more saintly, that they kept the fish in the sea. It is the fish in the British sea that we are mainly talking about. Therefore, when talking about cutbacks, bear in mind that 66 % of the UK share is 35 %. So when people are squealing with pain, you will forgive me if I squeal a bit too.

We have asked people to bring some reality into the figures they are bandying around here. After all, our waters were given away. I do not blame the other Member States. I blame Britain for that. You cannot blame the French, the Germans and the Danes for taking what we gave away. But nevertheless if the Community is to wear the human face that Commissioner Jenkins boasts about, it should be remembered that you cannot wear a human face and a death mask at the same time.

Ewing

I have scores of islands totally dependent on fishing. This dependence is not merely economic. A way of life is at stake! It is a dangerous way of life, but it is the only one that people in many parts of the Community want. One has to be very careful and ensure that whatever arrangements are adopted you do not produce ghost towns and villages and deserted islands. That is the appeal I am going to make. Commissioner Gundelach has heard me make it in so many speeches I could not name them, all saying the same thing. I shall end by making that appeal again.

President. — I call Mr Fich.

Mr Fich. — (DK) Mr President, the discussions this evening have taken place against the very topical background of this week's proceedings in Council — a background which is much more topical than we could have hoped. We might have hoped that there was more time till the Council meeting, and that we did not find ourselves in this rather odd situation. I would say that we should be rather careful. We are at a standstill, even though I have heard Mr Gundelach sound quite optimistic this evening. On the other hand, I have also heard more pessimistic voices saying that it is a question of where we stand on the whole and of what, in the main, we have ahead of us as realistic topics and bases for discussion.

Although the reports we have been talking about are quite remarkable documents, they nevertheless in my opinion cannot form the basis of laws, without further amendment. What I mean is that we have heard this evening many fine words from all political groups about how much good this is going to do for fisheries. Let me remind them that today is exactly two weeks to the budget. Let me remind them that we have a proposal to earmark ten million units of account for a structural policy for fisheries, and that this proposal did not get 205 votes in this assembly. I think it is very significant that people do not seem prepared to take the consequences of their own fine words. We have often seen excellent reports, long debates, but when the budget comes along there is no money to back them up. I feel we should ask for a little more realism so that our decisions are a logical result of the budgetary allocations that we are prepared to make.

I do not want to go into the actual substance of the fisheries debate. There has been a great deal of wisdom spoken, so I shall confine myself to a political evaluation of what has been said. I would remind the House that the problems have existed for a long time, and this whole political process has come to a conclusion on 30 May this year. And I would particularly remind the House that this solution was a package. It was a solution that covered more than just fisheries. Part of it, for instance, contained agricultural elements, and while not attempting to be controversial, I must also remind everyone that part of it was a payment to Britain. So I would warn against undoing

this package. It is a package, a political package — call it what you will — but it was definitely political, and unless it is taken as a package it falls apart completely. Now one part of this package is that a fisheries policy must be produced by January. We are very near the first of January, but however theoretical or difficult it looks, it has been decided. You cannot take one part of the package and reject the other. It is politically impossible, and I cannot stress that enough. When I demand a solution, it is of course not a complete solution. We must bear in mind that what we are after is not a phasing out of fisheries. It cannot be the task of the Community to phase out fisheries in particular regions. The only objective we can have is to develop fisheries. It is not our job to create unemployment, and as Mr Enright has rightly pointed out, what we have to do is to take account of social conditions in certain cases. This means that the greatest possible attention must be given to those who really are the fishermen at the present time. Who, at the present time, are really concerned with fisheries and the fishing industry? They must have first priority if we are not to create unemployment. It is certainly unfair if for example Danish fishermen and other fisheries employees have to suffer because of the interference of other countries in our traditional fishing rights.

Against this background I urge the Commission to stand fast with its proposals. I also urge the Council to respect the interests of all countries, and those of small countries too. And finally I would remind everyone yet again that the decision reached on 30 May was a package.

President. — I call Mr Harris.

Mr Harris — Mr President, I have precisely two minutes at my disposal, so I shall be both brief and blunt. I wish to join in congratulating Mr Clinton on his report. There is much in it which I found totally acceptable and much of it totally welcome. There was, however, one paragraph in the motion for a resolution which, I understand, was not of his own writing. I refer to the suggestion that there should be a general three-mile limit outside which all Community fishermen should have the same access to fishing grounds. I, for my part, find that provision totally and utterly unacceptable.

I say that because I believe it is a sad fact of life that following the cod war in Iceland the emphasis now, I am afraid, has to be not on deepwater fishing but on in-shore and middlewater fishing, and that means inevitably that there must be reasonable protection for in-shore fishermen, for the reasons so eloquently given by Mrs Ewing. That is also why I found the speech by our Communist colleague so utterly unrealistic, and I would condemn her approach. I do believe that this protection must be given, and I therefore reject — and I hope and I am sure that the House itself will reject — that provision of the report, which, as I say, I do

Harris

not believe was of Mr Clinton's writing. I think it was the result of an amendment.

I now turn in the short time available to one particular aspect of the report, an aspect not touched on much in this debate tonight — the regional aspect. Again I have in mind in-shore fishermen, and forgive me, Mr President, if I refer to my own part of the world, Cornwall. On page 22, the report draws attention to the fact that there has been a lot of fishing for mackerel off the coast of Cornwall and Devon, and it points out quite rightly that very little on-shore employment has been created as a result of that major fishery. I regret that. I find it abhorrent, quite honestly, that even now Communist factory-ships are off Falmouth processing the fish which are caught by Scottish fishermen, East Coast fishermen and my own fishermen. I long for the day, when we can have onshore fish-processing plants; but, of course, as Mr Clinton says, we shall not get those plants until processors and the fishing industry generally can have confidence in the future. And they will not have confidence in the future until we have a sensible common fisheries policy which is fair to our fishermen and which is based mainly on conservation. That is why I hope with all my heart that the talks now going on in Brussels do come to a satisfactory conclusion and that we can put an end to the fighting which has gone on in this Chamber — happily not tonight — so that we do indeed have a common fisheries policy which will give the assurance which, I think, is what all our fishermen want.

President. — I call Mr Remilly.

Mr Remilly. — (*F*) Mr President, our Group of European Progressive Democrats has long pointed out the serious problems resulting from the lack of a common fisheries policy. This is why we asked the Commission to take rapid steps to establish the Europe of fisheries and to impose respect for Community regulations, especially as regards limiting fishing zones in order to respect historical rights.

Today by our votes we are calling for a quotas policy which takes account of the available stocks and which allows all fishermen to participate fairly in reconstituting them. I shall not now go into the measures contained in Mr Clinton's and Mr Kirk's reports in detail, as Mr de Lipowski and other members of my group have already given excellent accounts of our positions on the delicate problems raised.

Nevertheless, my colleagues must not hold against me the fact that I return to one matter in drawing Parliament's attention to the vital importance of the decisions which will be taken for some regions which depend largely on fishing for their livelihood, and which as far as other industries are concerned have witnessed worrying changes which have raised their level of unemployment to an unenviable degree. This

is the case in Brittany. 45 % of the maritime population engaged in fishing live in this region, 44 % of the fish are landed and 48 % of initial sales value is made. Finally, 48 000 people are directly or indirectly employed in fishing, that is, about 10 % of jobs in coastal areas, and for some communities it is the main activity. In the light of these figures, how can we avoid realising that it is absolutely essential to recognize the serious plight of Brittany and to grant it the means of saving what can still be saved. Any measures taken today which do not take account of the situation I have described would very quickly have catastrophic results. Therefore, in order to preserve the livelihood of the working population, we propose that Brittany should be included on the European list of regions which are dependent on fishing to a high degree. This list was begun in 1976 at the time of the Hague agreement, and was extended recently by the inclusion of two British regions, the Isle of Man and the East coast of England, and at present includes Ireland, Northern Ireland, Western Scotland, Greenland, Southern Italy, the French overseas departments, the Isle of Man and the East coast of England. I am confident that Parliament and the Commission will want to repair an omission which imposes severe penalties on a region by asking for Brittany to take its rightful place on the list of regions which are dependent on fishing to a high degree.

I should like finally to draw the Community's attention to the importance of the measures aimed at encouraging fishing, whose contribution is essential to the economy and employment prospects of a region.

In conclusion, allow me to say that I very much regret the extension of emergency solutions, which results from the failure of negotiations on fisheries by the Council of Ministers on 18 November, and I deplore the lack of solidarity of certain members. In order for Europe to maintain credibility, we hope that whatever the circumstances, and with all possible speed, before the next session of Parliament the measures will be taken which we all await, especially the Breton deep-sea fishermen who pay a tribute to the sea which earns them the respect and consideration of our Assembly.

President. — I call Mr Newton Dunn.

Mr Newton Dunn. — Mr President, in view of the time, five minutes past twelve, I am going to confine my remarks to a single point for the Commissioner.

Mr Gundelach, I am going to echo Mrs Ewing and some of my other colleagues. We have talked about the need to protect the livelihoods of in-shore fishermen. I represent the fishing port of Grimsby, which has had many knocks in recent years but has survived and held on. Male unemployment is now at 12 % and rising fast, well above the Community's average. Would you please reconsider the geographical definition of the Hague preference region, which is known

Newton Dunn

as the northern parts of the United Kingdom, and please include the port of Grimsby?

President. — I call Miss Brookes.

Miss Brookes. — Mr President, I have two minutes, so I will talk very quickly indeed. May I first thank Mr Gundelach for remaining to listen to this debate, and the rapporteurs for this report? I would like to thank the staff for remaining and also the interpreters, who do a very difficult job. Thank you all for staying so late, ladies and gentlemen: we are grateful to you.

I welcome, Mr President and Mr Gundelach, all the decisions that take place in the Commission and in the European Parliament that concern the common fishing policy. And any progress that in the final analysis will bring about a solution to the problems that we face here in this House.

On 5 November this year, a high-level fisheries group met in Brussels to regulate several basic issues, but despite these proposed aims of the new fishing policy there are still likely to be fairly serious problems for the fishermen of my area, which is North Wales, and indeed fishermen for the whole of Wales. In connection with my part of the world, the weak position of fishing communities in peripheral areas must be pointed out. Wales comes into the category of unfavoured areas, and yet there is no special provision for our Welsh fishermen. There has been an inequitable application of quota preference for the areas, so dependent on their fishing industry. I regret this, and special allowance must be made for such fishing communities as North Wales. The Welsh fishing industry is still fighting against the intrusion of fishing-vessels from other Member States into our Celtic Sea, and these fishing vessels are beam-trawling. This was mentioned by Mr Battersby. They are trawling for the exclusive sole fish, which is an expensive fish and is very profitable in other parts of Europe. The beam-trawling is harming the marine life of the Celtic Sea and the seabed. It is quite right, Mr President and Mr Gundelach, that the quota system should be imposed; but again I ask that the Celtic Sea shall be policed efficiently and the quota system enforced and accepted by all. My remarks are brief, but I ask you, Mr Gundelach, if you will kindly note those remarks I have made, which mean a great deal to us in the Principality of Wales.

President. — I call Mr Purvis.

Mr Purvis. — Mr Commissioner, I wish you well in the last month or two that I hope you have to go before reaching a conclusion, but I have few illusions that fishermen around my home in the East Neuk of Fife are going to be wholly satisfied with the outcome. I do not suppose any other fishermen in Europe are

going to be completely satisfied, but they will welcome the stability such an agreement may well represent, and the stability they need most of all in common with all of Europe's fishermen is a stability in fish prices and a reasonable price. I suggest therefore to the Commission and the Council, as they come towards the end, that they will find agreement much more readily reached and more easily explained to our fishing constituents if they include in the final package items specifically mentioned and promoted in the Clinton report; firstly, a strong market-support element, with effective and sufficient withdrawal prices and reference prices for imports; secondly, a substantial fund — yes, Mr Fich mentioned the budgetary side; but if you get the Council's commitment and it is a condition of final agreement, I am sure Parliament will come to support it — a substantial fund for investment in infrastructures — in harbours, in transport and in markets and marketing systems, including the promotion of fish, adding value to fish, research into processing techniques, support, both legal and financial, for producer's organizations and support for downstream processing and marketing activities. It is going to be a selling job, whatever the conclusion, and the pill needs a sugared coating if it is to be swallowed.

President. — I call Mr Gundelach

Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission. — Mr President, I regret very much having to delay the debate and keep the interpreters and the staff at their post after midnight. I shall be as brief as I possibly can.

I want first, Mr President, to thank all the Members, even those who are no longer with us for their speeches in this debate, and to assure everybody that, irrespective of the manner in which I wear my headphones, I have listened to every statement which was made with very great attention.

Mr President, the debate has occasionally turned somewhat nationalistic and then towards the end, which was I understand somewhat better, towards regional concerns. That I understand a good deal better. There is no doubt that there are in Europe a number of fishing populations in regions which have very few alternative economic activities other than fishing. They must be taken into account in the establishment of the common fisheries policy.

Three major areas were singled out in the decision at The Hague four years ago, the Republic of Ireland, Northern Ireland and the northern part of the United Kingdom. Therefore, Mrs Ewing, the principle of a Hague preference has already been established for Scotland. It was argued that it should include Greenland as well. It was finally said that this list was not complete. Others could be added. But while respecting the needs of the regions, one must realize that there are other ways of complying with these concerns than

Gundelach

quota preferences. If you carry the quota preferences beyond a certain point you become counterproductive. We have already had difficulties in working out the relationship between Scottish preferences, Irish preferences and Northern Ireland preferences in the Celtic Sea.

It is to take into account the legitimate interests of the regions that the Commission, in the spirit of Article 39 of the Treaty, proposed the 12 mile zone and fishing plans to prevent big boats from operating in certain waters close to the coast. We consider that to be important for the protection of local fishermen. We are sure that a solution on this basis can be found in the Council which will meet the legitimate interests of the regions. We are not just speaking about regions in the United Kingdom or in Ireland, Greenland, Denmark, or Italy. We are also concerned with some outstanding interests in France. Brittany has been mentioned and it is an obvious example. There have been strong statements made by certain French Members tonight. I would disregard the remarks made by the French Communists who obviously are of the view that there should be no common fisheries policy, there should be a nationalistic policy where France should be catching what it would like to catch and selling it where it wanted to sell it without having to import anything. This is so much nonsense that it is not worthwhile spending any more time on it.

But there is a French problem in regard to the quota distribution. That was clearly stated by the Commission and repeated by the Presidency at the last Council session where reference was made, amongst other things, to the problems existing in a region like Brittany. The final settlement must include a solution to these French problems, because one cannot, as I said in my earlier statement, come to a conclusion which does not take into account the vital interests of all countries sitting around the table. But having said that I must also add that one has to face reality. Here I have two concluding remarks. The reality is that, for the time being, our resources have become fewer due to the loss of fishing possibilities in other waters. That has been a bigger loss for the northern fleets than for the Mediterranean fleets, on which I shall say no more because Mr Enright has answered the honourable Members of Italian origin for me.

Agreements have been concluded for the benefit of the Mediterranean fleet, but we have yet to work on the losses sustained through leaving Icelandic or north Norwegian waters, diminishing fishing in North American waters, etc. By pursuing a sound conservation policy we are building up our own resources, and the North Sea will become the richest fishing ground in the world in a few years time if we continue this policy. Therefore we do have light at the end of the tunnel if we have the steadfastness to continue this conservation policy until it gives results.

In the meantime one has to realise that the aggregate

quota cannot be as big this year as it was in 1975, 1976, 1977 or 1978. One has to face realities. If everybody wants to come back with more than they had before, there is not going to be an agreement. There cannot be an agreement if there is no realism. But secondly, because there has to be realism and because there has to be discipline, both in conservation and in equal sharing of losses for the time being until we get the fish back, there also has to be proper and equitable policing, and there I entirely agree with Mrs Ewing and others. There have to be control measures which are not just in the hands of national authorities, but where there is a Community presence. The Commission will, now that we have got the Council's support, make proposals for the necessary control measures and the necessary personnel, for the physical presence of Community control on ships, at harbours, and wherever necessary on the basis of rotation of inspection, etc. If there is not a conviction throughout the fishing world that the rules are being enforced in the same manner everywhere, the rules will not be respected, and that is the case today. Over-fishing still goes on, and we will not stop that until we have a proper Community policy.

The third point — and I am glad it has been taken up by other honourable Members — is that it is not enough to say nice words and pass nice resolutions in favour of Mediterranean policy or in favour of this, that and the other. The means have to be made available, and as one of the honourable Members made it clear in the budget debate in this House a few weeks ago, there is a lack of willingness to make the minimum effort required to go on forging the structural policy which is necessary for adapting our fleet, solving certain social problems and solving the problems of cooperation with third countries, in particular the developing countries, in a manner which permits them to build up their fishing. And that I must say to my Italian friends, Tunisia or Yugoslavia, or whoever have a right to develop their own fishing industry. But if we collaborate with them, we can arrive at a situation where they have a fishing industry and we still retain the possibility of having some presence in their waters; but in a friendly and cooperative fashion. We cannot force anybody, we can only negotiate and we can only negotiate if we have got something to negotiate with. There the budgetary authority must be consistent, when it speaks about fishing and when it speaks about the budget.

There is no alternative to a common fisheries policy. We know from experience that to try and solve problems on a national basis can only lead to strife, bitterness, and to collapse of fishing in the North Sea and elsewhere. It is also right that a fishing policy should be part of a package agreed on 30 May. If that policy is not finalized by the end of the year the validity of that package will be called into question. That is the second reason why a fisheries policy must be adopted by the end of the year. In my view, that goal can be attained if there is sufficient will to share the burden,

Gundelach

to make the means available, not to push national interests to the extreme, to show readiness for political compromise and understanding of each other's problems.

We are, in fact, nearly there. There remain two or three deep and difficult splits to be overcome. It is now up to Parliament, as it has done before, to create a political climate not of nationalistic strife, but of unity, and the will to compromise sensibly in order to bring about this policy which is so badly needed for Europe.

President. — I have received the following two motions for resolutions with request for an early vote, pursuant to Rule 47 (5), to wind up the debate on the oral question on the problem of fishing in the Mediterranean (Doc 1-515/80):

— by Mr De Pasquale, Mr Lima, Mr Cardia, Mr Giummarra, Mr Gatto, Mr Papapietro and Mr Ceravolo; (Doc 1-614/80)

— by Mrs Le Roux, Mr Damette, Mrs Poirier, Mrs De March, Mr Ansart, Mr Maffre Baugé and Mr Martin (Doc 1-617/80).

I shall consult Parliament on these requests at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting, Friday 21 November 1980.

The debate is closed.

The motions for resolutions will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

12. *Agenda for next sitting*

President. — The next sitting will take place at 9 a.m. tomorrow, Friday 21 November 1980 with the following agenda:

- Procedure without report
- Decision on requests for an early vote
- Decision on urgency of two motions for resolutions
- Motion for a resolution on the death penalty
- Motion for a resolution on Uganda

- Motion for a resolution on Soviet activists
- Motion for a resolution on the referendum in Uruguay
- Motion for a resolution on sales of butter to the Soviet Union
- Quin report on imports of butter from New Zealand
- Colleselli report on the system of agricultural surveys in Italy
- Rabbethge report on food aid
- Ghergo report on application of social security schemes to employed persons
- Van der Gun report on assistance from the European Social Fund to workers in the shipbuilding industry
- Pearce report on generalized tariff preferences
- Moreland report on Community quotas for the carriage of goods
- Oral question to the Commission on export refunds
- Key report on the safety of containers in the Community

Votes:

9 a.m.: Vote on requests for urgent debate and requests for an early vote

10.30 a.m.: Vote on motions for resolutions on which the debate has closed

After 10.30 a.m.: Motions for resolutions will be put to the vote at the end of each debate.

The sitting is closed.

(The sittings was closed at 0.25 a.m.)

SITTING OF FRIDAY, 21 NOVEMBER 1980

Contents

1. Approval of the minutes	285		
2. Petitions	285		
3. Documents received	285		
4. Verification of credentials	285		
5. Procedure without report	285		
6. Decision on requests for an early vote and for urgent procedure:			
<i>Mr Glinne; Mr Enright; Mr Bangemann; Mr Klepsch; Mr Pannella; Mr Scott-Hopkins; Mr Balfe; Mr Enright; Mr Pannella; Mr Nord; Mr Pannella; Mr Glinne; Mr Cousté; Mr Schwartzberg; Mrs Macciocchi</i>	285		
7. Abolition of the death penalty in the European Community — Motion for a resolution by Mrs Roudy and others (Doc. 1-589/80):			
<i>Mrs Roudy, author of the motion</i>	290		
<i>Mr Schwartzberg (S); Mr d'Ormesson (EPP); Mr Forth; Mr Pannella; Mr Israël; Mrs Macciocchi; Mr Møller; Mr Calvez</i>	290		
<i>Personal statement: Mr d'Ormesson; Mr Pannella</i>	294		
8. Uganda — Motion for a resolution by Mr Alber and others (Doc. 1-593/80):			
<i>Mr Penders, author of the motion</i>	294		
9. Feminist activists in the USSR — Motion for a resolution by Mrs Lizin and others (Doc. 1-602/80):			
<i>Mrs Squarcialupi; Mrs Macciocchi; Mrs Roudy; Mrs Maij-Weggen</i>	295		
<i>Personal statement: Mrs Squarcialupi</i>	296		
10. Referendum in Uruguay — Motion for a resolution by Mr Glinne and others on behalf of the Socialist Group, Mr Rumor and Mr Penders on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD), Mr Fergusson on behalf of the European Democratic Group, Mr Bangemann and Mr Berkhouwer on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, Mr Israël on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, Mr Carossino and Mr Capanna (Doc. 1-607/80):			
<i>Mrs Van den Heuvel, author of the motion; Mr Penders (EPP); Mr Carossino; Mr Lezzi</i>	296		
11. Votes	298		
• <i>Wawrzik report (Doc. 1-559/80):</i>			
<i>ACP-EEC Convention:</i>			
<i>Mr Wawrzik, rapporteur</i>			
			<i>Explanations of vote: Mr Clément; Mr Pannella; Mrs Le Roux; Mrs Kellett-Bowmann</i> 301
			<i>Adoption of the resolution</i> 301
		• <i>Sablé report (Doc. 1-522/80): Outcome of the proceedings of the ACP-EEC Joint Committee and Consultative Assembly:</i>	
		<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	302
		• <i>Kirk report (Doc. 1-597/80): Fish-stocks:</i>	
		<i>Mr Kirk, rapporteur</i>	302
		<i>Procedural motion: Mr Gautier</i>	303
		<i>Mr Kirk</i>	303
		<i>Explanation of vote: Mr Provan</i>	304
		<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	304
		• <i>Clinton report (Doc. 1-560/80): Common fisheries policy:</i>	
		<i>Mr Clinton, rapporteur</i>	304
		<i>Procedural motion: Mr Boyes</i>	
		<i>Mr Clinton</i>	308
		<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	308
		• <i>Cresson report (Doc. 1-537/80): Fishing off the coast of Guyana:</i>	
		<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	308
		• <i>De Pasquale et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-614/80): Fishing in the Mediterranean:</i>	
		<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	309
		• <i>Le Roux et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-617/80): Fishing in the Mediterranean:</i>	
		<i>Rejection of the resolution</i>	309
		• <i>Roudy et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-589/80): Abolition of the death penalty in the European Community:</i>	
		<i>Mr Glinne</i>	309
		<i>Procedural motion: Mr Pannella</i>	309
		<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	309
		• <i>Alber et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-593/80): Uganda:</i>	
		<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	309
		• <i>Lizin et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-602/80): Feminist activists in the USSR:</i>	
		<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	309
		• <i>Glinne et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-607/80): Referendum in Uruguay:</i>	
		<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	309

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>12. <i>Agenda</i> 310
 <i>Mr Pearce; Mr Vernimmen; Mr Bangemann; Mr Pannella; Mr Pearce; Mr Bangemann; Mr Scott-Hopkins; Mr Pearce; Mr Oebler; Mrs Kellett-Bowman; Mr Cohen; Mrs Rabbethge</i> 310</p> <p>13. <i>Sales of butter to the USSR: Motion for a resolution by Mr De Clercq and others (Doc. 1-609/80):</i>
 <i>Mr De Gucht, author of the motion</i> 311
 <i>Mr Vernimmen (S)</i> 312
 <i>Procedural motion: Mr Maher</i> 312
 <i>Mr Aigner, chairman of the Committee on Budgetary Control; Mr Gundelach (Commission)</i> 312
 <i>Procedural motions: Mr Tolman; Mr Hord; Mr Aigner; Mr Clinton</i> 313</p> <p>14. <i>Regulation on the importation of New Zealand butter — Report by Miss Quin (Committee on Agriculture) (Doc. 1-594/80):</i>
 <i>Miss Quin, rapporteur</i> 315
 <i>Mrs Cresson</i> 316
 <i>Procedural motion: Mr de Courcy Ling; Mr Martin</i> 316
 <i>Mr Tolman; Mr Curry; Mr Martin; Mrs Martin; Mr Remilly</i> 317
 <i>Procedural motion: Mr Cottrell</i> 320
 <i>Mr Muntingh; Mr Welsh (Committee on External Economic Relations); Mr Maher; Mr De Keersmaeker; Mr Newton Dunn (Committee on Budgets); Mr Gundelach (Commission)</i> 320
 <i>Consideration of the motion for a resolution:</i>
 <i>Miss Quin</i> 323
 <i>Adoption of the resolution</i> 325</p> <p>15. <i>Decision on restructuring the farm survey system in Italy — Report by Mr Colleselli (Committee on Agriculture) (Doc. 1-524/80):</i>
 <i>Adoption of the resolution</i> 325
 <i>Procedural motion: Mr Pannella</i> 325</p> | <p>16. <i>Regulation on the supply of food aid — Report by Mrs Rabbethge (Committee on Development and Cooperation) (Doc. 1-551/80):</i>
 <i>Procedural motions: Mr Cohen; Mr Vernimmen</i> 325
 <i>Adoption of the resolution</i> 326</p> <p>17. <i>Agenda</i> 326
 <i>Mr Scott-Hopkins; Mr Cohen; Mr Muntingh</i> 326</p> <p>18. <i>The Community's generalized tariff preferences — Report by Mr Pearce (Committee on Development and Cooperation) (Doc. 1-545/80):</i>
 <i>Consideration of the motion for a resolution:</i>
 <i>Mr Vouel (Commission)</i> 327
 <i>Procedural motion: Mr Collins</i> 327</p> <p>19. <i>Regulation on the carriage of goods by road between Member States — Report by Mr Moreland (Committee on Transport) (Doc. 1-555/80):</i>
 <i>Consideration of the motion for a resolution:</i>
 <i>Mr Vouel (Commission)</i> 327
 <i>Procedural motion: Mr Pearce</i> 327
 <i>Adoption of the resolution</i> 327</p> <p>20. <i>Agenda</i> 327
 <i>Mr Pannella; Mr Gundelach (Commission)</i> 328</p> <p>21. <i>Directive on the safety of containers — Report, without debate, by Mr Key (Committee on Transport) (Doc. 1-556/80):</i>
 <i>Adoption of the resolution</i> 328</p> <p>22. <i>Verification of credentials</i> 328</p> <p>23. <i>Dates of the next part-session:</i>
 <i>Procedural motion: Mr Pearce</i> 328</p> <p>24. <i>Approval of the minutes</i> 329</p> <p>25. <i>Adjournment of the session</i> 329</p> |
|---|---|

IN THE CHAIR: SIR BASIL DE FERRANTI

Vice-President

(The sitting opened at 9.05 a.m.)

President. — The sitting is open.

1. *Approval of the minutes*

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

Are there any comments?

The minutes of proceedings are approved.

2. *Petitions*

President. — I have received one petition, the details of which you will find in the minutes of this sitting.

3. *Documents received*

President. — Details of the documents I have received may be found in the minutes of this sitting.

4. *Verification of credentials*

President. — At its meeting of 20 November 1980, the Bureau verified the credentials of Mr Geronimi Under Rule 3 (1) of the Rules of Procedure, the Bureau established that this appointment complies with the provisions of the Treaties. It therefore proposes that Parliament ratify the appointment.

Are there any objections?

The appointment is ratified.

5. *Procedure without report*

President. — I announced on Monday the titles of these Commission proposals to which it was proposed to apply the procedure without report laid down in Rule 27 A of the Rules of Procedure.

Since no Member has asked leave to speak and no amendments have been tabled to them, I declare these proposals approved by the European Parliament.

6. *Decision on requests for an early vote and for urgent procedure*

President. — The next item is the decision on requests for an early vote and for urgent procedure.

First, I have requests for an early vote on two motions for resolutions to wind up the debate on problems of fishing in the Mediterranean:

- the motion for a resolution by Mr De Pasquale and others (Doc. 1-614/80); and
- the motion for a resolution by Mrs Le Roux and others (Doc. 1-617/80).

I suggest that, with your approval, we hold a single vote on these two motions.

I call Mr Glinne.

Mr Glinne. — *(F)* Mr President, the Socialist Group will be voting in favour of an early vote. I say so in order to underline the fact that our attitude is the complete opposite — in the good sense — of that taken by Members in other groups yesterday when they refused the same positive procedure with regard to the motions for resolutions about Turkey.

President. — I put the request to the vote.

The request is approved. The vote will therefore take place at the next voting time.

*
* * *

President. — We now come to the requests for urgent procedure.

We begin with the motion for a resolution by Mr Enright and others, on the places of meeting for plenary sessions (Doc. 1-612/80).

I call Mr Glinne to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Glinne. — *(F)* Mr President, I can only say that this proposal is logically incompatible with the commitment made by various political groups towards the staff serving Parliament. What is more, having adopted a resolution yesterday on where Parliament is to sit, we cannot take a decision to upset the agreed schedule twenty-four hours later.

President. — I call Mr Enright.

Mr Enright. — Mr President, this is certainly not based on agreements with the various groups, because, as you will see from my resolution, I have specifically not gone through the groups. This is a motion signed by a number of back-benchers who are fed up to the back teeth with having decisions handed down to them from on high, just as Moses handed down the tablets of stone.

(Applause from the European Democratic Group)

It is not an attack upon Luxembourg. It is not even a plea for Strasbourg, beautiful though Strasbourg be. It is a plea for some degree of consultation with back-bench Members, instead of the Mafia cocooned in anonymity that we have in the enlarged Bureau, with agreements being forged between the political groups.

(Applause from the European Democratic Group)

In practice, Mr President, it may be quite impossible to do what I ask, but I urge this House to vote for the motion; for then, even if we are told that in practice it may not happen, at least we shall have taken some control over our own affairs.

(Applause from the European Democratic Group)

President. — I think that, as President, I should take your reference to the Mafia with a pinch of salt before it is included in the Report of Proceedings.

I call Mr Bangemann.

Mr Bangemann. — *(D)* Mr President, I really could not conceive that this would be given as a ground for adopting urgent procedure. I read the text and accepted, as it says here, that if the motion for a resolution was to be dealt with at all, then its urgency was self-evident. If, however, the grounds for urgent procedure are that the back-benchers listed here have had no opportunity in their respective groups of getting in touch with their group leaders in order to discuss these matters, I feel, Mr President, that this request for urgent procedure is more a matter for the groups whose members have signed this motion, and not for the House as a whole. It is not the Assembly's function to make up for any lack of coordination in the groups whose members have signed this paper. A matter can be urgent for the full Assembly only if the Assembly itself or the Bureau has failed in some way. If there has been a failure on the group leaders' part — although that, as Mr Arndt has just confirmed to me, is not the case — then the members of those groups should ensure that they are run democratically instead of bothering the Assembly with this matter.

That, after all, is the problem. We cannot treat as urgent in the Assembly a matter which may not really have been intended as an attack on Luxembourg but which cannot avoid being interpreted in that way. We have initiated a sensible procedure to improve the arrangements about places of meeting. If we go on in the way suggested, then we shall give the impression that Parliament does not treat its own decision seriously, even though it was voted through yesterday by a large majority and with the agreement of all the groups, and jumps this way and that like a child, unable to tackle seriously one of the most important problems of its own organization. For this reason, my group is against urgent procedure.

I would like to add, Mr President, that when I say something in the Bureau it is always after ascertaining whether the majority in my Group endorses it. If not, then I take steps to find that majority.

(Laughter. Applause from the Liberal and Democratic Group)

President. — I call Mr Klepsch.

Mr Klepsch. — *(D)* I, too, am against the urgent procedure, for three reasons. Firstly, I must tell Mr Enright that this is not the place to discuss the internal affairs of the Socialist Group. Mr Enright said that the group leaders are engaged in shady dealings with other . . .

(Interruptions)

President. — You must address your remarks to the Chair.

(Cries of 'Hear, hear!'. Laughter)

Mr Klepsch. — . . . I would first like to say, Mr President, that I find it intolerable — and this was already happening yesterday during the debate on urgent procedure — for members of different groups to hold discussions in this Assembly that they ought to have had in their own group meetings. To my mind, that is improper in this House.

Everybody here knows how the places of meeting are allocated for part-sessions. Every Member has received a communication, which was also the basis of an agreement with our staff. Since, therefore, we are dealing with a decision taken by the Parliamentary body made responsible for the matter — and one that was not taken yesterday but has been in effect for some considerable time — I find it difficult to understand how this motion, even though it may be admissible in the formal sense, has been allowed. In my view, it is completely irresponsible to ask the Assembly to

Klepsch

adopt a resolution when the proposers of the motion already know that, if it were passed, it could not be put into effect. This way of promoting parliamentary decisions — at least in my opinion — really does not befit this House.

I shall now conclude. It is my understanding that the Member making the explanatory statement wished to express his indignation and that of some other members of his Group at the decisions taken by the appropriate bodies of the House. In my Group, thank the Lord, that is not necessary. I am always in the fortunate position of being able to speak on the basis of decisions taken by my Group.

(Laughter. Interruptions)

Look, Mr President, if Mrs Focke, who pointed out to us forcefully yesterday, during a vote, that the whole House would lose face if the motion for a resolution were adopted, although not even a third of her Group voted with her, is looking for applause, too, then I am somewhat surprised.

President. — I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — *(I)* Mr President, I am obviously bound — and with conviction — by the resolution we passed yesterday and which, for my part, I supported because I think — and I would like to say this to Mr Enright — that yesterday the governing bodies of this Parliament finally took a step forward in the sense that, at last, we had won for ourselves a “ledge” beyond which we should not go. Perhaps we were graduating from the law of the jungle to the *lex talionis* — which is still not very civilized — but yesterday we undoubtedly made a step forward, and this is why I shall defend that position.

Therefore, Mr President, whilst I state firmly that I shall be voting against Mr Enright’s motion, I must also say that I perfectly understand — because for a year-and-a-half I have been warning the majority of our colleagues along these lines — the creeping state of mind that is increasingly tending to express itself in polemical terms. We saw this during the budgetary part-session in Luxembourg, Mr President, with the appointment of certain officials. We have to put an end to a certain way of running things which is both bureaucratic and authoritarian.

But this is a problem of the Rules of Procedure, ladies and gentlemen, because — to take an example — the continual desultory use of Rule 28 does not harm the minority groups that we are as much as it harms all Members of Parliament as such, who find that they are no longer entitled to ask the President of Parliament for the floor but have to ask the chairmen of their groups. So if Members accept this, Mr Enright, do not

complain if they then become the real controllers of the Rules of Procedure and parliamentary rights!

President. — I call Mr Scott-Hopkins.

Mr Scott Hopkins. — Mr President, I am a little surprised to find this motion on the order-paper this morning. Unless my memory plays me false, the decision to meet in Luxembourg in December was announced to this House in June of this year. That seems quite a long time ago, and if the honourable Member feels so strongly about it, I am surprised that he has not brought the matter before this House before now. He has had something like 6 months to do so, and has failed to do so.

Of course, Mr President, as you know full well, when this decision was announced to the House there was a certain amount of dissatisfaction, and I will not conceal it from the House that there was a great deal of dissatisfaction in my own Group; but that was the decision which was taken and the reasons for it were explained to the House. They did not like it, but they accepted it as such. I find it pretty extraordinary that the honourable Member should come forward with this particular motion at this very late hour, knowing full well, as he does, that it is almost impracticable, even if it were passed, and that in point of fact there has been no time to go into the details of it. So I would say to him that he has had his amusement; he has made his point about the Bureau, with a great deal of dissatisfaction in my own Group; but that was the he has done that I would ask him, and the other honourable Members, to follow the wisest course, which is to withdraw this motion now, because it really is not appropriate. The decision was made 6 months ago, and absolutely nothing was done until the 59th minute of the 11th hour.

President. — I call Mr Balfe.

Mr Balfe. — Mr President, the reason why I asked to speak against the motion is not that I am pro-Luxembourg. In fact we probably have less facilities there than anywhere else. I hope that we shall soon stop meeting in Luxembourg. But this decision was taken some time ago, and the one group that has not been mentioned this morning is the staff. Now I think that the staff of this Parliament put up with a tremendous burden because of the way in which circumstances force us to change our meeting-places and to move around. Many of the staff of this institution have known for some months and have been able to tell their families that the December meeting would be in Luxembourg. Planning has gone on around that concept, and it really is capricious of this House at this time to change that the decision, thereby affecting the lives and the abilities of quite a large number of our staff. As many of us must know from our own circum-

Balfe

stances, one has to take a very careful note of family circumstances and family demands. This is, as Mr Scott-Hopkins says, a proposal which could have been made many months ago. It has not even just come as a request for urgent procedure this part-session; it has arrived as urgent business on the last morning of the part-session, the morning when probably there are fewer people here than usual.

The final point I would like to make is this: Mr Enright has said that even if we pass this motion it may not be possible to implement it. I remind the House that the motion states that we resolve to hold the December part-session in Strasbourg. If that motion is passed it binds the House. If we show that we are prepared to approve a course of action which we know cannot take place, we shall be weakening this House even *vis-à-vis* its own Bureau. I think it would be foolish of this House to pass resolutions which might put it in that position. For those reasons, although, as I say, I certainly do not want us to meet in Luxembourg any more often than we have to, I hope, both for the sake of the staff and for the sake of this House, that we will reject this motion.

President. — I put the request for urgent debate to the vote.

The request is rejected.

I should point out that under the Rules of Procedure if a request for urgent debate is rejected, the motion for a resolution is referred to the appropriate committee.

I call Mr Enright.

Mr Enright. — Out of consideration for the House, I withdraw the motion for a resolution provided those who signed it with me agree.

President. — We now come to the request on the motion for a resolution by Mr Pannella and others, on the legal proceedings against *Le Monde* (Doc. 1-616/80).

I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (*F*) Mr President, this motion for a resolution with request for urgent debate, which I have tabled together with Members ranging from Mr Michel, of the EPP, to Mrs Baduel Glorioso, of the Italian Communist Party, and including Mr Martinet, Mr Dankert, Mr Gendebien, Mrs Macciocchi, Mr Arfe, Mr Lange, Mr Capanna, Mr Ruffolo, Mr Ripa di Meana, Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul, Mrs Feuillet, Mr Jalton, Mr Zagari, Mrs Castellina and others, is couched — in my view — in extremely moderate terms. I would like every Member to think about this

honestly. All we say, in fact, is that we are upset by the taking of legal proceedings against *Le Monde* and we refer to the high standing it enjoys in our eyes. We very often read it. That does not, I would stress, mean that we are voicing any political judgement on the matter; we are simply moved at the fact that this should have happened. And we instruct our President to express those feelings and also the wish that, throughout Europe and the world, the freedom of the press should be not only legally protected but politically supported and understood as an essential constituent of democracy.

I therefore feel, Mr President, that we have a duty to register our sensitivity to an event that has caught the attention of world public opinion. I do not think there is any country in the world where what has been happening in France is not reported in the press and on television. We believe that, sometimes, there is a duty to interfere, but that we are not doing in this particular case; we feel we have simply recorded the feelings — varied and contradictory though they may be — of the whole House. On this subject, Otto Habsburg, if you will allow me to say so, reacts in a different way, but the event has certainly moved him. It seems important to him; we have talked about it and we were both moved, each in his own way. I believe that we ought to record those feelings and that we can ask our President to voice them. I believe we can say, Mr President, that, in this specific case, we are all agreed in wishing that the freedom of the press should be regarded at all times and by the whole world as a constituent of democracy.

I would add, begging Members' indulgence, that the reason for urgent procedure is not that given. There is a misunderstanding here, due to our services. The reason is obviously that which I have just given. If feelings are aroused, their expression is a matter of urgency. We cannot express an emotion beyond the time when we feel it. Our feelings should be expressed immediately, there is nothing to be said about past emotion.

President. — I call Mr Nord.

Mr Nord. — (*NL*) Mr President, I would like to speak against urgent debate, because, in our view, this is clearly a matter of a misuse of the urgent procedure itself. In a constitutional state, no one is above the law, not even a newspaper, whatever its excellence and repute. Legal proceedings for contempt have been taken out against this newspaper, and that has nothing to do with the freedom of the press or the freedom of expression. It is inappropriate, at a time when legal proceedings have been instituted, for this Parliament or anyone else to want to interfere in something that is not its business by means of urgent procedure. For that reason we shall vote against.

Mr Pannella. — (*F*) Mr Nord, have you read the text in question?

President. — I call Mr Glinne.

Mr Glinne. — (*F*) Mr President, the Socialist Group is most certainly one of the staunch defenders of the freedom of the press wherever it is threatened and we agree, with many others, that the French newspaper involved here is one of the few great providers of fair and democratic information. We have already said this in a press-release issued after a meeting held by our Group, and the terms we used were particularly strong and well-argued.

But we also agreed that it was high time to take steps to reduce the flow of motions tabled under Rule 14, and this is why, though convinced about the substance of the matter and having made our opinions public, we shall abstain from voting on this request for urgent debate.

President. — I call Mr Cousté.

Mr Cousté. — (*F*) Mr President, we are against urgent debate. We understand Mr Pannella's feelings and we understand that he has held himself back in the very reasons he has referred to. He wants to register an emotional reaction, but to my mind that is improper when a constitutional state, in a country like France, by its very nature provides every safeguard both to journalists and to governments, since the French constitution provides for the total separation of legal, executive and legislative powers. For that reason, I consider that these feelings are ill-advised.

I would add that we, Mr Pannella, are just as much attached to the freedom of the press as you are. We hope that it will be safeguarded effectively. It is not threatened in France, believe me, and no one here thinks it is. I would add that the human rights you referred to apply not only to the people we represent here — ordinary citizens — but to journalists as well of course and it is not to France, with its traditions going back to 1789, that any sanction or reprimand from this Parliament is due.

(Applause from certain benches on the right)

President. — I call Mr Schwartzberg.

Mr Schwartzberg. — (*F*) The proceedings instituted against *Le Monde* at the request of the French Minister of Justice cause us profound concern, because they might be seen as an attack on the independence and freedom of the press, which this newspaper, in France, symbolizes.

It seems hardly admissible to us — and even not admissible at all — that attempts should be made by trickery, because that is what it is, to reduce a newspaper and its journalists to silence. In our democracies, the press performs an indispensable rôle as a power in opposition, a legitimate and necessary function of discussion and criticism, without which there is no real democracy. When a country's leaders' only wish is that all should bow before them, when they believe they are infallible and untouchable, when they no longer even tolerate the voicing of criticism, when they are reduced to attacking journalists who are just doing their job, then I feel there is cause for grave concern about the future of democracy.

So it is perfectly necessary for this Parliament, as guardian of our democratic values, to express its deep-felt solidarity with the directors and journalists of *Le Monde*, who have been so unjustly accused. That is why Parliament must vote for this motion tabled by Mr Pannella and several others, worded as it is in very moderate language.

(Applause from certain benches on the left)

President. — I call Mrs Macciocchi.

Mrs Macciocchi. — (*I*) Mr President, I express my Group's firm support of this motion for a resolution, and I would like to tell those of my colleagues who have defended the spirit of freedom for which France has been famous since 1789 and the great French democratic tradition that it is precisely because of our respect for these principles that we have tabled this motion for a resolution today, which demonstrates how we share the feelings that surely are also felt by them.

It is the first time — I repeat, the first time — in the history of France that a newspaper has been harrassed in this way. There were numerous cases in the past during the Vichy occupation period, but we know of no others.

With regard to the newspaper, I would say that all of us, in a sense, are writers in *Le Monde*, because we all read it, we all, free men and women, have often drawn courage and inspiration from it, embodying as it does the essential principle of the absolute independence of the press, to which so many of us are attached. I recall the great Anglo-Saxon tradition and that of so many European countries, and I fail to see how some people are unable to feel, like us, that all this is an act or gesture signifying that we are for the freedom of the press and against any form of fear, servility or cowardice in a journalist. I was a journalist for many years and found myself in some terrible situations involving grave responsibility, and every time I had only one option, that of sincerity, truth and occasionally courage. In the same situation, *Le Monde* cannot fail to

Macciocchi

have our sympathy and our fellow-feeling at this moment.

This is all that is asked of the House, and to me, frankly, it does not seem so outrageous as to vex our French colleagues and friends.

President. — I put the request for urgent procedure to the vote.

The request is rejected. The motion for a resolution is referred to the appropriate committee.

7. *Abolition of the death penalty in the European Community*

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution tabled by Mrs Roudy and others, on the abolition of the death penalty in the European Community (Doc. 1-589/80).

I call Mrs Roudy.

Mrs Roudy. — (*F*) Mr President, I do not have much to add on this motion for a resolution, to which I have already had an occasion to speak. I would simply say that the reason why I, and a number of other Members, have tabled it is that, with reference to the discussion now taking place in committee, where a report is being prepared, a new fact has arisen: people have been sentenced to death in France. Our request is that, in the meantime, these sentences be suspended, which is perfectly legitimate because of the risk of their being carried out. I feel that it would be wholly to the honour of this House to make such a request.

President. — Before I call the next speaker, I wish to say a word about today's proceedings. Frankly, I think it is impossible to get through the work today, and anything that is not completed will be taken at our next part-session in Luxembourg. To limit speaking-time further is not within my power, but I would suggest, in view of the feeling in the House that we really must get on with our business, that nobody speaks for more than 3 minutes. Most speakers could make their point in 10, 20 or 30 seconds, and this would help us to get through the day's proceedings to the satisfaction of the House.

(Applause from various quarters)

I call Mr Schwartzberg to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Schwartzberg. — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, Mrs Roudy's motion for a resolution refers

to my own which will be considered by the Legal Affairs Committee on 4 December next. So later there will be a general debate.

But, as Mrs Roudy has very well said, urgency has arisen with the presence in French prisons of three people condemned to death. They have appealed, but their appeal will perhaps be rejected, and then their only hope will be a reprieve.

Now you probably know that the President of the Republic does not readily exercise his right to reprieve criminals who have been sentenced to death. In fact, since the beginning of the Fifth Republic there have been 17 executions for offences against common law and, during Mr Giscard d'Estaing's period of office alone, three of the seven persons definitively sentenced to death have been executed.

Naturally, the authorities and public opinion in our respective countries are quite rightly attentive to what is thought and decided in this House. No one here wants to encroach on the field of responsibility of the national authorities and we all know that the decision rests exclusively with them, but it does seem to us necessary and legitimate to help to aid this decision and those that have to take it.

If it is adopted, therefore, the resolution will have unique value as a guide. It will clearly express the common opinion of the representatives of the nine nations of Europe.

It is particularly useful that the European Parliament should make its opinion known in that the French Parliament, for its part, has been prevented for years from voting on this capital punishment issue by the government, which controls the agenda and obstinately refuses to have this subject included.

It is my belief that Europe is not only a common market but also a common civilization, based on common values and above all on the respect for human life and dignity even in those who themselves have taken life. Six of the nine countries have formally abolished the death penalty; two, Belgium and Ireland, have stopped applying it; only one still does so. I feel that this state of affairs must stop and that my country must no longer be the last in Europe, particularly when we hear so much about advanced liberalism.

My second point is that, if the death penalty is applied it may make mistakes in the courts irreversible. Here I am thinking of the problem that still remains about the execution in July 1976 of the 22-year-old Christian Ranucci, whom many people today think not to have been guilty.

Lastly I would add that, like all of you here, I am horrified by crimes of bloodshed, which I regard as abominable, and disturbed at the growth of violence, but I feel that, as has been shown in other countries,

Schwartzenberg

the death penalty and its application can be replaced by long-term prison sentences which may well prove to be as strong a deterrent. Numerous statistics show that criminality does not increase when capital punishment is abolished. All we have, therefore, is a cruel penalty, inherited from another age that shocks our consciences. All crime is abhorrent and shocks us for that reason, but I do not believe that our response to an abhorrent crime should be an equally abhorrent punishment. If a man ceases to behave as a man, the reaction of the community should not be to follow his example. Ladies and gentlemen, it is indeed my belief that our society can be proud of itself for not responding to violence with violence or to bloodshed with bloodshed.

Lastly, I would like to tell you something, although I wondered whether I should, but I think it useful in this discussion.

A few days ago, knowing that I had tabled this motion for a resolution and that Yvette Roudy had also done so, the mother of a lad of 24 who had been sentenced to death telephoned me. I shall never forget her voice, her dignity, her distress and the hopes she put in this House and in the help it might provide in having her son, her child, . . . (*cries of 'And the mothers of the victims?' from some of the Liberal and Democratic Group benches*)

. . . I think about the mothers of the victims too, but try to react at another level, try to make civilization go forward, not backward, gentlemen of the right!

I shall never forget that voice because this mother is still hoping you will prevent her son from being guillotined and sent to his death one dark winter's night. Women and mothers give life. Theirs is the deepest and most sincere voice, that of humanity, compassion and pity. Let us, like them, gentlemen, do something for life. Europe can take a step towards the forces of life and the principles of humanity. Let us take this step together and let us make this autumn day one which will go down in the history of man!

(Applause from the left)

President. — I call Mr d'Ormesson to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group).

Mr d'Ormesson. — (*F*) Mr President, the authors of this motion for a resolution demand 'that all executions be suspended, pending a debate on the death penalty', a punishment that raises feelings of disgust, terror and abhorrence in the mind of anyone and first and foremost that of the President of the Republic of France.

If only, ladies and gentlemen, a murderer, before assaulting and killing a teen-age girl or old and

defenceless people or a father of children simply because he is in the police, were to listen to you, how easy it would be to respond to your heartfelt desires! But we live in a period of violence when crimes are aggravated by many different factors and when it is difficult to contend with the prevalence of crime.

The day after the despicable crime in the Rue Copernic, a noisy crowd, including friends of the authors of this motion, protested violently at what they called the inadequacy of the police action taken by the Ministry of the Interior and my government. A few days later, they turned on the Minister of Justice, who happened to be asking Parliament to pass a bill designed to increase the safety of the public. You know, if you try to make people believe too many contradictory things in too short a space of time, they will end up by not believing you at all.

What kind of procedure is this today? Just suppose for a moment that this motion for a resolution and its explanatory statement, drafted in the form of a directive, were laid on the desk of the Head of State just when he was receiving the legal representative of a condemned man petitioning for a reprieve. Might not your action possibly have the reverse effect to that desired, since the very subject of this motion does not fall within the responsibilities of our institutions?

I therefore appeal to the wisdom of the majority of this House not to support the authors of this motion but to vote instead for the amendment tabled by Mr Forth.

(Applause from certain benches on the right)

President. — I call Mr Forth.

Mr Forth. — The problem, Mr President, as we can all see, is that we are liable, if we are not careful, to get involved in a debate on the substance of the question of the death penalty. My whole case — and this is why I wish formally now to move the amendment that I have tabled to this resolution — is that I do not believe this House is yet competent or ready to start involving itself in such substantive discussions. This is why I hope that my amendment will receive support from this House this morning. It is a most serious and dangerous precedent, Mr President, that we make if we start to assume that the Community, through this Parliament, can interfere in the domestic criminal law of Member States. That is a very serious step to take, and I am not sure that the movers of this resolution have thought through the implications of what they are doing in the resolution.

Now I do not, of course, doubt in any way their sincerity of their wish to get involved in this case. But what I would ask them to think about is this: are there not many other areas where other Members may have

Forth

an interest or a strongly-held view about almost any element of the criminal law within Member States? Are they saying, the people who have suggested this resolution to the House, that this House can judge on any item of the criminal law within any Member State at any time? If I do not like something that goes on in any other country may I simply move a resolution here, and if I can get a majority in this House, then what happens?

You see the implications of doing what we are trying to do in this resolution today are quite terrifying. That is not to say that at some time in the future the Community may not want to move towards that. Let us not prejudice that issue but let us please, Mr President, be most careful in what we do through the kind of resolution that is in front of the House today.

I would commend to colleagues here my own amendment to this resolution, which acknowledges the work that Mr Schwartzberg is doing, but which says that for the time being this Parliament should not be involving itself in such a matter in the way in which the resolution suggests. I believe, Mr President, that if people will consider the wording of my amendment carefully they could support it for the reasons that I have suggested to them, and I hope that they do.

President. — I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (*F*) Mr President, I have listened to Mr Forth's speech with great interest and I think he gave a lot of thought to what he said. I am not, however, convinced, and that does not make me any the happier, because I feel that there are some subjects on which it is unfortunate for Parliament to be divided: clearly, if a certain Parliament lacks a minimum of unity on certain occasions, then it will rarely be sufficiently strong to get its arguments, even on institutional matters, accepted.

I am forced to acknowledge that, as stated in the motion for a resolution, we are living outside the law in many of our countries. If we accept the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and if we look closely at the very philosophies and legal doctrines of our countries, we are compelled to admit that our countries, or some of them, continue — for readily understandable reasons rooted in the past — to ignore in practice the undertakings given by our governments at a given moment of our history.

These declarations are legal and must become part of the law in our countries. Otherwise, Mr Forth, we must find the courage to say in our national parliaments that we no longer respect the undertakings given at a certain moment in the history of Europe and of the world.

The positive law that has been taken over by our legislation is very clear. In the UK itself, I think that legally the positive law is contradictory: there is the prevailing, old-established law, but there is also, with the validity of positive law, the act accomplished by your government and your Parliament when it ratified certain declarations and commitments.

You are laughing, Mr d'Ormesson, and I am pleased, because, to quote an old Latin tag, laughter comes easily to certain people; but I do not think the subject is a matter for smiling or laughing: here we are trying to understand, not to kill arguments the better to execute people.

Mr President, whereas Mr Schwartzberg believes that, to some extent, the sternness of the penalty may act as a deterrent, I am convinced that this is not true, and I think modern legal thought has sufficiently established this point. It is no longer a matter of imposing a sentence as a punishment but of maintaining it for as long as the criminal remains a danger to society.

It is on the basis of that approach — which is certainly not yours, I know you like South Africa, Mr d'Ormesson, which is a different civilization, I agree, but it is different and you are here more as a spokesman for South Africa than for France — that I am convinced that the death penalty serves no purpose. On the contrary, it encourages people to take the fatal road and promotes the murderer's desire for self-destruction. Because of that and because law, whether British, French or of any other nationality, is not what it is said to be, and also in view of the Declaration on Human Rights and other international legal instruments, I shall vote in favour of this motion. Even Mr Glinne, in spite of his obligation to Mr Scott-Hopkins and Mr Klepsch, supports it! You can therefore vote for it, ladies and gentlemen, whatever bench you are sitting on.

President. — I call Mr Israël.

Mr Israël. — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I do not know whether Mrs Roudy was right to table this motion for a resolution. I do not know whether Mr Schwartzberg was right to attack those on the Right. I do not know whether Mr d'Ormesson was right in his blind confidence in the institutions of the French Republic and its President. I do not know whether Mr Pannella, in his extremely likeable romanticism, was right to fire a broadside at all the social forces.

What I do know, Mr President and ladies and gentlemen, is that the death penalty is a barbarous act dishonouring the society that carries it out. I know that in this situation, the issue is not one of procedure, intellectual skill or political balance. Corporal punishments were abolished centuries ago, and yet today we still

Israël

have this penalty, which really is absolutely unworthy, degrades our society and is a challenge that we should meet whenever it confronts us.

President. — I call Mrs Macciocchi.

Mrs Macciocchi. — (*I*) Mr President, I would like, as it were, to dedicate to Mr d'Ormesson the writings of Victor Hugo on capital punishment which have recently been republished in France and from which I shall just quote two sentences he wrote in 1848: 'The abolition of the death penalty is now certain in the civilized countries. The inviolability of human life is the basis of all principles and will be to our honour and to that of this 19th century'. Of course he was not thinking about the 20th century, he thought that he had given this philosophical truth a social reality and that he had wiped this bloodstain from civilization's august brow. I say this because you have spoken of principles and because you made much of your faith in the clearmindedness with which the authorities in France will be considering these questions.

I should like to say to Mr Forth that, in my opinion, he was guilty in his speech of a serious contradiction. I have read his amendment, which refers to the discussions we shall be having in Rome, on 4 and 5 December, in the Legal Affairs Committee, which is to discuss a report by Mr Vayssade on the death penalty in the hope of seeing it abolished in all the Community countries. So this subject, which is being raised again in the normal run of business by the Legal Affairs Committee, is one which we have every right to discuss. If, therefore, we accept that the Legal Affairs Committee can study the matter, if we accept that this committee is entitled to declare itself in favour so that this subject then comes back to Parliament, I do not see why we cannot adopt a resolution today which merely asks, not that the whole problem be investigated, but that the three executions announced in France be postponed.

When Mr Schwartzberg was talking about his telephone conversation with the mother of Philippe Moris, I was thinking about the time I met her and the long talk I had with her; and whilst my sympathy, certainly, goes out to the mothers of the victims, I must say that this woman too taught me something that I did not know and made me understand the tragedy of a family abandoned by the father, who left his wife to take care of two children, one 7 and the other 8. And who was that father? He was a policeman. I understood the tragedy of this mother, whose young son used to say: 'Mummy, Daddy's gone, he had a pistol in the drawer and he took it with him'. I understood the tragedy of this mother who now says: 'I was the wife of a policeman, I know the risks he faces during the night and I know the tragedy that has befallen those killed by my son and their families. You have to be a mother to know the danger a youngster

runs who sets himself against the police. The case of my son is the reflection of a family tragedy — that of children abandoned by their father, that of a firstborn son who fell into petty theft in order to survive and that of a mother who, once the wife of a policeman, now goes visiting the prisons in Paris to take things to her imprisoned son'.

So how can we fail to realize that the key to this tragedy we all find so moving, the key to this tragedy in the life of a French family and the key to this Philippe is divorce? I am in favour of divorce, but I understand the terrible wounds it inflicts. I understand the tragedy of a family living at the subsistence level, with not enough to eat, and I can easily understand how this lad, the day he grew into an adult and found a pistol in his hand, should have been impelled to do exactly the opposite of what his father had done. I can understand how, in a sense, this boy was trying to kill his father. We are faced with a cruel riddle, and we cannot simply judge with the severity of a court that decides, under the French system, that another head should fall into the basket.

I would also like to tell you that Mrs Jacqueline Prevost has brought me the letters she received from her neighbours who had watched her bring up her sons on her own. There are dozens of these letters. One of her woman neighbours wrote: 'I am desperately sorry about your misfortune and I would like you to know that we are thinking about you and your poor little son with sadness and with all our sympathy, because we well remember the storm that convulsed and upset your lives when the father left. The tragedy in your family began when you were left on your own with your two little boys'.

That is why we cannot accept that Philippe too should be killed a few days from now. We are ready to discuss the matter coolly and calmly in the Legal Affairs Committee, but we claim today that it is perfectly possible for this Parliament to express the wish that the executions in France be postponed.

(*Exclamations*)

President. — I think Parliament should remember that it voted to put this on the agenda and that therefore we must allow time for people to speak. I have no powers on your behalf to limit the speaking-time; nevertheless, in our own interests, as a Parliament, could we try and speak as briefly as possible?

I call Mr Møller.

Mr Møller. — (*DK*) Mr President, all the time I was a Member of the Danish Parliament, I was against the death penalty. I have always opposed the assumption that the law of the land had the right to take a person's life. But this Parliament is not the legal authority for

Møller

the whole of Europe: we are not competent to set penalties for France: that is for the National Assembly of France to decide. We can obviously suggest to France what she should do regarding penalties. We can also go into a concrete appraisal of the court. But which of us can say that a French court in this connection has gone against French law? Can a court do otherwise than to work within the law of the country in which it finds itself? Has a French court no right to interpret French law? If it has, then surely the remedy lies in the French appeal procedure. What we are doing at the moment is getting mixed up in the details of a case.

This toothless Parliament, which cannot even regulate its own affairs, is certainly in no position to set itself up as an authority on the laws and penalties of other countries. The administration of justice is a national matter, and it is therefore the French Parliament and not this one that should be concerned. For myself, I shall abstain from voting. Although I am against the death penalty, I shall abstain because I am also against this Parliament interfering in the internal affairs of Member States and their administration of justice.

(Applause from various benches on the right)

President. — I call Mr Calvez.

Mr Calvez. — *(F)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we are not going to settle the problem of the death penalty in half an hour in this Parliament, and I ask myself — and with good reason — what authority our Parliament has in this question. Something quite abnormal is going on here, because this European Parliament cannot state its views in advance of the Chamber of Deputies and the French Senate, as one of our Members has just pointed out. This is a decision for the national authorities, Madam. That is what I wanted to say and I think that when this Parliament is talking about its field of competence it would do well to think about this problem as well.

President. — I call Mr d'Ormesson.

Mr d'Ormesson. — *(F)* Mr President, excuse me a moment, but I have been personally attacked by Mr Pannella. I only heard the end of that attack and that was because, to be frank, I was not following his speech for the simple reason that he talks so often without having anything to say that I felt I did not need to listen to him.

To Mrs Macciocchi, I would reply . . .

President. — Mr d'Ormesson, you cannot address your remarks to Mr Pannella any more than Mr

Pannella can address his remarks to you. You all must address your remarks to the President.

I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — *(F)* Mr President, addressing my remarks to you in accordance with the Rules, I want to say that it is perfectly possible that I may talk often or always without having anything to say, but there are other people, Mr President, who are far better at it than me. Some I know not only talk but even write a lot without having anything to say. Don't you agree, Mr d'Ormesson?

(Laughter)

President. — The debate is closed.

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

8. Uganda

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution by Mr Alber and others, on Uganda (Doc. 1-593/80).

I call Mr Penders.

Mr Penders. — *(NL)* Mr President, I would like to introduce this motion for a resolution with just one word. What it in fact urges is that a team of international observers should be present at the elections of 10 December in Uganda. I believe some explanation is needed here because such a step could well be regarded as interference in the internal affairs of Uganda. Well, that is not at all the intention of the Members tabling this motion for a resolution. In the climate that followed the expulsion of Amin and in view of the new situation in Uganda and the help that the EEC gave, immediately after the fall of the Ugandan dictatorship, to areas in the far north of the country that were so hard hit by famine, we have taken our cue from the very positive example of Zimbabwe, where, in the presence of international observers, the elections proceeded in excellent conditions and a new democratic régime was established.

It was in this spirit that we felt we had to submit this motion for a resolution. Once again, any impression that there can be any question of interference in the internal affairs of Uganda must be avoided. Our intention, in a spirit of international cooperation and solidarity, is to help Uganda set up a democratic régime on the basis of the elections of 10 December next.

President. — The debate is closed.

President

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

9. *Feminist activists in the USSR*

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution, by Mrs Lizin and others, on the treatment by the Soviet authorities of a number of activists seeking to abolish discrimination between men and women in the USSR (Doc. 1-602/80).

I call Mrs Squarcialupi.

Mrs Squarcialupi. — (*I*) Mr President, yesterday I gave my personal support to the request for urgent procedure on the treatment of feminist militants by the Soviet authorities but the support I gave yesterday was intended in a highly critical sense for this reason, that the same groups voted for an urgent debate on this motion for a resolution as rejected urgent procedure both for the debate on the death penalty and for the debate on the right to strike in Greece — which unfortunately does not validate Mrs Lizin's motion for a resolution but neither does it give it any prestige. Moreover, the same groups that have voted for urgent procedure in the case of this motion also refused to speak on the military dictatorship in Turkey.

To my mind, these geographical distinctions add nothing to Parliament's reputation, because there are no geographical distinctions or barriers when it comes to human rights. I have noticed a new code of conduct in this Parliament which is better suited to public schoolboys of the 19th century than to mature politicians, whichever their sex, of the 1980s. Here we say that we must not interfere in internal affairs, that the national Parliaments must debate first and that it is wrong to put our finger on certain evils in countries that are very close. And once again arises the contradiction of this geography of human rights, the pattern of which is highly confused. Was it the feminist spirit, with which certain groups in this Parliament of ours are imbued, that impelled them yesterday to vote for the Lizin motion almost unanimously? I would not say so, because throughout Mrs Lizin's speech we heard sneers, comments and remarks punctuating her description of real facts. To put it briefly, I had the feeling that certain groups still pictured women as shrews or as what Sartre described as 'respectueuses'.

To my mind, a subject concerning women has once again been used for other purposes. The rights of women are being used as ammunition for continuing the conflict between political blocs, in which the situation of women has only one fate and that is to be crushed. The way I see it, when the condition of women is made part of this struggle, it will come to the same end as an earthenware vessel in the middle of iron pots.

Because of all the contradictions that have emerged around this question, though right and just in itself, I have to say that, though yesterday I voted in favour of urgent debate, today I cannot vote for the substance of the motion — in view, for another thing, of certain ambiguities regarding, for example, the 'fear' of the imminent arrest of three feminist activists, a wording which seems to me very ambiguous. We certainly cannot table motions for resolutions purely out of 'fear' that something will happen. Although, therefore, I voted in favour of urgent debate, today I shall abstain from voting on the substance of this motion for a resolution.

President. — I call Mrs Macciocchi.

Mrs Macciocchi. — (*I*) Mr President, I find the statement of Mrs Squarcialupi, who has told us that after giving her support she is now withdrawing it, extremely strange — although strange only up to a certain point because, knowing full well the attitude of the Members sitting alongside Mrs Squarcialupi in this European Parliament, I know they try to avoid any kind of condemnation of what happens about human and women's rights in the Soviet Union. I therefore appreciate the impulse that made her sign, but I cannot approve the fact that she has withdrawn. I say this to Mrs Squarcialupi as a human being free, as we all are, to behave as she wishes, although, in my opinion, this freedom has its constraints.

The problem is serious, because it has already happened more than once, in similar cases where safeguarding *détente* seems to have meant saying nothing about Afghanistan or Cambodia — behaving, that is, like the people in the parable of the good Samaritan. Well, a refusal of this kind cannot be justified by anything.

This motion for a resolution also carries my signature. I do not think I can be accused by Mrs Squarcialupi of having acted differently in the defence of human rights according to the regions or régimes where they were violated.

What does the detention of these feminists — for whom we demand immediate release — threaten? It threatens another idea, which we have been fed on for years, which is that Marxism and feminism could form a whole and constitute the synthesis of a dialectical process. But this is not so. A type of Marxism, which is not Marxism in fact, is establishing a new form of feminine oppression. The case in front of us implies a situation that is widespread, socially, economically and politically, in which women are inferior at all levels of a given society.

I would like to add that this inferiority of women is now confirmed, Mrs Squarcialupi, in dozens of books where Soviet women are referred to. You only have to

Macciocchi

read "Essere donne all' Est" or other recently published articles on women and the evidence vouched for by Mr Pelikan regarding the situation of women in Czechoslovakia.

If we could trace the curve of women's repression, we should see the misogyny that was unleashed by those who called themselves the champions, in the October revolution, of the liberation not only of the proletariat but of all women.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, in this atmosphere of disarmament and resignation that has something to do with world events, we intend, in an important case of this nature, to vote in fellow-feeling for the feminists who have been hounded and to demand that they be set free.

President. — I call Mrs Roudy.

Mrs Roudy. — (*F*) Mr President, I shall support this motion for a resolution, which we have tabled at the request of the League of Human Rights. What bothers me a little is that everybody is going to support it, but for differing reasons, and in the support from the right I recognize certain reflex action of which, of course, I do not approve.

For my part, I would just make one point and that is that, in this repression, there is political recognition of the feminist movement. So feminism is a political movement because it is being repressed and it is clear to me that this is indeed a matter on which we must take up a stand, because it is a political case. Methods of repression vary with régime: in those that go to extremes and where there is no freedom, the methods include putting people in prison; in our countries, the methods used are more kid-gloved but they are still there.

I shall fight repression wherever and in whatever form it shows itself. I shall therefore fight this repression specifically directed at women; I shall fight it in my country, I occasionally have to fight it in my own Group; I shall fight it wherever I am, and of course I cannot approve of it any more over there than here. Given, therefore, the different forms it takes in different régimes and the fact that it must be fought against everywhere, I approve this motion for a resolution while fully aware that many of these gentlemen on the right will also support it, though, of course, for reasons that have nothing to do with the defence of feminism.

President. — I call Mrs Maij-Weggen.

Mrs Maij-Weggen. — (*NL*) Mr President, I can explain why my Group is supporting this motion. In the Soviet Union, it is always claimed that women there

are completely emancipated. That is a half-truth, and that is what the feminists in the Soviet Union are protesting against. Women there are wholly involved in the work process, but nothing is done in the Soviet Union to make their work any easier. That means that, there, women have an exceptionally heavy work-load and are in fact exploited. Although women in the Soviet Union, and in the other East-bloc countries, may often have an equally good or even better education than men, this overloading often has the result that, in working life, the women remain at the lower levels. I do not want to repeat clichés, but we know only too well that the streets in Moscow are cleaned by women, whereas hardly any women are to be seen in the Soviet Union's so-called parliament. Mr President, it is that sort of thing that the feminists are protesting against. They want to be really emancipated, and they want rights and duties in the family to be fairly divided. This we endorse, and therefore we are supporting this motion for a resolution.

President. — I call Mrs Squarcialupi.

Mrs Squarcialupi. — (*I*) Mr President, I asked to speak purely on a personal point. I think my signature was put on the motion by mistake because I had said that I should like to take part in the debate, but I did not actually append my signature to any paper. I regret that a document should be in circulation carrying my name without my having signed it.

President. — The debate is closed.

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

10. Referendum in Uruguay

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Glinne and others on behalf of the Socialist Group, Mr Rumor and Mr Penders on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group), Mr Fergusson on behalf of the European Democratic Group, Mr Bangemann and Mr Berkhower on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, Mr Israël on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, Mr Carossino and Mr Capanna, on the referendum in Uruguay (Doc. 1-607/80).

I call Mrs Van den Heuvel.

Mrs Van den Heuvel. — (*NL*) Mr President, if we are to discuss Uruguay we should, after all, look a little into the history of the country. In contrast to many other Latin American countries, Uruguay had a

Van den Heuvel

relatively peaceful political history up to the 50s. It was one of the few Latin American countries that had been able to hang on to democracy for a long period. The present constitution of Uruguay gives the elected congress a controlling function with regard to civil rights and gives anyone who is arrested, for example, the right to go for trial within 24 hours.

Unfortunately, as we all know, this constitution has not been applied in its entirety for several years. Early in 1972, a national security act was passed in Uruguay which is in complete conflict with the existing constitution. Under this national security act, the rights of individual citizens are suspended or limited and matters relating to national security are turned over to the military courts. The draft constitution on which a referendum is to be held on 30 November next, is designed to adjust the constitution to cover the practices of oppression that have been current in Uruguay for years. According to this draft, the head of state and the armed forces will be empowered to curtail fundamental rights by declaring a state of emergency. The draft specifies three different forms of this state of emergency, and only in one of these cases does parliament have to be asked for ratification by a two-thirds majority and at that only 60 days after the state of emergency has come into force.

In organizing a referendum on this draft constitution, the military régime of Uruguay is lining itself up with the other Latin American régimes that are seeking for a pseudo-legitimation of their practices of oppression. By having the draft passed by universal suffrage and by the reference in it to an elected parliament, the idea is to polish up the country's democratic image in the eyes of the outside world. What they forget to say is that, on top of the absurdities already mentioned, the new constitution specifies that there can be only one candidate for the presidency, who, what is more, has to be approved by the senior military command, and that only two political parties will be allowed. The Social-Democratic, Socialist, Communist and Christian-Democratic parties are outlawed. If we add to this the fact that all those opposed to this draft constitution have been arrested even when leaders of the officially accepted parties, then it is clear what the real worth of this so-called democracy is.

The European Parliament, which has already demonstrated its solidarity with the Uruguayan people on several occasions and is shortly to hold a debate on the situation in Uruguay on the basis of a report by the Political Affairs Committee, cannot be silent in the face of this referendum. The present motion for a resolution, for which there seems to be wide support in this Parliament, makes no bones about our views on this and on the régime that is trying to legalize oppression under the flag of democracy. As Members of this Parliament, we must insist that the Ministers of Foreign Affairs, meeting in political cooperation, and the Commission and the Council should be equally

clear and do everything possible to improve the situation of the people of Uruguay.

President. — I call Mr Penders to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

Mr Penders. — (*NL*) Mr President, a brief word in support of this motion on behalf of my Group. We are not in favour of a new request for urgent debate every time a question of human rights comes up, but here we are faced with the problem that the referendum will take place on 30 November next whereas it will be some time before the major report on human rights in Uruguay can be discussed in Parliament.

As the motion clearly states the referendum has two aims. One thing it does not do is to offer any real choice to the people of Uruguay. It does do something else — it makes an attempt to institutionalize the dictatorship. With this referendum and the new constitution, the régime clearly has three objectives in mind: firstly, to give constitutional force, with retrospective effect, to decrees and acts brought in since 1973 whose object is to impose silence on groups holding different views from those of the régime; secondly, to abolish formally provisions of the good constitution of 1967 guaranteeing citizens certain rights and freedoms and establishing the appropriate legal machinery, which is also to be abolished; thirdly, and here I am naturally very much reminded of the referendum held in Chile on 11 September, to try to put up some kind of democratic image.

If this all succeeds, then this is going to be a sinister programme in Uruguay: first we shall have presidential elections, for which there will be only one candidate and he must have the approval of the military; then we shall have parliamentary elections, in which only two parties, the traditional Colorados and the Blancos, can take part but not the other parties, including the Christian-Democratic Party of Uruguay. And even in the two parties that are permitted, several leaders who had objected to the referendum have been arrested and stripped of a number of their democratic rights.

I have to tell you that the World Union of Christian Democrats, the European Union of Christian Democrats, the European People's Party and the Christian Democrats of Uruguay itself have urged us as strongly as they can to make a protest against this referendum. For this reason I am in a position to say on behalf of my Group, that we shall fully support this motion for a resolution.

President. — I call Mr Carossino.

Mr Carossino. — (I) Mr President, I wish to offer the support of the Italian Communists for this motion for a resolution without wishing to anticipate the political debate on the situation in that country which is to take place in one of Parliament's forthcoming part-sessions.

We condemn today the fraudulent nature of this referendum held by the military. It is a farce they want to put on as a way of masking their real faces and to cover up the shameful deeds of a cruel police state where persecution, torture and abuse prevail.

We therefore associate ourselves with the request addressed to the Ministers of Foreign Affairs meeting in political cooperation, asking them to reconsider their relations with Uruguay. Indeed, we take the view that it is necessary to break off diplomatic relations with this country. At the same time, we wish to express to the people, parties and democratic forces of Uruguay our solidarity with them and our determination to support them in their fight to regain their freedom.

President. — I call Mr Lezzi.

Mr Lezzi. — (I) Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to draw your attention to the fact that the most important political ingredient of the Uruguayan situation, with the referendum now imminent, is that all the political groups — including the Blanco party, the Colorado party, the Christian-Democrats, the Socialist party and the Radical Civic Union — all intend to vote against the draft constitution.

When, early in November, I had occasion to be in Montevideo with a small delegation from the Italian Parliament, the country was waiting to hear the opinions of Pacheco Arreco, leader of the Colorado party, and Wilson Ferreira Aldunate, leader of the Blanco party. These two parties had collected 80 % of the votes in the 1971 election. But none of the politicians that I met was nursing any illusions. Indeed, there is awareness of the tragic situation that will arise after the referendum, particularly in view of the fact — be it noted — that the 'hawks' in the military are said not to have wanted the referendum and to be working for a *pronunciamiento* against the draft constitution, which will imply that the majority of the Uruguayan people is in favour of the military régime. So the situation is critical.

We have heard that the Political Affairs Committee will be completing its work on Mrs Van den Heuvel's report in December and that the problem will then come before the full Parliament. We hope that Parliament will be able to give an immediate response, to take immediate steps and to induce the governments of the Member States to introduce real measures of solidarity towards this lonely little country in the depths of South America so as to bring about a real change in the life of this country, secure the release of

political prisoners such as Seregni, Massera, Liliana Celiberchi, Caniboni and Teti of Italian nationality, all undergoing long prison sentences, and put an end or at least a limit to the proscription lists and the return of the exiles, in order that Uruguay may return to the old values of what once was the noble Uruguayan democratic tradition.

(Applause)

President. — The debate is closed.

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

IN THE CHAIR: MR ROGERS

Vice-President

11. Votes

President. — The next item is the vote on motions for resolutions on which the debate has been closed.

We begin with the *Wawrzik report (Doc. 1-559/80): ACP-EEC Convention*.

(Parliament adopted the preamble and paragraphs 1 to 3)

After paragraph 3, I have Amendment No 5, tabled by Mr Denis and others and seeking to insert a new paragraph to read as follows:

- 3a. Condemns any use of the food weapon against any country whatever for any reason whatever.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Wawrzik, rapporteur. — (D) The amendment has no relation to the subject dealt with in the report. It has more to do with the Ferrero report. I am against.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 5 and adopted paragraph 4)

President. — On paragraph 5, I have Amendment No 6, by Mr Denis and others, seeking to replace this paragraph by a new text:

5. Views with alarm the failure of the North-South negotiations in New York at which the important proposals of the '77' on the democratization of international financial bodies such as the IMF and IBRD were once again rejected by the United States and the countries of the Community;

President

Hopes that the General Assembly of the United Nations will overcome the difficulties which threaten to prevent the opening of the negotiations at the time appointed; invites the Member States of the Community to adopt an open attitude to proposals from developing countries in order to ensure that the negotiations will develop rapidly and have a positive outcome.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Wawrzik, rapporteur. — (D) The content of this proposed amendment was not discussed in committee. I therefore take the view that we should keep to the committee's wording.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 6 and adopted paragraphs 5, 6 to 11, 12¹ and 13 to 16)

President. — On paragraph 17, I have Amendment No 11, by Sir Fred Warner and others, seeking to replace the words, 'but considers these concessions inadequate' with the phrase 'and expresses the hope that future concessions will be made as soon as the market allows'.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Wawrzik, rapporteur. — (D) Mr President, the amendment as proposed would mean that no one could introduce any further improvements at any time.

I am therefore against.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 11 and adopted paragraph 17)

President. — On paragraph 18, I have Amendment No 3, by Mrs Poirier and others, seeking to replace this paragraph by a new text:

18. Points out the concern of many ACP countries at the announcement of a possible enlargement of the EEC to three new countries and expresses its surprise that this possible enlargement should be presented to the ACP countries as a *fait accompli* in circumstances resembling a diktat.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Wawrzik, rapporteur. — (D) Against.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 3 and adopted in succession paragraphs 18 and 19)

President. — On paragraph 20, I have Amendment No 12, by Sir Fred Warner and others, seeking to replace this paragraph with the following text:

¹ A separate vote on this paragraph was requested by Mrs Kellett-Bowman.

— to reduce gradually all existing tariff and non-tariff administrative measures which adversely affect the agricultural exports of the developing countries.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Wawrzik, rapporteur. — (D) I accept.

(Parliament adopted, in succession, Amendment No 12,¹ paragraph 20, thus amended, and paragraph 21)

President. — On paragraph 22, I have Amendment No 13, by Sir Fred Warner and others, seeking to replace this paragraph with a new text:

22. Notes that the Commission's original proposals concerning revised quotas for EEC sugar producers were not adopted; further, notes that revised proposals from the Commission are now being studied, and calls for measures in the Community sugar sector which will prevent surpluses generated within the EEC from damaging the development of sugar-cane production.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Wawrzik, rapporteur. — (D) Mr President, in my view the whole conflict on the sugar problem is almost wholly academic at the present time, but I agree.

(Parliament adopted in succession Amendment No 13 paragraphs 23 to 27, 28² and 29 to 30)

President. — After paragraph 30, I have Amendment No 1, by Mr Denis and others, seeking to add the following new heading and new paragraph:

Agricultural cooperation

30 a. Considers that one of the primary human rights is the right to food; in the European Community, millions of families are going without food while in the countries of the Third World tens of millions of adults and children are suffering or dying from hunger; this is particularly true in many countries linked to the EEC by the Lomé Convention. This situation demands a halt to:

- the destruction of food products by spraying with oil or dumping in the sea,
- policies for reducing food production pursued by the Commission in Brussels and the Council of Ministers,
- and demands instead the development of food production to satisfy all needs while strictly respecting Community competences;

Proposes therefore by way of initial measures the immediate creation of two funds:

¹ By means of the electronic voting-system.

² A separate vote on this paragraph was requested by Mrs Kellett-Bowman.

President

- one permitting the allocation of agricultural products destroyed or denatured by the EEC to developing countries in need of them,
- the other permitting the negotiation of long-term agreements with a view to ensuring regular supplies to developing countries.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Wawrzik, rapporteur. — (D) The proposed amendment is, in principle, right, but it has no connection with the subject. I am against.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 1)

President. — On paragraph 31, I have Amendment No 7, tabled by Mr Cohen and Mrs Focke on behalf of the Socialist Group and seeking to replace this paragraph by a new text:

31. Calls on the Community to examine without delay, in agreement with the ACP States and in accordance with their previous requests, the ways in which it can contribute to safeguarding the nutrition of the developing countries by making the appropriate resources available in the context of the common agricultural policy.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Wawrzik, rapporteur. — (D) The amendment was rejected in committee. I am against.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 7 and adopted paragraph 31)

President. — After paragraph 31, I have amendment No 4, by Mr Vergès and others, seeking to insert a new paragraph:

- 31 a. Points out the link between disarmament and development.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Wawrzik, rapporteur. — (D) The proposed amendment has nothing to do with the subject concerned. I am against.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 4 and adopted in succession paragraph 32¹ and paragraphs 33 and 34)

President. — On paragraph 35, I have Amendment No 9 by Mr Cohen and Mrs Focke on behalf of the Socialist Group and seeking to replace this paragraph by a new text:

35. Welcomes the fact that experience so far with Stabex has been largely positive for the ACP.

¹ A separate vote on this paragraph was requested by Mr Kellett-Bowman.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Wawrzik, rapporteur. — (D) A similar amendment has already been rejected in committee. I am against.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 9 and adopted in succession paragraphs 35 and 36 to 39)

President. — After paragraph 39, I have Amendment No 2, by Mr Vergès and others, seeking to insert a new paragraph:

- 39 a. Demands urgently, in order to deal with the very onerous effects of the weight of external debt on the economies of developing countries, the adoption of measures for immediate aid of the reduction or cancellation of the debts of developing countries undergoing particular difficulties as a result, as is the case with most ACP countries.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Wawrzik, rapporteur. — (D) I am in favour.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 2 and paragraphs 40 to 72)

President. — On paragraph 73, I have Amendment No 8 tabled by Mr Cohen and Mrs Focke on behalf of the Socialist Group and seeking to delete the third indent of this paragraph.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Wawrzik, rapporteur. — (D) Amendments Nos 8 and 10 were also discussed and rejected by the committee.

I am against.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 8 and adopted in succession paragraphs 73 and 74)

President. — On paragraphs 75 and 76, I have Amendment No 10, tabled by Mr Cohen and Mrs Focke on behalf of the Socialist Group and seeking to replace these two paragraphs by a new text:

75. Believes that the aid provided under the ACP-EEC Convention should be used primarily to improve social and living conditions in the ACP States; recalls in this context the proposals of the Commission concerning the minimum conditions laid down by the International Labour Office, which relate to all the developing countries and are still being considered by the Council, and urges the Commission to follow up these proposals.

President

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 10 and adopted paragraphs 75, 76 and 77 to 82)

I have had several requests from the floor to give an explanation of vote.

I call Mr Clément.

Mr Clément. — *(F)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Group of European Progressive Democrats feels that, if there is one field where Europe can go all out without ruffling national susceptibilities, it is that of development and cooperation. A good example is the fact that, in a period of economic crisis and political disturbance affecting all the Member States, the Community has been able — *via* the Lomé II agreements — to maintain the preferential aspect of its relations with the ACP countries.

These agreements consolidate the technical and commercial cooperation instituted by the Lomé I agreement, but their object is also to foster the development of reciprocal relations based on respect for differences and human dignity; and during the discussions that have taken place not only during this part-session but also during the budgetary part-session and in the ACP-EEC Consultative Assembly, the humanitarian and economic aspects of these agreements have been analysed at length.

The Lomé II Convention, after Lomé I, may therefore be said, in spite of the imperfections that mark any human achievement, to constitute a precedent of an original kind. Where the United Nations failed, Europe has succeeded: it has institutionalized the dialogue with the developing countries.

By continuing and improving this dialogue, the European Community can, without being false to itself, serve the cause of peace in the world, a world ready to listen to any moral authority capable of acting as peacemaker — but not interfering — in the clashes of interest that cause unrest.

This is where the rôle of Parliament lies. It is up to Parliament and Parliament alone to acquire this moral authority, which carries more weight than any kind of budgetary power. Europe has to take a certain conception of the world as the baseline for its action and not see its rôle in terms of what it thinks are its resources. For the men and women of my generation, this is a transcending goal. The motion for a resolution in Mr Wawrzik's report points in that direction, and that is why my Group will vote for it unhesitatingly.

President. — I call Mr Pannella.

(Protests from some quarters)

Mr Pannella. — *(F)* I am sorry, but I have a duty here

not only to my electors but also to you, ladies and gentlemen, to say the — stupid or intelligent — things I think. That is my job, even if yours is apparently to keep quiet.

Mr President, I profoundly hope, as I did last year when we voted on world hunger, that we are wrong again and you right. I hope that, as the weeks and months go by, the Ferrero report will prove to be a good report. Practically all of you voted for it, but I think it is bad. I think that the Lomé Convention, if judged as Mr Cheysson and others have judged it on the basis of Lomé I, may be regarded as good; but judged by the yardstick of the world situation, the situation of the ACP countries, their economic, social and even geographical situation, for me Lomé II is bad. We must, unfortunately, have the courage to say so if that is what we think.

You, who always vote in favour, ladies and gentlemen, you whose good consciences cost so little and for whom numbers are always comforting and proof of right judgement, unhappily I think there are some brutal disappointments in store for you.

The FAO, the World Food Council and the World Bank all predict that mortality rates will go up during the next few months in the Lomé countries as they will elsewhere. In the Lomé II framework, only 60 % of trade and development plans are of any real value; two-thirds of them relate to only two countries, the Ivory Coast and Nigeria. The effects of Stabex are increasing confined to tropical products. I think you are deceiving yourselves — and us.

We shall be voting against this motion and at the same time hoping we are wrong. Unfortunately, when you adopted the resolution last year you attacked us for voting against it, and yet a few months later you admitted yourselves that it was inadequate and bad. You voted, ladies and gentlemen, in the ACP-EEC Consultative Assembly in Luxembourg, and then you changed your minds; you went back on your word. Well, we shall have voted against on both occasions, including Mr Wawrzik's report, because I feel that the majority in this Parliament is putting up a poor show as regards attentiveness, courage and clearheadedness and instead displays a serenity of mind which, as I say, is totally unwarranted.

President. — I call Mrs Le Roux.

Mrs Le Roux. — *(F)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the French members of the Communist and Allies Group, I wish to say that we shall be voting against the Wawrzik report.

The reason is that it is a step back from the Focke resolution passed by the ACP-EEC Consultative Assembly. My friends have already described the inadequacies of that resolution, improved though it was by

Le Roux

our amendments. Most of these amendments have just been rejected by Parliament, which has refused to condemn the use of food as a weapon; and yet the same amendments were passed in the presence of the ACP countries.

It looks as though Members have discovered what they really want to say in the absence of the representatives of the countries concerned. Two months ago, in Luxembourg, they supported our proposal that agricultural produce that would otherwise be destroyed should be transferred to the people who are suffering from hunger. Today, Parliament rejects that proposal and so shows, once again, what it really thinks. This explains the attitude of the Committee on External Relations, which refused to discuss the report produced by my friend Mrs Poirier, as she explained yesterday. We reject this attitude, and we shall vote against the Wawrzik report.

President. — I call Mrs Kellett-Bowman.

Mrs Kellett-Bowman. — Mr President, I used to be a member of the ACP delegation and I am very much in favour of much of the work that is done therein, but I have some very strong reservations, on behalf of the region which I serve, namely, the North-West of England, on some of the provisions in this particular document. I refer in particular to paragraphs 12 and 28 and it was for this reason that I asked for a separate vote on those particular paragraphs, because they make no distinction between the importation of products which the European Community can absorb without doing irreparable damage to its own industries and those which it cannot. I very much regret, Mr President, that owing to the fact that many of our colleagues overstep the mark in their speaking-time, we shall be unable to discuss the general system of preferences today before the ministerial meeting to decide on that policy on November 24 and 25, because the list of products to be imported freely can do very grave damage indeed to the textile, footwear and chemical industries of the Community and particularly of the area I serve. These are also covered by this particular document before us today.

I shall be voting for this document because I believe in the ideals behind it, but I do not think we have given sufficient thought to those whose jobs, livelihoods, homes and futures are to be sacrificed in the Member States.

President. — I put the motion for a resolution as a whole to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.¹

*
* *

¹ OJ C 327 of 15. 12. 1980.

President. — I put to the vote the motion for a resolution contained in the *Sablé report (Doc. 1-522/80): Outcome of the proceedings of the ACP-EEC Joint Committee and Consultative Assembly.*

The resolution is adopted.¹

*
* *

President. — We come now to the *Kirk report (Doc. 1-597/80): Fish-stocks.*

(Parliament adopted the preamble and paragraph 1)

On paragraph 2, I have Amendment No 9, by Mr Provan, seeking to delete this paragraph.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Kirk, rapporteur. — Against.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 9, paragraph 2 thus amended and paragraph 3)

President. — On paragraph 4, I have Amendment No 2, by Mrs Le Roux and others, seeking to replace this paragraph by a new text:

4. Considers that there is a need for collective management of fish-stocks based on fair and equitable quotas worked out on scientific criteria, taking account of the mutual interests, requirements and historical traditions of the Member States.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Kirk, rapporteur. — (DK) As rapporteur, I must oppose the amendment, Mr President.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 2 and adopted paragraph 4)

President. — After paragraph 4, I have Amendment No 3, by Mrs Le Roux and others, seeking to insert a new paragraph:

- 4 a. Calls for the abolition of quotas exploited by flags of convenience.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Kirk, rapporteur. — (DK) As rapporteur, I must resist this, Mr President.

¹ OJ C 327 of 15. 12. 1980.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 3)

President. — On paragraph 5, I have Amendment No 10, by Mr Provan, seeking to modify this paragraph as follows:

5. Believes that if fish-stocks are to be exploited responsibly, conservation and resource policies must be based on the multi-species approach, so that the interrelations and interdependence of the various species of fish are also taken into account in determining fishing activities;

— Notes that total allowable catches are determined exclusively on the basis of a fish biology report;

— Hopes that sufficient account will also be taken of technical economic considerations;

— Hopes, in other words, that sufficient account will be taken of the wishes of the fishing industry and of market requirements;

When fixing the total catch, the TAC's for all important species shall be taken into account. The principle of priority for fishing for human consumption, accepted by the Commission, shall be adhered to.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Kirk, rapporteur. — *(DK)* I think Mr Provan's amendment makes paragraph 5 very much clearer. I can therefore accept it, Mr President.

President. — I call Mr Gautier to speak on a point of order.

Mr Gautier. — *(D)* We have already had this problem today. I should like to ask the rapporteur whether he is speaking on behalf of the committee or is expressing his personal opinion.

President. — I call Mr Kirk.

Mr Kirk, rapporteur. — *(DK)* That is, of course, Mr President, my own assessment of this amendment. During the discussion of this report, I could see that paragraph 5 was very unclear and not particularly easy to read, and that Mr Provan's Amendment No 10 was designed to remedy this. But that is my personal opinion.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 10 and adopted paragraph 5)

President. — After paragraph 5, I have Amendment No 4, by Mrs Le Roux and others, seeking to insert a new paragraph:

¹ By sitting and standing.

- 5 a. Calls also for the period prior to implementation of Council Regulation (EEC) No 101/76 to be taken into account.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Kirk, rapporteur. — *(DK)* I am against, Mr President.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 4 and adopted paragraph 6)

President. — After paragraph 6, I have Amendment No 5, by Mrs Le Roux and others, seeking to insert a new paragraph:

- 6 a. Challenges the Commission's technocratic methods of calculation, which openly favour certain Member States, and in particular calls for the size of the extra-quota catch to be taken into account.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Kirk, rapporteur. — *(DK)* I am against, Mr President.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 5 and adopted paragraphs 7 and 8)

President. — After paragraph 8, I have Amendment No 1, by Mrs Ewing, seeking to insert a new paragraph:

- 8 a. Considers, furthermore, that the loss of access to fishing grounds due to the encroachment of the oil industry should be equated with the loss of access to third-country waters when quotas are allocated.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Kirk, rapporteur. — *(DK)* I am against, Mr President.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 1 and adopted paragraph 9)

President. — After paragraph 9, I have two amendments by Mrs Le Roux and others, each seeking to insert a new paragraph:

— Amendment No 6:

- 9 a. Denounces the pointless waste caused by the catching of immature fish, and calls for it to be prohibited;

— Amendment No 7:

- 9 b. Calls for fish-meal to be produced only from fish otherwise thrown back and fish not intended for human consumption.

President

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Kirk, rapporteur. — (DK) I am against, Mr President.

(In successive votes Parliament rejected Amendments Nos 6 and 7)

President. — On paragraph 10, I have Amendment No 8, by Mrs Le Roux and others, seeking to replace this paragraph with a new text:

10. Rejects the Commission's quota proposals and asks it to amend them in the spirit of the comments made in this resolution.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Kirk, rapporteur. — (DK) I am against, Mr President.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 8 and adopted paragraphs 10 to 13)

President. — I can now give the floor for explanations of vote.

I call Mr Provan.

Mr Provan. — I am very disappointed that Amendment No 10 was rejected by the House, because, when fish-stocks are very scarce, it seems ridiculous that we should allow a situation to develop in which we might be taking fish for industrial purposes when we should be stressing that human consumption should be the predominant concern in the Community fishing policy. The House does not appear to have accepted that this morning, and I find this ridiculous. However, I do think Mr Kirk's report has many positive aspects and I look forward to supporting it.

President. — I put to the vote the motion for a resolution as a whole, thus amended.

The resolution is adopted.¹

*
* *

President. — We shall now consider the motion for a resolution contained in the *Clinton report (Doc. 1-560/80): Common fisheries policy.*

(Parliament adopted preamble and paragraphs 1 to 6)

¹ OJ C 327 of 15. 12. 1980.

On paragraph 7, I have three amendments, seeking to amend or replace subparagraph (c) as follows:

— Amendment No 4, tabled by Mr Davern:

- (c) the need for a 12-mile exclusive coastal band with provision for the phasing out of historic fishing rights through suitable arrangements;

— Amendment No 10, tabled by Mrs Le Roux and others:

- (c) recognition of the basic principle of equal access to Community resources, taking account of traditional rights in the 6-12-mile zones;

— Amendment No 2, tabled by Mr Battersby and Mr Provan:

- (c) for certain particularly dependent areas, protective measures may be adopted by the Community for local fishermen; these safeguards should include the designation of fishing zones exclusively reserved for boats operating from the local area, and should also include limits on the sizes of boats allowed to fish within certain areas.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Clinton, rapporteur. — No 4 I can personally accept. If it were before the Committee on Agriculture, I do not think it would be accepted.

(Loud laughter)

I am against Amendment No 10 and in favour of Amendment No 2.

(Parliament rejected in succession Amendments Nos 4¹ and 10 and adopted Amendment No 2 and paragraph 7, thus amended, up to and including subparagraph (f))

President. — Still on paragraph 7, I have Amendment No 11, tabled by Mrs Le Roux and others, seeking to expand subparagraph (g) as follows:

based on the signature of long-term bilateral agreements.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Clinton, rapporteur. — I am against this amendment.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 11 and adopted subparagraphs (g) and (h) of paragraph 7)

President. — After paragraph 7, I have Amendment No 12 tabled by Mrs Le Roux and others and seeking to insert a new paragraph:

¹ By sitting and standing.

President

- 7 (a) Considers it necessary that resources should be managed collectively on the basis of fair and balanced quotas calculated according to scientific criteria taking account of the mutual interests, the needs and historical traditions of the Member States.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Clinton, rapporteur. — I do not accept it.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 12 and adopted paragraphs 8 and 9)

President. — On paragraph 10, I have Amendment No 13, tabled by Mrs Le Roux and others and seeking to replace this paragraph with a new text:

10. Urges that the reference price be determined on the basis of the trend of production costs; in the short term the guarantee price should be raised by at least 30 %.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Clinton, rapporteur. — Against.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 13 and adopted paragraph 10)

President. — After paragraph 10, I have two amendments:

— Amendment No 6, tabled by Mr Kirk on behalf of the European Democratic Group and seeking to insert the following new paragraph:

- 10 a. Demands that imports into the Community of fish from third countries respect the minimum prices observed by the Community's own fishermen,

— Amendment No 14, tabled by Mrs Le Roux and others and seeking to insert the following new paragraph:

- 10 a Urges that there should be an automatic guarantee for each species as soon as prices fall below the fixed level.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Clinton, rapporteur. — I accept Amendment No 6 and am against Amendment No 14.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 6 and rejected Amendment No 14)

President. — On paragraph 11, I have Amendment

No 3, tabled by Mr Seeler and amending this paragraph as follows:

11. Hopes, however, that imports from third countries for processing in the fishing industry will not be made more expensive by duties where supplies of EEC catches cannot be guaranteed.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Clinton, rapporteur. — Mr President, it sounds reasonable, but I think it is dangerous and I am against it.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 3 and adopted paragraph 11)

President. — After paragraph 11, I have Amendment No 15, tabled by Mrs Le Roux and others and seeking to insert the following new paragraph:

- 11 (a) Urges that customs concessions granted to certain non-member countries be abolished.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Clinton, rapporteur. — Against.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 15)

President. — On paragraph 12, I have Amendment No 16, tabled by Mrs Le Roux and others and seeking to replace this paragraph with the following text:

12. Considers that the responsibilities of the producers' organizations are strictly a matter for the Member States.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Clinton, rapporteur. — Mr President, I am against this amendment. We must have a Community approach if we are going to have a Community policy.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 16 and adopted, first paragraph 12, then paragraphs 13 and 14)

President. — On paragraph 15, I have Amendment No 17, tabled by Mrs Le Roux and others and seeking to delete this paragraph.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Clinton, rapporteur. — I am against this amendment, Mr President.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 17 and adopted paragraph 15)

President. — On paragraph 16, I have Amendment No 18, tabled by Mrs Le Roux and seeking to delete this paragraph.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Clinton, rapporteur. — Against.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 18 and adopted paragraph 16)

President. — On paragraph 17, I have Amendment No 19, tabled by Mrs Le Roux and others and seeking to replace this paragraph with the following text:

17. Believes that subsidized fuel for fishing-vessels is not contrary to the Treaties; bearing in mind fuel price differences, considers that it is up to each country to fix the level of subsidized fuel-prices for fishing-vessels, which should not be lower than 0.6 EUA per litre.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Clinton, rapporteur. — Against.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 19 and adopted paragraph 17)

President. — After paragraph 17, I have Amendment No 9, tabled by Mr de Lipkowski and others, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, and seeking to add the following new paragraph:

- 17 (a) Considers it necessary to provide direct Community fuel subsidies pursuant to the EEC rules, and in the interests of harmonization, in order to cope with the problems of small-scale inshore fishing.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Clinton, rapporteur. — Personally, I am in favour, Mr President. I do not know what the committee would say if it were before them. We have not had an opportunity to consider these amendments.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 9 and then paragraphs 18 to 20)

President. — On paragraph 21, I have two amendments:

— Amendment No 20, tabled by Mrs Le Roux and others and seeking to delete this paragraph; and

— Amendment No 8, tabled by Mr Kirk on behalf of the European Democratic Group and seeking to amend this paragraph as follows:

21. Emphasizes that quotas are not a sufficient basis for conservation policies (rest deleted).

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Clinton, rapporteur. — I am against both amendments.

(Parliament rejected Amendments Nos 20 and 8 and adopted, first paragraph 21,¹ then paragraphs 22 to 24)

President. — On paragraph 25, I have Amendment No 1, tabled by Mr Kirk and seeking to amend the third subparagraph to read as follows:

Points out that industrial fishing is the only way to realize the value of certain small species of fish; notes that existing Community rules already provide for a ban on the fishing of human consumption species for industrial purposes, and expresses support for this ban; believes that these current by-catch rules represent a reasonable balance between the need to fish for industrial purposes and the need to conserve species for human consumption.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Clinton, rapporteur. — I could accept it, but I have a feeling that the Committee on Agriculture might not.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 1 and paragraph 25, thus amended)

President. — After paragraph 25, I have Amendment No 21, tabled by Mrs Le Roux and others and seeking to add the following new paragraph:

- 25 a. Requests that effective measures be taken against ships flying flags of convenience, including immediate withdrawal of their quotas.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Clinton, rapporteur. — Against.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 21 and paragraph 26)

President. — After paragraph 26, I have Amendment No 22, by Mrs Le Roux and others, seeking to add the following new paragraph:

- 26 a. Requests a ban on the catching of undersized fish and the processing at sea by factory ships of all the fish which should be returned to the sea.

¹ By sitting and standing.

President

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Clinton, rapporteur. — Against.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 22¹ and adopted paragraphs 27 to 34)

President. — On paragraph 35, I have Amendment No 7, tabled by Mr Kirk on behalf of the European Democratic Group and seeking to delete the words: 'limiting access to fishing-grounds'.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Clinton, rapporteur. — Mr President, the feeling in the Committee on Agriculture was that the licensing system should not be restricted and that it should be more a form of registration.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 7, paragraph 35 thus amended and paragraph 36)

President. — On paragraph 37, I have Amendment No 23, tabled by Mrs Le Roux and others and seeking to replace this paragraph by the following new text:

37. Believes that responsibility for monitoring should rest with the Member States.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Clinton, rapporteur. — Against.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 23 and adopted paragraph 37)

President. — On paragraph 38, I have two amendments:

— Amendment No 24, by Mrs Le Roux and others, seeking to delete the paragraph; and

— Amendment No 5, by Mr Davern, seeking to amend the paragraph as follows:

38. Believes that Community inspectors should be considered as agents of the Community and, having received prior agreement from the national government of a Member State, should therefore be able to move and act fully in and between all Community zones;

Believes there should be instituted an appeals procedure for fishermen sanctioned in national courts for alleged contraventions of Community provisions, and considers that potential conflicts can be minimized if national inspection vessels carry an inspector from another Member State.

¹ By sitting and standing.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Clinton, rapporteur. — With regard to Amendment No 5, this paragraph was changed by the Committee on Agriculture to its present form, and therefore I do not want the paragraph changed.

I am against Amendment No 24.

(Parliament rejected Amendments Nos 24 and 5¹ and adopted paragraphs 38 and 39 to 46)

President. — On paragraph 47, I have Amendment No 25, by Mrs Le Roux and others, seeking to delete this paragraph.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Clinton, rapporteur. — Against.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 25 and adopted paragraph 47)

President. — On paragraph 48, I have Amendment No 26, by Mrs Le Roux and others, seeking to delete this paragraph.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Clinton, rapporteur. — Against.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 26 and adopted paragraph 48)

President. — On paragraph 49, I have Amendment No 27, by Mrs Le Roux and others, seeking to delete this paragraph.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Clinton, rapporteur. — Against.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 27 and adopted paragraphs 49 and 50)

President. — On paragraph 51, I have Amendment No 28, by Mrs Le Roux and others, seeking to delete this paragraph.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Clinton, rapporteur. — Against.

¹ By sitting and standing.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 28 and adopted paragraph 51)

President. — After paragraph 51, I have Amendment No 29, by Mrs Le Roux and others, seeking to add the following new paragraph:

- 51 a. Urges, in the interests of fishermen, the effective application of Article 117, which provides for the upward harmonization of social security systems.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Clinton, rapporteur. — I could accept this amendment.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 29 and paragraphs 52 to 59)

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

Mr Boyes. — This is going on all morning. It is taking far too long when we have got three buttons here. All we have to do is to press the button we want and then go on to the next vote straight away. As it is, we have been at it nearly 1¾ hours, and we have what is supposed to be the most sophisticated voting system in Western Europe. It is nonsense.

President. — I quite agree with you, Mr Boyes. We ought perhaps to have a better system, but unfortunately the electronic system takes longer than the show of hands if people do it properly.

On paragraph 60, I have Amendment No 30, tabled by Mrs Le Roux and others, seeking to replace this paragraph with the following text:

60. Hopes that a far-reaching fisheries policy can be worked out with the developing countries on the basis of long-term bilateral agreements.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Clinton, rapporteur. — I am against.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 30 and adopted first paragraph 60, then paragraphs 61 to 64)

President. — After paragraph 64, I have Amendment No 31, tabled by Mrs Le Roux and others, seeking to add the following new paragraph:

- 64 (a) Urges that bilateral agreements be negotiated with non-member countries.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Clinton, rapporteur. — I am against.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 31 and adopted paragraph 65)

President. — On paragraph 66, I have amendment No 32, tabled by Mrs Le Roux and others, seeking to replace this paragraph with the following text:

66. Urges total rejection of the plans to enlarge the Community to include Spain and Portugal, as this would aggravate the situation of fishermen both in the Community and in the applicant countries.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Clinton, rapporteur. — I am against.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 32 and adopted paragraphs 66 to 68)

President. — I put the motion for a resolution as a whole, thus amended, to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.¹

(Applause)

*

* *

President. — I put to the vote the motion for a resolution contained in the *Cresson report (Doc. 1-537/80): Fishing off the coast of Guyana.*

The resolution is adopted.¹

*

* *

¹ OJ C 327 of 15. 12. 1980.

President. — I put to the vote the *motion for a resolution by Mr De Pasquale and others (Doc. 1-614/80): Fishing in the Mediterranean.*

The resolution is adopted.¹

*
* *

President. — I now put to the vote the *motion for a resolution by Mrs Le Roux and others (Doc. 1-617/80): Fishing in the Mediterranean.*

The resolution is rejected.

*
* *

President. — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution by Mrs Roudy and others (Doc. 1-589/80): Abolition of the death penalty in the European Community.*

I have received a request from the Socialist Group for a roll-call vote, so the vote will be taken electronically. Mr Glinne, does this request apply to the motion for a resolution as a whole or do you want it on the amendment as well?

Mr Glinne. — On all the votes dealing with the same issue.

President. — We shall therefore vote by roll-call on all the votes dealing with this issue.

I have Amendment No 1, by Mr Forth, seeking to replace the entire motion for a resolution by the following new text:

The European Parliament,

- having regard to the historic and actual differences in basis, principles and operation of the legal systems of the Member States of the European Community.
- bearing in mind that the motion for a resolution PE 64 047 of 14 March 1980 by Mr Schwartzberg and the Socialist Group will make it possible for Parliament to hold a debate in the near future on the basis

of a report now being prepared in the Legal Affairs Committee.

1. Believes therefore that it cannot for the time being usefully express any view on the provisions of domestic national law in any one respect in any Member State.

I call Mr Pannella on a point of order.

Mr Panella. — (F) Mr President, I apologize, but some other Members and myself have not understood what we are voting on. I should like to know.

(Protests)

President. — Mr Panella, it would be helpful if Members stayed in the Chamber. That way they could follow the voting from beginning to end.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 1)¹

I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.²

*
* *

President. — I put to the vote the *motion for a resolution by Mr Alber and others (Doc. 1-593/80): Uganda.*

The resolution is adopted.²

*
* *

President. — I put to the vote the *motion for a resolution by Mrs Lizin and others (Doc. 1-602/80): Feminist activists in the USSR.*

The resolution is adopted.²

*
* *

President. — I put to the vote the *motion for a resolution by Mr Glinne and others (Doc. 1-607/80): Referendum in Uruguay.*

The resolution is adopted.²

¹ For details of the roll-call votes, see the minutes of this sitting.

² OJ C 327 of 15. 12. 1980.

¹ OJ C 327 of 15. 12. 1980.

12. Agenda

President. — I call Mr Pearce.

Mr Pearce. — Could you please advise us of your intentions for the rest of this sitting, because my report on the GSP system is still some way down the agenda? The matter is on the agenda of the Council of Ministers for next Monday and the scheme it refers to is due to come into force on 1 January. It is therefore essential, Mr President, that this House pronounce on it today.

President. — Mr Pearce, my intentions are to hand over the Chair to Mr de Ferranti, who has so very willingly agreed to preside. I think the decision will rest with him. Perhaps you could put your point to him.

I call Mr Vernimmen.

Mr Vernimmen. — (NL) Mr President, I insist that the agenda be observed and that the social problems which are on today's agenda and which concern the ordinary citizen in Europe should also be dealt with.

President. — I call Mr Bangemann.

Mr Bangemann. — (D) Mr President, would you be kind enough to draw Members' attention to the fact that the agenda has already been decided and that we cannot, therefore, agree on any further preferences. Obviously, everyone would like his own point to be dealt with first, but that cannot be done, because the agenda is already fixed.

President. — I certainly accept all these points, but as Mr de Ferranti will be presiding from now on I am going to let him take the decision.

IN THE CHAIR: MR DE FERRANTI

Vice-President

President. — I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (F) Mr President, I would first of all point out to the previous speaker that, failing proof to the contrary, Parliament is sovereign and can even change its agenda if it thinks fit.

Secondly, I would point out that Mr Gundelach appears to be present. We had him come for the consideration of Item 254, about which, to put it very simply, there is a slight breath of scandal. It was not I

who had this item included, but members of the EEP. If we want a transparent Community, at this time when the press is asking questions, then Parliament needs to respond immediately. I therefore ask all groups and all Members to consider this item, given the suspicion of very serious political scandal, and make their views known.

President. — I call Mr Pearce.

Mr Pearce. — Mr President, I will repeat the request I made to Mr Rogers. My report on the generalized system of preferences is far down on the agenda. The subject matter with which it is concerned is on the agenda of the Council of Ministers on Monday next and the system is due to come into force on 1 January.

In answer to the colleague opposite, it is not a question of wanting my report to receive priority; the topic it deals with is something on which the Council has asked for our opinion. It is ridiculous to waste time as we do here talking about this, that and the other when we should be doing what we are asked to do — namely, delivering our opinion on draft legislation. May I therefore urge you very strongly to ensure that somehow or other this matter of GSP is put to the vote before we leave Strasbourg today? If we do not do that it will be a dereliction of Parliament's duty, which I shall put down to incompetent management of our work by the Bureau.

President. — The House, of course, is sovereign. It made its original decision on the order in which the debates should be held, and if the House wishes to change it we can do so by vote.

Somebody has to move the proposal before we can vote on it.

I call Mr Bangemann.

Mr Bangemann. — (D) Mr President, forgive me but I cannot agree. Once the agenda has been decided, once all Members have made their arrangements accordingly and are in the House for specific items and at specific times, it seems to me not possible to change the agenda by taking a vote. Of course, the House is sovereign but only insofar as it has not committed itself. In the case of the agenda, it has already committed itself. I apologize again, but I must disagree with you.

President. — I call Mr Scott-Hopkins.

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — There is perhaps a solution to this problem, Mr President, by not changing the agenda at all, but asking the rapporteur whether he is

Scott-Hopkins

willing to put this forward to the House as a motion without debate. If the House agrees to its being taken without debate, then we can vote on it at the end of business today before we rise.

President. — I call Mr Pearce.

Mr Pearce. — Mr President, I am prepared to accept that as a compromise measure, but I think it demonstrates the pretty poor way the business of this House is run when a matter as important as this has to be treated in that way. However, in order to get something through, I would accept the compromise suggested by Mr Scott-Hopkins.

President. — I call Mr Oehler.

Mr Oehler. — (F) Mr President, I would all the same like to point out that a few days ago, before coming here, we received an agenda which included at least two vital questions on social matters which had been discussed in committee and which were scheduled to be dealt with today. Will this House one day decide to treat agendas distributed in advance with respect? If motions for resolutions are tabled at the last minute, then let them be held over! Let us at least deal with the agenda, because the workers have no time to wait!

President. — It is the House that has amended its agenda. But, of course, your point will be noted.

I call Mrs Kellett-Bowman.

Mrs Kellett-Bowman. — Mr President, what is the status of the amendments on, for example, the Pearce report if in fact they have not been formally moved at any stage? Will they be able to be voted on?

President. — We shall take them in due time.

I call Mr Cohen.

Mr Cohen. — (NL) Mr President, I cannot accept your last statement. If we discuss the Pearce report without having an opportunity to debate the amendments, then no vote can be taken on them. All we can do is to vote on the Pearce report, if that is what we really want, in the form in which we have it before us, without the amendments.

President. — The proposal was made by Mr Scott-Hopkins that we should curtail the debate and make it so brief as to be non-existent and then proceed to vote upon it. That, I think, was accepted by the House, and I think we must proceed on that basis.

I call Mrs Rabbethge.

Mrs Rabbethge. — (D) Mr President, for the same reasons as those given by Mr Pearce, I request that the same procedure be applied to my report (Doc. 1-551/80) as that proposed for the Pearce report.

President. — We shall do our best.

13. *Sales of butter to the USSR*

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr De Clercq and others, on sales of butter to Russia (Doc. 1-609/80).

I call Mr De Gucht.

Mr De Gucht. — (NL) Mr President, this motion for a resolution which Mr De Clercq and I have tabled personally, relates to a controversial situation about which our agricultural experts will no doubt have a number of comments to make, some of them not entirely without foundation. It is indeed a fact that there are agricultural surpluses in our Community and that we have to get rid of them in one way or another. It is also a fact that it is cheaper to get rid of them on the international market with export refunds than to store them. It is further true that the Christmas butter system that we had in the past disorganizes the market, although that should not be overestimated and undoubtedly is gravely exaggerated by the agricultural experts themselves.

Nor do I want to tag onto this motion for a resolution a debate on agricultural policy as such. Agricultural policy is too important a matter for the House to discuss in a short debate on Friday afternoon. This policy will, in the next few months, be the subject of a full and far-reaching debate between all the groups. Today the issue is the big exports that are about to go (or perhaps we should now say, were about to go) to Russia, at the cost of unacceptably high export refunds.

At the beginning of this year the export refund was set at 160 ECU, then it was reduced to 100 in view of the market situation and now it has suddenly been set again, as from 1 January 1981, at 150 ECU per 100 kg. Immediately, there was an enormous demand of 90 000 tonnes, whereas throughout the whole of 1980 the demand had been only ± 70 000 tonnes.

This enormous demand prompts some questions. Where do the exports go, and to what extent is this very high export refund necessary? What, in other words, are the consequences of these exports for the European budget? As a matter of fact, there was an

De Gucht

immediate reaction. Among other things, suspension of the export refund was recommended, on the initiative of Mr Ertl, the German Minister of Agriculture, and, as I see it, the Commission has to a certain extent acknowledged its mistake in this matter.

The question that we put in this motion for a resolution, whether the Commission is not guilty of an error of judgement, is therefore to my mind entirely pertinent.

The Commission asserts that it does not know where these exports go to. The Commission is in a position to find out. That possibility is built into the system. Why, therefore, does the Commission not do so? That is why we note that immediately after the suspension decision, 30 000 tonnes were cancelled. That, surely, prompts certain questions.

I believe that today we have to put two fundamental questions. On top of that is the fact that the situation is aggravated by the background information dug out by certain people who would follow any remotely reliable source to squeeze what they can out of it. In this way, the Commission is put in a bad light which I feel, is dangerous for the European institutions as such and for the Commission in particular. The obscurer aspects of this matter require that the situation be clarified and that the Commission should take an unequivocal stand.

Lastly, alongside these technical problems, a political problem emerges. The people of Europe cannot accept that dubious transactions take place, costing the European budget a great deal of money, transactions with Russia, whilst on the other hand a 'nyet' is the answer with regard to the Christmas butter. I know very well that these two things, technically and economically, have very little to do with each other and that this is what will no doubt be said against me, but this Parliament also has a duty to adopt a political standpoint. Its principal task is to create confidence in this House among the people of Europe. That is why, to my mind, this debate is vitally important and why the European Parliament must proclaim this clear standpoint that is needed by adopting the motion for a resolution that we have put before you today.

President. — I call Mr Vernimmen to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Vernimmen. — (NL) Mr President, with this motion for a resolution we are indeed confronted with an awkward situation. The severest criticism to which this Parliament is exposed is undoubtedly that concerning agricultural expenditure. Well, it is just as clear that these enormous payments are primarily the result of surpluses, and mainly surpluses in the dairy-produce sector. So the issue here is agricultural policy.

If we think this thing through logically, then we have to vote against this motion, and I would stress that the question whether these exports are for Russia or some other country is of minor importance. The fact is that we have to sell our butter-mountain somewhere. Here I would emphasize that I am not one of those who want to misuse food aid or food sales as a political weapon against certain countries. However, if I think politically, then it is clear to me that these sales will reduce the authority of Europe even more and, Mr De Gucht, that observation is certainly not without its importance.

Here arises a series of other questions, to which no doubt we cannot give an answer today, but I should very much like to know what the Commission is doing to encourage European consumers to use more butter. Presumably we lack the courage to condemn certain big multinationals who misuse certain imported raw materials and then mount an unhealthy advertising campaign costing millions to persuade consumers that margarine is far better for them than natural butter. Surely it is obvious that, through certain agreements in the framework of the GATT, we are going to become totally dependent on this policy as regards our consumption and also our way of life. Hence it is clear that if we really want to find a practical solution to the problems now facing us we have to decide on a completely different course and, pending the time when we shall have the courage to introduce certain measures, at the same time not forgetting the political consequences, I shall abstain from voting on this motion. I do not, however, agree with those who, I am convinced, will try to use this motion in the future as a cheap and — allow me to say so — demagogic argument in favour of a certain policy.

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

Mr Maher. — We have very limited time today and a heavy agenda still to get through. There is confusion about this subject-matter; enough information is not available to us. I think it would be a good idea if, with your permission, Mr Gundelach, since he is here, would at this moment explain what the position is in relation to the sales or non-sales of butter to Russia. Perhaps, as a result of these explanations, we could save time. Some of us may not even need to intervene in the debate.

President. — I think it is a very helpful suggestion, if Mr Gundelach would agree.

I call Mr Aigner first.

Mr Aigner, Chairman of the Committee on Budgetary Control. — (D) Mr President, surely it is necessary for Mr Gundelach to hear the opinion of Parliament before he answers. Therefore kindly allow me, as

Aigner

Chairman of the Committee on Budgetary Control, to say a few words on this motion for a resolution.

I am particularly grateful to you, Mr Gundelach, for saying that you are ready to be at the disposal of my committee on Thursday for a full discussion. I have already given you a written indication of the particular points that we wish to discuss with you in detail.

Mr President, this Parliament has for years been telling the Commission that it does not keep a close enough watch on the administration of the agricultural markets and that — I am putting this very carefully — the suspicion exists that factors outside the decision-making process play an important part. That is to say that the parties concerned may manipulate the information they supply; since this cannot be correctly analysed, it gives rise to wrong decisions by the Commission.

I also feel that, above all, the Commission is supporting an export policy that is quite definitely in conflict with the express will of this Parliament. We have often stated that we consider the policy of heavily-subsidized sales to state-trading countries — I am not naming any particular country — as basically wrong because the machinery is unsuitable. We have often enough asked the Commission to develop different machinery for trade with state-trading countries. Last week in Luxembourg, Mr Gundelach, during the first reading of the budget, we requested that there should be no licence or pre-fixed contract arrangements at all with state-trading countries and a direct tendering procedure used instead. It is simply inadmissible, and European taxpayers cannot be asked to accept, that we should send thousands of tonnes of heavily-subsidized butter to Soviet Russia, which that country can then sell at three or four times the price to its own population. That is not the purpose of subsidies.

The motion for a resolution has my full support on very topical grounds. It is impossible to understand how the Commission, against the advice of the dealers — though certainly not against that of the Soviet purchasing company — and just at a time when the market for the first time was craving for deliveries of our surplus dairy products, should have increased the refund rate from 100 to 160 ECUs per 100 kg and then, because of shocked public reaction, reduced it by 10 points to 150 . . .

(Interruption by Mr Gundelach)

Naturally, Mr Gundelach, the rate then suddenly went down from 160 to 150. But it is still difficult to understand why the figure went from 100 to 150. We do not understand why. I can only imagine that this policy was in fact intended to cover up manipulated contracts. Since the refund rates are paid in two stages, perhaps the agreement is for 85 % on signing the contract, it being possible to waive the remaining 15 % when the identity of the country of destination is

established, because in fact the goods are delivered to quite different destinations from those specified in the contracts originally signed. Parliament suspects that this was the reason for the incredible increase in the rate of refund and is of the opinion that its political will is therefore not being respected.

These are grave criticisms, Mr Gundelach, and I hope that, in the dialogue between us, it will be possible to achieve complete transparency with regard to these facts and events.

President. — I call Mr Gundelach.

Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission.

— Mr President, I do not think that it is only a matter for discussion in Mr Aigner's committee, even if I am most happy to appear before that committee. When public criticism is being voiced by this Parliament against the action and management of the Commission and it seems as if Members of Parliament are about to pass judgement even before having heard the accused, it would appear to me to be a most extraordinary procedure.

The draft resolution in front of you is based upon rumours from the press. It unfortunately does not take into account the full explanation in regard to these matters which I previously gave to the plenary sitting and to committees of Parliament, including Mr Aigner's, and our ongoing policy has not been changed. It was given to the Committee on Agriculture on Monday of this week, and was seemingly to the satisfaction of the committee at that stage; but there is not one reference here to any of the information or points of view which the Commission had put on the table; one continues down the road on the basis of press reports which are quite demonstrably wrong. There is, Mr Aigner, nothing incomprehensible about all this, and I shall proceed to explain the main elements once again.

But first I want to make one point quite clear. You speak, Mr Aigner, about state-trading countries. I am speaking about Russia, because that is what this draft resolution is about. There has not been agreed one kilogramme of pre-fixed butter to Russia. Not one kilogramme. It has not even been considered, and to Mr De Gucht I must say it was not due to any intervention on Mr Ertl's part. He got, like the other Ministers, the same explanation as you are getting now and was fully satisfied. It was ongoing Commission policy in accordance with the promises I have given to this House. We have allowed not a single kilo of butter to be contracted for with Russia or with any destination which might lead to Russia. Another correction here. We do consider the destination, and when I see for instance pre-fixed butter for Cuba I am not so stupid that I cannot see that that means Russia. Of course there is a very, very limited consumption of

Gundelach

butter in Cuba; and if this type of butter appears all of a sudden, then that gets stopped as well.

The power of the Commission to see to it that this is the situation, and remains the situation for as long as necessary, lies in the fact that, as I have explained to this House before, we have introduced very strict rules on requests which might lead to sales to Russia. In particular, all intervention agencies have to report daily on what has been pre-fixed and for what destinations, and the Commission has the right, within five days, to reject any pre-fixed butter which is requested, wherever it might be, and for whatever destination. We made use of that power *immediately* when we were confronted with requests for pre-fixed butter from Russia or, for instance, Cuba or any other destination which might lead to sales to Russia.

All this talk of huge sales of butter to Russia is simply a newspaper story, and it is beneath the dignity of this House to carry on a solemn debate on the basis of pure rumours which have been denied again and again by the Commission over the last two or three weeks, where the Commission's policy was clearly established months ago that we were not going to tolerate it and were going to use weapons which we had clawed to us from the Council in order to pursue this policy.

Concerning the level of refunds on 10 June: these stood, quite in accordance with world market prices, at 160. Our prices were then as they have been throughout, at the upper limit of world market prices. In other words, our export refunds were the smallest they could be to move the amount of butter which had to be moved out in order to prevent butter from piling up, to the detriment of the budget, in our intervention stocks.

But by 10 June there was a considerable quantity of pre-fixed butter: nothing to do with Russia — ordinary trade. There have been sales to Russia, but only the quantity worked out in the position taken by the Council and discussed in the European Parliament — some 70 000 tonnes. No more.

So, on 10 June there were quite a number of requests for pre-fixed butter for other destinations. We found that this was due to the fact that traders hoped that pre-fixing would affect the milk price and lead to a retroactive increase in other export refunds on milk products. We refused that, and on 10 June we reduced the export refund to 100. We might just as well have said zero, because it was an unoperational level. 100 was not an expression of what the refunds should be in order to sell butter, it was a level chosen at random but low enough to ensure that no butter was sold. Later I learned that this causes confusion. In future it will not be set at 100; since if it is unoperational, it will be set at zero, since everybody can see that a zero is a zero!

In October we had to start planning for normal sales in the first quarter of 1981, because traders have to

improve their contacts with Switzerland or Morocco or wherever it may be. We therefore considered reopening refunds at an operative level and we eventually did so in the beginning of November at the level of 160. That was too high, not through an error of judgement on the part of the Commission, it was the price that day. There was an American election which put the dollar up. Immediately we recognized that the price was due to the change in the dollar overnight from 4 to 5, we cancelled all pre-fixed butter to all destinations not only Russia, but everywhere. Nothing was sold at 160. And we set it at 150. At that stage there were no requests for pre-fixed butter from Russia.

That came at the beginning of this week. We cancelled the whole thing again, and the price will be fixed in one or two weeks' time when the market has settled into a calmer pattern. I am not speaking about Russia but about the rest of the world. Nothing was sold at 160. Practically nothing at 150. Nothing to Russia at all. I therefore cannot accept, either in regard to transactions with Russia or other state-trading countries or in regard to the management of prices, any criticism.

I must add that we are still selling a considerable amount of butter and other dairy products on the internal markets with subsidies, which of course are much more of a burden to the budget than export refunds.

We have not agreed this year, nor have we any commitment to do so, to pay money for the so-called Christmas butter, which, of course, is very popular, but it does not change the amount of butter sold in the longer term, because less is bought before or less after. If we had decided on sales of Christmas butter this year, I should have been forced to come to the House, which I cannot, and ask for a supplementary budget for budgetary reasons that have therefore to be left out. That is not so that money can be used for huge sales of butter to Russia. That is simply not true. As far as the future in 1981 is concerned, we shall proceed on the basis of the same policy I have described here today, with full recognition of the Council's decisions of January and February of this year, as discussed also in this Parliament.

(Applause)

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

Mr Tolman. — *(NL)* Mr President, we are now running badly short of time. After Mr Gundelach's statement, which has given us the facts, we can do one of two things: either the Members who tabled the motion for a resolution withdraw it, or else we can go straight to the vote without further debate.

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

Mr Hord. — Mr President, I think it might be more pertinent to give those people who have asked to speak an opportunity of speaking or at least of replying to certain points made by Mr Gundelach, so that we can have something to vote on.

President. — I put to the vote the proposal to close the debate.

The motion is carried.

I call Mr Aigner on a point of order.

Mr Aigner. — (D) Mr President, it is true that we cannot fully discuss these urgent questions under the prevailing pressure of time. I should therefore be grateful to you, to prevent the matter being swept under the table — for that would cost European taxpayers too much money — if we could refer this question to the Committee on Budgets, the Committee on Budgetary Control and the Committee on Agriculture, so that the necessary debate can be held free of the constraint of time.

President. — Mr Aigner has asked for the matter to be referred to committee.

I call Mr Clinton on a point of order.

Mr Clinton. — Mr President, before the vote was taken I was asking for the floor on a point of order, but nobody happened to see me. I think it is totally wrong that one Member should be selected in the House to give a point of view on exports of butter to Russia or anywhere else and that the other people who had their names down should be completely ignored and excluded. I think it is very poor procedure.

President. — Well, it is perfectly possible for any Member to move the closure of a debate. We have voted upon it and the House has made its decision. You may have your own view on it, of course, but now another formal proposal has been made by Mr Aigner that the matter be referred to committee. This is also in order and we shall now proceed to vote on it.

The proposal is adopted.

14. *Regulation on the importation of New Zealand butter*

President. — The next item is the report by Miss Quin (Doc. 1-594/80), on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-336/80) for a regulation relating to the importation of New Zealand butter into the Community on special terms.

I call Miss Quin.

Miss Quin, rapporteur. — Mr President, I shall be as brief as possible in presenting this report. The report, which was adopted by the Committee on Agriculture, supports the Commission's proposal for a permanent arrangement governing imports of New Zealand butter. My report is also backed up by favourable opinions from the Committee on External Economic Relations and, I understand, the Committee on Budgets. The Commission's proposal on which the report is based is, I believe, aimed at promoting proper cooperation between New Zealand and the EEC as the two major butter-exporting countries on the world market. While a certain amount of cooperation does take place between these two trading-units, I believe that the proposal provides a fair and lasting basis for this.

The Commission's proposal envisages an orderly reduction of New Zealand imports to the EEC to 90 000 tonnes by 1984 and also a simplification of the levy and price arrangements.

The report recognizes the heavy economic dependence of New Zealand on exports of dairy products as well as the links, not only economic but also historical and political, between New Zealand and the EEC as a whole. Obviously, the links between New Zealand and the UK are close, but New Zealand is a country with a European and not just a British tradition. The majority in the Committee on Agriculture did support the report, although certain criticisms were expressed about having imports from New Zealand. Very briefly I will say one or two things about this.

Although it may seem odd for the Community to import butter when the Community itself has a surplus of this product and this does constitute a certain budgetary burden, I think there are various ways in which such a criticism of the present arrangement can be refuted. If no New Zealand butter came into the EEC, the EEC would still have a substantial surplus and the problems of EEC dairy producers would still exist. New Zealand is not responsible for those aspects of the agricultural policy which have tended to promote such a dramatic increase in production and therefore should not be penalized for this.

New Zealand's dairy production has remained stable for the last 6 or 7 years, whereas that of the Community has increased dramatically. In the last 2½ to 3 years, it has increased its milk production by more than the total milk production of New Zealand.

Consequently, the Community has been increasingly competing with New Zealand on the world market.

Quin

Having exported only 24 000 tonnes in 1975, the Community is likely to export this year something in the region of 400 000 tonnes. New Zealand has sought to diversify her products and has been successful, but my report points out that, since these opportunities remain strictly limited, there is a limit to the diversification which can take place.

It is true that Japan and the United States adopt fairly protectionist attitudes as far as dairy products are concerned; but I think it is an odd contradiction for those in the EEC to criticize Japan and the United States on the one hand and at the same time argue for complete protection of the Community market on the other.

In conclusion, in presenting this report, I would like to say that for me our response to New Zealand is a test of our general attitude towards trading relations and the extent to which, despite our own agricultural difficulties, we are prepared to be outward-looking. I believe the report and the Commission's proposals are in the interests of world dairy cooperation and constitute an enlightened response to a friendly third country and to a valuable trading partner.

President. — I call Mrs Cresson.

Mrs Cresson. — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the French Socialists consider that the Commission's proposals to continue the importation of New Zealand butter into the Community indefinitely are unacceptable.

Once again we are going back on signed and sealed agreements. Protocol 18, annexed to the United Kingdom's treaty of accession, specified special conditions for these imports up to 1977. The extension of this provision was agreed by the Council in 1975 and 1976: imports of New Zealand butter were to be reduced from 120 000 tonnes in 1978 to 115 000 in 1980. In April 1979, the Commission suggested the extension of the agreement to 1983, but under different arrangements, with annual imports of 92 500 tonnes at 75 % of the intervention price. The Commission now envisages that these imports should continue after 1984, and with no time-limit, with the vague promise to take another look at the way the scheme is operating.

Every day we hear complaints from all sides, but particularly from the UK, about the cost of agricultural spending and in particular the spending on milk. Now production in the UK, encouraged by exchange-rates, went up from 48 000 tonnes in 1975 to 161 000 in 1979. Over the same period, consumption in the UK fell from 462 000 tonnes in 1975 to 389 000 in 1979. The United Kingdom therefore reduced its butter imports from the other Community countries by 29 %. In 1980, the United Kingdom, whose butter exports have continually increased — from 16 000 tonnes in

1976 to 95 000 in 1980 — became a net butter exporter. The familiar circuit of lamb and ACP sugar thus now also applies in the case of butter.

I wonder what the Commission has in mind in making European farmers — and French farmers in particular — pay a steeply rising co-responsibility levy whilst guaranteeing them, for only one year, an income that has again fallen for the seventh year in succession, whereas New Zealand sees its future as a milk producer guaranteed indefinitely with no levy to pay. What is more, the annual increase in income per tonne of butter for the New Zealand producer, as proposed by the Commission, is very considerable, since the intention is to pay 75 % of the intervention price instead of 53 %.

There is, of course, no question of doing without this necessary help overnight. That is what a transitional period is for, but this one has not been used as it ought. What is worse, European farmers are paying for this failure. Is a generous policy of this kind any help to European industry? Of course not. Japan and the United States are still importing New Zealand agricultural produce as grudgingly as they did ten years ago, and in the meantime they have become major suppliers in other products. Community exports on the other hand, not including the United Kingdom, went up from 8 to only 9 % of total New Zealand imports between 1970 and 1978. It is true that the situation in British exports is even worse, because they fell from 30 to 17 % of New Zealand imports over the same period. Nevertheless, the New Zealand trade balance with the Community is negative and constantly so because of the continuous increase in invisible exports to New Zealand, which, of course, mainly benefit the United Kingdom.

The French Socialists have tabled amendments and we shall vote for them and for others, but the truth is that the Commission's proposals, which disregard the principle of Community preference, make transitional arrangements permanent and turn exceptions into rules, are wholly unacceptable. The French Socialists do not therefore accept them and do not see who in France, or among those to whom the common agricultural policy is important, could accept them.

President. — I call Mr de Courcy Ling on a point of order.

Mr de Courcy Ling. — Mr President, I beg to move the closure of the debate. In so doing, I should like to say that the House has heard with interest two eloquent speeches, both by members of the Socialist Group. The first, I thought, put an extremely persuasive case and I am bound to say that the second misled the House on certain important points of detail — namely, on certain historical points. I beg to move the closure of the debate, Mr President.

President. — I call Mr Martin on that point of order.

Mr Martin. — (*F*) Mr President, my name is down to speak in this debate. To me it is a democratic principle that all those whose names are down to speak should be allowed to do so. It would be insufferable to close the debate now.

President. — Under Rule 32 anybody may stand up and move the closure of the debate. It is for you to use your eloquence in the brief intervention you have just made to persuade people to vote in favour of continuing the debate. It is there that the democracy lies.

(Parliament rejected¹ the motion to close the debate)

I call Mr Tolman.

Mr Tolman. — (*NL*) Mr President, I shall meet your wishes and use telegraphic brevity for the few comments I wish to make on the problems regarding New Zealand that have arisen since the accession of the United Kingdom. The regulation has to be revised and possibly renewed, and it is a good thing that we should use this occasion to take stock. That is what I intend to do by referring to one or two points.

Why did the regulation come into being? Because there are historical and political ties between the United Kingdom and New Zealand, because New Zealand has a very one-sided agricultural sector and because an abrupt interruption of butter exports in 1973 would have caused it great problems.

We know that, in Parliament, exceptionally fierce criticism is levelled at the agricultural policy. The criticism is exaggerated, but sometimes it is justified with regard to policy in the dairy-produce sector. Pressure comes from all sides to put it right. For that reason, continuing to import 90 000 tonnes of butter is a very illogical proposal. Because dairy produce has so often been a problem, unpleasant measures have had to be taken. Let me list them: a price-freeze on surplus produce lasting three years, co-responsibility levies and the prospect of an extra levy next year on any expansion in production. — And New Zealand can just go on as before, as Mrs Cresson has just said.

We must also, because there is a special relationship between New Zealand and the United Kingdom, take note of the fact that butter consumption has fallen slightly in the United Kingdom and butter production has gone up by 70 %.

I have the impression that we are sometimes a little careless in the way we add to our agricultural problems. We import surplus products — butter from New Zealand — and unlimited quantities from America, and when you look at the trade balance you can see that we have a deficit of \$ 5.8 billion. The United States operate a powerful protectionist policy with

regard to dairy produce. Finally, we have consistently failed to bring in a regulation on oils and fats.

In eight years, New Zealand has had time to change its policy. The present situation in the Community does not allow us to continue with these imports. Producers cannot understand it, and what must consumers say when they are always being told about surpluses and dairy-produce mountains? Now if we decide to import another 360 million packs of butter or, in other words, to add 25 % to our butter stocks, then no one will understand it at all. On top of that, this matter comes up just at the right time. New Zealand can probably do business just as well with another country. I don't need to say which. The proposal to go on with these imports therefore deserves very clearly to be rejected.

President. — I call Mr Curry.

Mr Curry. — Mr President, this is an issue on which it is very easy to get worked up. There are many Members of this Parliament who are passionately committed to the defence of the common agricultural policy, and New Zealand imports are seen by them as part of a seditious British plot against the very foundations of the Community. Mrs Cresson was passionate on this score, insofar as anybody reading her speech as quickly as she read it could be passionate about anything.

In Britain, where many people have got sons, daughters and relatives in New Zealand and where the memories of ties forged in war and peace are very strong, the fate of this patch of earth on the other side of the globe is equally a subject of very powerful emotion.

I wish to steer clear of the emotional presentation today. I am not even going to mention the importance of the issue as a symbol of the Community's intentions to be part of an open-trading Community. I wish to suggest quite clearly that the continued access for New Zealand butter, which is one of the few things she has got to export, is by any standard of plain common sense in the interests of the whole European Community.

I am not going to pretend that these imports do not create problems. Of course they do. We have about 360 000 tonnes of our own butter — about 15 % of production — which has got to be got rid of at a subsidy of about £ 1 000 a tonne to whoever will buy it. To import 90 000 tonnes a year, which is what is being proposed, of course will make our problem more difficult. But what is the practical alternative? Keep it out? — A nice, simple solution! And what happens then? What happens is that that New Zealand butter goes onto the world market, where it competes with the butter the Community will still have to sell there. The result is ruinous competition which will

¹ By sitting and standing.

Curry

force up the cost of exporting in the Community and give to the countries of Eastern Europe, virtually the only people who want to buy butter on the world market, a blissful opportunity to play off the European taxpayer against the New Zealand Dairy Board, with the entire profit gained by their own political régimes, which have nothing in common with the political system in either this Community or New Zealand.

Any idea that the New Zealand surplus would disappear like snow in summer by a policy of trying to put up a 'No entrance' sign is pure illusion. Even if every pat of New Zealand butter sold in this Community were replaced with a pat of Community butter — no doubt in these disagreeable 12 and 14 gramme packs which are the only manifestation of butter you can get in Strasbourg — there would still be a butter surplus of 10 % in the Community. The amount it is being proposed to admit each year is somewhat below the historical level of annual increase of butter in the Community. So that is the first reason for accepting it. We both supply the world market. If we are not both going to be exploited by commercial blackmail we have no choice but to sit down and discuss together how we approach the world market so as to make the most of our joint position as monopoly suppliers. Nothing could be more ludicrous than a policy of permanent and embittered competition.

The second reason why self-interest should indicate our willingness to accept New Zealand access is the need to develop our own exports to New Zealand. The Community is New Zealand's biggest trading partner: she supplies more than a quarter of New Zealand's imports, and allowing for invisible trade, the New Zealand deficit is about \$ 150 million. It would be perfectly absurd to think that the Community can exclude the only commodity New Zealand has got to sell and at the same time continue to supply her with telecommunications equipment — of which a large part is French — cars and machine tools. To cut off sales of New Zealand butter to the Community would not create one single job in Europe. To destroy the Community's trade with New Zealand would mean the loss of thousands of jobs inside this Community.

(Applause)

The third reason why Community self-interest should dictate our need to import is the strategic rôle of New Zealand and the Pacific. It is all very well for Mr Tolman to say that we should go away and find new markets. The Community has been trying to find new markets for years. We are in the throes of a recession. Tell me how easy it is for a nation of three million people almost wholly dependent on trade in dairy produce to diversify with the simplicity and ease with which Mr Tolman seems to think it can be done. Just look at the facts of the case! Haven't our own car-makers who have just come back empty-handed from Japan got evidence enough of how difficult it is

to multiply trade when the whole of the world is in economic recession?

New Zealand's sales are falling. Before Britain entered the Community, New Zealand was selling 175 000 tonnes of butter and 70 000 tonnes of cheese a year to the United Kingdom. Last year its entitlement was only 125 000 tonnes of butter, and not even a single mousetrap morsel of cheese was sold. During a time when costs have risen in New Zealand by 180 %, her dairy farmers have had an increase in real returns of only about one-quarter of that. So the proposals to stabilize sales at about 90 000 tonnes a year, Mr President, with a fixed tax-rate and adequate arrangements to review the position in the light of market developments, are surely reasonable, equitable and designed to achieve a responsible balance between the Community's obligations towards her own farming community and towards her international trading partners. The proposals are merely common sense in pursuit of a common interest and deserve the support of this House.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Martin.

Mr Martin. — *(F)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the eminently official Commission des comptes de l'Agriculture has just made known the trend in French farmers' incomes in 1980. Overall, the fall in gross income exceeds 6 %, but net income, which is a better measure of purchasing-power, will go down by over 10 %. Stock farmers, and milk producers in particular, are the hardest hit. This decrease is largely due to decisions by the Commission and the Council approved by the majority in this House: pressure on prices and taxes and super-taxes on producers, but immunity for imports of New Zealand vegetable fats and butter.

About the serious situation of milk producers and the deterioration of their living and working conditions, Miss Quin is unconcerned. 'That is not her business'. There is not a word about it in her motion for a resolution, which could just as well have been signed by a New Zealand minister or, better, the managing director of the New Zealand Dairy Board, which has the monopoly of New Zealand butter exports. On behalf of the overriding interests of New Zealand, she approves the Commission and its proposal not only to renew once again the preferential arrangements for New Zealand butter imports into Great Britain but also to extend it to all EEC countries and to reduce the levy. This proposal, which will affect the EEC agricultural budget and have serious implications for milk producers, is a purely political gesture. That is clear from the Commission's explanatory statement, which says: 'New Zealand must continue to provide a

Martin

pole of stability in the Pacific.' Maybe, but farmers should not have to pay the bill!

At the outset, the only purpose of this exemption granted to the United Kingdom was to allow it to adjust itself to Community mechanisms. It has arbitrarily and unfairly been continued since the 1975 Dublin agreement. This temporary exemption, now becoming permanent, is a serious breach of Community preference on top of the long list of other exemptions relating to oils and fats, soja, substitute products, etc. We have reached a point where the main Community rule is the exception. In the interests of producers in our regions this cannot go on. This exemption is all the less warranted in that the United Kingdom is exporting increasing quantities of butter to the EEC whilst at the same time obstructing imports of dairy produce from other EEC countries.

Moreover, we refuse to have the EEC compensating for the closure of the American and Japanese markets to New Zealand butter. The continuance of these imports, denounced by the non-governmental organizations in the EEC, is all the more intolerable that the Commission is still refusing to give refunds at the level that would permit access to the world market. All these exemptions are the more scandalous in that they are supported or demanded by the fiercest enemies of the CAP, the very people who accuse producers of creating surpluses and costing us too much and who are conducting an offensive on all fronts to destroy the CAP and throw it open 'to the fresh wind of free trade'. It is these same people who ask that these exemptions, which cost the EEC budget so much, be maintained. Messieurs les Anglais, you have adopted the habit, in this House, of being the first to fire, at the CAP. In return, please play fair: 'Messieurs les Anglais, you pay first.'

New Zealand is adding its own voice to the chorus of CAP critics. The September 1980 issue of the official 'New Zealand' magazine dwells at length on 'the absurd nature of the CAP' and asks that it be revised. Has not New Zealand, via the United Kingdom, become a partner of the EEC from which it has found a way of extracting the benefits without suffering the drawbacks?

For us, the French Communist and Allies, the interests of the milk producers come before those of the New Zealand Dairy Board or those of Unilever. This is why we ask you to reject Miss Quin's motion for a resolution and to throw out the Commission's proposals. We ask for the immediate repeal of the preferential arrangements under which the United Kingdom imports New Zealand butter. If you followed our proposal you would prove your resolve to uphold the Community preference principle and protect our producers. At the same time you would be taking a first step towards the formulation of a true policy on oils and fats — which we are continually demanding — with limitations and taxes on vegetable fat imports.

President. — I call Mrs Martin.

Mrs Martin. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, without wishing to deny that New Zealand has very close links with the Community and particularly the United Kingdom, which Protocol 18 and the 1975 Dublin summit, moreover, both recognize, I am opposed to this new system proposed to us by the Commission for the future.

During the discussion on the budget, many Members stressed the need to keep Community milk surpluses within limits. Strangely enough, I note that it is often the same Members who today defend just as passionately this new preferential system which is a grave violation of the principle of Community preference. Please, let us be logical. Committing ourselves for four years or even longer is clearly out of the question at a time when the Community has to contend with financial difficulties that can be solved only on an annual basis in the framework of the budget. It is illogical to separate the Community's internal financial problems from its relations with third countries. Public opinion would be at a loss and the agricultural sector would in the end wonder why it is necessary to reduce butter production when the Community budget is being used to finance the absorption of surpluses from other countries.

There is no reason to make permanent, by repeated extensions, a system designed to be transitional. It must remain so, particularly since the idea, here, would not be to renew a system that has already been renewed once but to extend to the whole of the Community special arrangements so far applied only to butter imports into the United Kingdom, a traditional market for New Zealand. No time-limit is set for this new arrangement which provides New Zealand producers with long-term guarantees whereas the income guarantees to European producers never go beyond one year. Is it right to perpetuate such a system at a time when the Community has financial difficulties and when the reform of the common agricultural policy is in the air? And supposing we were, in spite of everything, forced to move in the direction of such an extension, we could not accept it for more than one year. We also want the budgetary cost of these imports, arising out of political considerations, to cease being imputed to agriculture.

What is more, this House has declared itself several times, including a very recent occasion, in favour of the reclassification of all budgetary spending required by policies other than the common agricultural policy. The problem of New Zealand butter imports, beyond this fresh extension, should be considered at the same time as the definition of an overall policy for oils and fats which we have already been demanding for a very long time — too long in fact.

Martin

This is why, with Mr Delatte and other Members, we have tabled an amendment along those lines. I refer to Amendment No 1. In this way we do not challenge the EEC's political responsibility towards New Zealand — which has been stressed by our rapporteur — but we ask that the solution to be found to this question should not be separated from our study of the changes to be made to the common agricultural policy.

President. — I call Mr Remilly.

Mr Remilly. — (*F*) Mr President, we too would like an overall policy on oils and fats. We are being asked to perpetuate what was only provisional in 1974 and remained so in 1977, that is to say the sale of butter to the EEC by New Zealand. Everything we hear in this House tells us, time and time again, that Community production is already heavily in surplus.

Why the retention of this privilege? How can public opinion and the agricultural sector understand the declared need to reduce butter production in the Community if, in practice, the same Community budget is used to finance the absorption of surplus New Zealand dairy produce? The only answer is: New Zealand has to be given extra time to find a solution to its problems. Why should we accept that New Zealand should, so to speak, be a member of the common agricultural market by proxy and enjoy its advantages without bearing any of the cost? The inadmissible nature of this pretext put forward to justify this fresh bending of the Community preference rule — that is to say, the strength of the relations between New Zealand and the European countries — is clear to all.

But even if we accept this argument, two questions have to be asked. What does Europe get from New Zealand, in political and economic terms, in return for this privileged treatment? Does it buy cars, steel products or computers from European industry, does it buy European aircraft? Unfortunately the answer is no. The details for those who need them, are given in Mrs Quin's report. In 1965, 43 % of New Zealand's imports came from the EEC. In 1978, 27 % of New Zealand's imports came from the EEC. Over the same period Japan doubled its share of New Zealand imports and stopped buying its butter.

These are the reasons why we cannot accept the Commission's proposal or, therefore, approve the motion for a resolution we are considering.

Over and above these considerations, however, there is another lesson to be learned from what we might call the New Zealand butter affair. The lesson is clear. It is that there are opportunities for exporting agricultural products all over the world even in the case of dairy produce. New Zealand proves the point. Here are a few revealing figures. Every year, New Zealand

exports 175 000 tonnes of butter, over 200 000 tonnes of powdered milk and 66 000 tonnes of cheese.

An export policy is therefore possible and even necessary for EEC agricultural products. It is possible because the markets exist and it is necessary because it is a way of achieving the prosperity of European farmers, food independence for the population and an increase in food aid to the developing countries. It would, in addition, contribute to political power as the events of every day and the use made of it by other countries show. If the New Zealand butter affair had the effect of convincing our Community of the need for this agricultural exports policy, the common agricultural policy, so criticized in many cases, would show not only its utility to European farmers and consumers, but also its political necessity for Western European countries.

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

Mr Cottrell. — Mr President, in the interests of efficiency and in order to make sure that this report will reach the Council of Agriculture Ministers meeting on Monday, I beg to move the closure of the debate under Rule 32 of the Rules of Procedure.

President. — Under Rule 12, once Parliament has decided on its procedure with regard to the debates, it may not be amended.

I call Mr Muntingh.

Mr Muntingh. — (*NL*) Mr President, a few centuries ago, New Zealand was an empty country and, to use the words of a well-known book, a land flowing with milk and honey. Later it was inhabited by the Maoris, the first people to live there, and then it was colonized. Who colonized it? People who came primarily from Western Europe. That means that, in fact, New Zealand is a distant member of our family and with the family you maintain good relations. But apart from being a distant member of the family, New Zealand is also a good friend and acquaintance. New Zealand has always maintained good relations with our countries and, when the European Community was set up, with that Community. It has become a firm friend.

This New Zealand demonstrated again in 1940-45 when it stood shoulder to shoulder with us in the fight against fascism. You do not let family and friends down when they are in trouble. New Zealand has shown itself to be a very good friend in the case of agricultural surpluses because it has tried with might and main to diversify its market and it gave its agreement to reducing the quotas originally fixed.

In short, New Zealand has done what a good friend and member of the family should do. On top of these

Muntingh

two virtues, the country possesses that of being our trading partner. And the fact is that, in international trade, there is a question of give and take. When one country in a trade partnership is an economic giant like the European Community and the other small then there are certain standards of ethics that apply. And if I add the fact that, in the present case, it is to the advantage of the giant, namely the European Community, to maintain good economic relations with New Zealand, then there is no reason at all not to approve the Commission's proposal and the proposals spelled out in Mrs Quin's report.

I find it embarrassing when conflict develops in the House between France and the United Kingdom about whether one or the other is entitled to import a few more tonnes of butter or a few less, when we know we are talking about a relationship that has grown up over many years and a country that has done its utmost to find a solution. It is embarrassing to hear Members say that this kind of thing simply has to be swept off the map. I cannot understand it.

In my view, the European Community has assumed the rights and duties of both France and the United Kingdom. We must take steps to see that New Zealand receives that to which it has a right as a distant member of the family and a trading partner, in other words what the Commission has proposed.

President — I call Mr Welsh to speak on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations.

Mr Welsh, draftsman of an opinion. — Mr President, it is my duty to move the opinion of the Committee on External Economic Relations, which, of course, fully endorses Miss Quin's report. I do not propose to say very much more than that, because I notice that the people who have spoken against this report have delivered their carefully prepared speeches and, with the distinguished and honourable exception of Mrs Martin, have probably flounced out of the Chamber. I think that is fairly typical of the general attitude of the lobbyists in this case. They are prepared to listen to no one. I am not therefore going to debate with them.

I would merely like to put it on the record that the Committee on External Economic Relations, which has the interests of the whole of the Community at heart, endorsed its opinion by 13 votes to 0 and that every single nationality from every Member State was represented in that decision.

President. — I call Mr Maher.

Mr Maher. — Mr President, I am someone who may not agree with Mr Welsh, but I can tell you that I will stay in this House. I think I have been here a lot

longer than Mr Welsh, if the times were added up. However, that is not the point I want to make.

I have a great deal of sympathy for New Zealand. I know the country reasonably well. I know its farmers very well. I do not want to speak against them. I am not for a moment suggesting that we should try to damage them or harm them.

That is not where the real problem lies, however. The real problem is in this House and in this Community. We are not prepared to pay for the luxury of having New Zealand butter come into this Community. That is the problem. What most people are saying is, let the farmers of the Community pay. Every time the problem arises about increasing farmers' incomes, which are unavoidably depressed because of problems on the agricultural export market caused by imports, people say it cannot be done, it is too expensive. We have seen an unholy alliance between the British Socialists and the British Conservatives every time an attempt is made to establish reasonable price increases for farm products. They say, we cannot do it; we have surpluses; surpluses are costing too much; we have got to peg down farm incomes. That is the question we have got to come to terms with. Are we prepared to pay?

I have the greatest admiration for Mr Curry; he is a very intelligent man, and I believe he spoke with great sincerity; but I do not understand his logic. What he was saying today, if you carry his argument to the logical conclusion, was that the more butter we import, the better off we are going to be. That is the logic of it. What he said was, by importing New Zealand butter we have more jobs and it costs us less. Surely this means that if we increase the import of butter, we shall have more jobs and more money and it will cost us less. I do not understand the logic of that. It is completely lost on me. Mr Curry, I think you have to think again.

Miss Quin, if you would listen for a moment please, I do not understand your logic either. Not long ago I heard you proposing that there be a limitation on imports of fish, because, you said, the incomes of the fishermen in your constituency were being adversely affected by the imports of fish. Yes you did, and you supported that very strongly. But you do not give a damn about the incomes of dairy farmers. In my country, they have fallen by 45% in real terms in two years. You then expect them to accept that we should have imports of butter, which are in fact the cause of the problem. They are told they cannot have increases in milk prices but, indeed, have to pay levies in order to dispose of surpluses.

I think this Parliament has got to get rid of this Jekyll-and-Hyde attitude. Of course let us have New Zealand butter in, but let us not complain if it is going to increase the cost of the budget. Let us be prepared to pay for it. At least we shall then begin to see

Maher

whether we can have a logical CAP or not. But do not ask just the farmers in the Community — particularly the small ones and most dairy farmers are very small — to pay for this luxury. If you want it, be prepared to pay for it!

President. — I call Mr De Keersmaeker.

Mr De Keersmaeker. — (NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, this problem of importing butter from New Zealand without special precautions is far more than just a technical question. The European Community took a political, economic and social option in defining its agricultural policy. If we wish to uphold these fundamental options then we must respect and maintain the various pillars on which that policy is built. That is the substance of the matter.

One of these pillars is Community preference, to which, at that time for historical reasons that Mr Tolman has very clearly explained; an exception was made. That exception is now being consolidated and in that way we are weakening the strength of one of the pillars. This whole question has nothing to do with the criticism rightly or wrongly levelled at the agricultural policy or points about imbalance between big and little traders and between the different regions — the reasons why, again rightly or wrongly, people want to make changes to that agricultural policy. It does, and what Mr Maher said about this is very true, have to do with the budgetary imbalance or more specifically the fact that the sector concerned is already overloaded, already struggling with surpluses and now to be further overloaded because of the loss of income to the European Community.

Mr Muntingh says that New Zealand is a worthy friend of the European Community. That is, of course, abundantly clear. But that is not the point. The point is who is to pay the bill. Are the costs of this operation going to be met exclusively by the farmers, yes or no? That is the question.

The farmers are told that the till is empty and that, if they are looking for an extremely necessary and legitimate price adjustment which is still insufficient then they must pay for it themselves and, what is more, they alone. They have to pay an extra tax — what we call *inleveren* — in this difficult time of crisis. When the government in my country proposed to deduct 2% from the forthcoming increase in civil service salaries, a general protest went up. Farmers have been paying these levies for two years now, and if it is now proposed to open the door even wider by making this exception to Community preference permanent, then for us this will be too much of a bad thing. This concern is expressed in the amendments tabled by Mr Tolman, which we fully support.

President. — I call Mr Newton Dunn to speak on behalf of the Committee on Budgets.

Mr Newton Dunn, draftsman of an opinion.
— Despite the cry of 'oh no!' from in front of me, Mr President, I am duty bound to give my opinion as draftsman for the Committee on Budgets. I shall do so in 30 seconds.

Specifically, regarding the proposal to extend the arrangements for the import of butter into the United Kingdom, the Committee on Budgets voted to approve the proposal. However, it regretted the attitude of the Council, which had amended the existing rules without consulting the Parliament in good time. The committee was of the opinion that the Council's attitude was reprehensible from the point of view of relations between the Community institutions, and that it undermined the validity of the consultation procedure itself. The committee believed that, if this should ever happen again, the European Parliament should refrain from delivering an opinion and reveal the facts to the public.

On the second proposal, regarding importation into the Community on special terms, the committee voted to accept the proposal.

President. — I call Mr Gundelach.

Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission. — I just want to make it absolutely clear that the Commission stands by its proposal. It can be limited in time to three or four years.

What is at stake here, Mr President, as people seem to forget, is our good name as a partner in international cooperation. We discussed only half-an-hour ago the extent to which we have become major exporters of agricultural commodities. How do you think the world is going to react to that if we are not willing to take care of a friend and an ally like New Zealand.

If you say no, you will never live it down.

(Applause)

President. — The debate is closed.

We shall now consider the motion for a resolution.

(Parliament adopted the first three indents)

After the third indent, I have Amendment No 18, by Mr Pranchère, seeking to replace the motion by a new text:

- having regard to the deterioration in the situation of dairy producers,
- 1. Points out that the exemption arrangements for New Zealand butter imports were only granted on a provisional basis;
- 2. Is concerned at the increase in the cost of supporting the dairy market as a result of continuation of such imports, which gravely penalize EEC dairy producers;

President

3. Considers it necessary to bear in mind that since it joined the Common Market the United Kingdom has increased its production of butter and reduced its consumption;
4. Notes that the United Kingdom is exporting increasing quantities of butter to the EEC whilst obstructing imports of dairy products from other EEC countries;
5. Rejects the idea that the Community should make up for the closure of the United States and Japanese markets to New Zealand butter;
6. Regards the continuation of New Zealand butter imports as particularly unacceptable to the European dairy industry when the Commission continues to refuse to grant refunds at a level permitting access to the world market;
7. Asks the Commission and Council to put in hand a genuine oils-and-fats policy restricting, and imposing duty on, imports;
8. Considers that the interests of EEC milk producers take precedence over the commercial interests of the New Zealand Dairy Board, the sole importer and exporter of New Zealand butter;
9. Confirms its fundamental opposition to extension of the preferential arrangements for imports of butter originating in New Zealand, which constitute a grave breach of the principle of Community preference;
10. Calls for the immediate repeal of these preferential arrangements;
11. Rejects the Commission's proposals.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Miss Quin, rapporteur. — Mr President, I am against this amendment.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 18 and adopted the fourth and fifth indents)

President. — On paragraph 1, I have two amendments, both seeking to replace the paragraph with a new text:

— Amendment No 5, tabled by Mr Davern and Mr Fanton on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats:

1. Deplores the fact that massive imports of New Zealand butter by the United Kingdom at preferential rates at a time when the EEC dairy industry is being seriously hit, are a major contributing factor to the present situation;

— Amendment No 3, by Mrs Cresson and others:

1. Stresses that New Zealand and the Community are together the major dairy exporters on the world market; but points out that the exemption arrangements for imports of New Zealand butter were granted on a provisional basis and were intended to be terminated in 1977, and that their purpose was to

facilitate the United Kingdom's adjustment to the Community systems, not to subsidize New Zealand butter exports.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Miss Quin, rapporteur. — I am against both amendments, Mr President.

(Parliament rejected Amendments No 5 and No 3 and adopted paragraph 1)

President. — On paragraph 2, I have two amendments each seeking to replace the paragraph with a new text:

— Amendment No 6, tabled by Mr Davern and Mr Fanton on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats:

2. Emphasizes the urgent need to resolve equitably the surplus situation within the EEC, while at the same time respecting the principle of Community preference;

— Amendment No 4, tabled by Mrs Cresson and others:

2. Emphasizes the importance of appropriate, reciprocal cooperation agreements on imports and exports between New Zealand and the EEC on world markets to ensure stable market and price conditions.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Miss Quin, rapporteur. — I am against both.

(Parliament rejected Amendments No 6 and No 4 and adopted paragraph 2)

President. — On paragraph 3, I have three amendments, all seeking to replace this paragraph with a new text:

— Amendment No 7, tabled by Mr Davern and Mr Fanton on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats:

3. Refutes any Community notion of value judgement on New Zealand's successes or failures in the commercial field — in the same way as it would be contrary to basic principles for any individual or group of Member States to pass value judgements on another Member State — used as a means of influencing Community decisions on current negotiations;

— Amendment No 13, by Mr Tolman:

3. Recognizes the degree of economic dependence of New Zealand on dairy products; notes at the same time that this places a heavy and continuing burden on Community agriculture through the importation of

President

totally superfluous products which are already in surplus.

— Amendment No 2, by Mrs Cresson and others:

3. Deplores the fact that the principle of Community preference has been clearly divorced from its original objectives and has now come to mean the payment of a co-responsibility levy by European dairy producers, while we subsidize imports of the very same products from third countries;

What is the rapporteur's position?

Miss Quin, rapporteur. — I am against all three.

(Parliament rejected Amendments Nos 7, 13 and 2 and adopted paragraph 3)

President. — On paragraph 4, I have two amendments:

— Amendment No 8, tabled by Mr Davern and Mr Fanton on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats and seeking to replace the paragraph with the following new text:

4. Underlines

- (a) the Commission's conclusion that 'a reduction of protectionism in other developed countries in the dairy sector would be a highly desirable development in the interests of both the Community and New Zealand'; and
- (b) Article 4 of Protocol No 18, which states that 'the Community shall continue its efforts to promote the conclusion of an international agreement on milk products so that, as soon as possible, conditions on the world market may be improved';

— Amendment No 14, tabled by Mr Tolman and seeking to amend this paragraph as follows:

4. Conscious of the attempts of New Zealand to diversify her dairy exports and find new markets, attempts which have been successful but have obvious limits imposed upon them, regrets that in New Zealand, in contrast with the situation obtaining for European milk producers, there are no provisions restricting milk production and no co-responsibility levy to be paid.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Miss Quin, rapporteur. — I am against both.

(Parliament rejected Amendments Nos 8 and 14 and adopted paragraph 4)

President. — On paragraph 5, I have Amendment No 9, tabled by Mr Davern and Mr Fanton on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats and seeking to replace this paragraph with a new text:

5. Rejects any further increase in the New Zealand butter quota over the 1980 figure of 90 000 tonnes, and indeed recommends that measures be taken to implement further reductions in the import quota, in view of the present serious situation in the Community.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Miss Quin, rapporteur. — I am against.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 9 and adopted paragraph 5)

President. — After paragraph 5, I have two amendments, both seeking to add a new paragraph:

— Amendment No 16, by Mr Tolman:

- 5 a. Considers it right, in view of New Zealand's special relationship with the United Kingdom, to take into consideration that since the accession of the UK
 - butter consumption in the UK has fallen, and
 - butter production in the UK has risen;

— Amendment No 17, tabled by Mr Tolman:

- 5 b. Considers it wrong that New Zealand has to pay a lower levy, as a result of which the cost to the EEC will increase by around 60 million EUA, and considers the world market price to be the only valid reference point.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Miss Quinn, rapporteur. — Against both.

(Parliament rejected both amendments)

President. — On paragraph 6, I have Amendment No 10, tabled by Mr Davern and Mr Fanton on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats and seeking to replace this paragraph with a new text:

6. Deplores the responsibility of the Commission and the Council in their failure to propose and to implement a genuine Community policy for oils and fats, including a limitation on imports and the introduction of import levies, which would greatly alleviate the present situation in the dairy sector within the Community, while at the same time allowing a more flexible Community attitude towards the United Kingdom's imports of butter from New Zealand.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Miss Quin, rapporteur. — Against.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 10 and adopted paragraph 6)

President. — On paragraph 7, I have four amendments, all seeking to replace the paragraph with a new text:

— Amendment No 11, tabled by Mr Davern and Mr Fanton on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats;

7. Regrets that in the present economic circumstances the Commission's proposals are totally unacceptable and therefore rejects them;

— Amendment No 1, tabled by Mr Delatte and others:

7. Cannot, however, approve the Commission's proposal until an overall policy for oils and fats in the Community has been defined;

— Amendment No 15, tabled by Mr Tolman:

7. Rejects the Commission's proposal;

— Amendment No 12, tabled by Mr Davern and Mr Fanton on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats:

7. Invites, therefore, the Commission to withdraw their proposal.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Miss Quin, rapporteur. — I am against all of them.

(In successive votes Parliament rejected Amendments Nos 11, 1, 15 and 12 and adopted paragraph 7)

President. — I put the motion for a resolution as a whole to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.¹

15. *Decision on restructuring the farm survey system in Italy*

President. — We now proceed to the reports that we agreed to deal with without debate. If a Member wishes to debate a subject when we get to it, then we shall just have to put it off until December.

The next item is the report by Mr Colleselli, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture (Doc. 1-524/80), on

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-426/80) for a decision on restructuring the system of agricultural surveys in Italy.

We shall first consider the proposed decision.

¹ OJ C 327 of 15. 12. 1980.

On paragraph 1 of Article 5, I have Amendment No 1, tabled by Mr Notenboom on behalf of the Committee on Budgets and seeking to replace this paragraph by the following text:

1. The Community's annual financial contribution to the programme referred to in Article 1 shall be fixed from year to year on the fixing of the Communities' general budget for the following year. The estimate of the appropriations required shall take account of the annual programme submitted by the Italian Republic under Article 4 of this decision.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 1)

On paragraph 2, I have Amendment No 2, tabled by Mr Notenboom on behalf of the Committee on Budgets and seeking to delete this paragraph.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 2)

On paragraph 3, I have Amendment No 3, tabled by Mr Notenboom on behalf of the Committee on Budgets and seeking to delete this paragraph.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 3)

I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.¹

I call Mr Pannella to speak on a point of order.

Mr Pannella. — *(F)* When the rapporteur is not here and the Commission has not asked for the floor, would it not be normal to hold the vote over? The rapporteur should at least be present.

President. — The Rules Procedure say we can do without the rapporteur.

16. *Regulation on the supply of food aid*

President. — The next item is the report by Mrs Rabbethge, on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation (Doc. 1-551/80), on

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-364/80) for a regulation laying down general rules for the supply as food aid of products other than cereals, skimmed-milk powder or butter-oil to certain developing countries and specialized bodies.

I call Mr Cohen to speak on a point of order.

Mr Cohen. — *(NL)* Yes, Mr President, I would like to speak on this report. I would therefore ask you to give me the floor before you take the vote.

President. — The decision of the House was to take it without debate.

I call Mr Vernimmen.

Mr Vernimmen. — (NL) Mr President, at least three quarters of an hour ago I urged that all aspects of social problems should be discussed in a serious manner in this Parliament and that we should not occupy ourselves the whole day long exclusively with all kinds of theoretical matters. I therefore ask that you postpone the discussion of important social documents like the reports by Mr Ghergo and Mr Van der Gun to a later part-session . . .

President. — I am sorry, you are speaking to the wrong item on the agenda. Perhaps you could contain yourself until we reach the right point!

Mr Vernimmen. — (NL) Mr President, I am not misusing the time of this Parliament, but others are! This is a special request.

(Parliament adopted the preamble)

President. — Before paragraph 1, I have Amendment No 1, by Mr Denis and others, seeking to insert the following paragraph:

Condemns any use of the food weapon, as did the ACP-EEC Consultative Assembly meeting in Luxembourg from 22 to 26 September 1980, and therefore calls for the immediate re-establishment of food aid for Vietnam, Kampuchea and Afghanistan.

(In successive votes Parliament rejected Amendment No 1 and adopted paragraphs 1 to 15)

I put the motion for a resolution as a whole to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.¹

17. Agenda

President. — I call Mr Scott-Hopkins.

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — I beg to move that items 195, 244, 254 and 255 — they refer to reports by Mr Ghergo, Mr Van der Gun, Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti and Mr Key respectively — be held over until our next part-session in Luxembourg.

President. — I call Mr Cohen.

Mr Cohen. — Mr President, we already had the same point of order about two hours ago. This House decided then that we could not make any changes in the agenda. As a consequence Mr Scott-Hopkins or someone else from his group asked to have several reports dealt with without debate, and this was decided. We cannot begin changing the agenda again, must continue with the agenda as it is before us; there is no other possibility.

President. — We need some commonsense at this stage. If we just proceed as we were doing, I think we shall complete everything.

I call Mr Muntingh.

Mr Muntingh. — (NL) Mr President, you are fully entitled to adjourn the session. It is two o'clock and we are at the end of the road. You can simply decide to close the sitting.

President. — Yes, but it is entirely my decision and I am not going to do so.

18. The Community's generalized tariff preferences

President. — The next item is the report by Mr Pearce, on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation (Doc. 1-545/80), on

the proposals from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-429/80) for regulations fixing the Community's five-year scheme of generalized tariff preferences for the period 1981-85 and the opening of the scheme applicable in 1981.

(Parliament adopted the preamble and paragraphs 1 to 4)

After paragraph 4, I have two amendments by Mr Notenboom seeking to insert a new paragraph:

— Amendment No 3:

4a. Fears, however, that the absence of any information in the Commission proposals as to the loss of Community revenue which would result from the application of this system renders the Community policy of generalized preferences void, since the scope for financial autonomy is almost totally used up;

— Amendment No 4:

4b. Urges the Commission to state the foreseeable financial consequences of the generalized preferences system so that the budgetary authority can ensure, having regard to the current limits on the Community's own resources,

¹ OJ C 327 of 15. 12. 1980.

President

that the proposals for regulations to achieve this policy are applied in the budgetary sphere.

(Parliament rejected Amendments Nos 3 and 4 and adopted paragraph 4)

President. — I call Mr Vouel.

Mr Vouel, Member of the Commission. — Mr President, I have to state that the Commission cannot support any one of the four amendments presented.

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

Mr Collins. — I do think we ought to request that the existence of a quorum be established. At this point, Mr President, it is fairly clear that there is not a quorum present.

President. — The request must be supported by 10 Members.

(Ten Members rose to their feet)

As a quorum is not present, the vote is adjourned until the next part-session.

19. Regulation on the carriage of goods by road between Member States

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-555/80) by Mr Moreland, on behalf of the Committee on Transport, on

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-356/80) for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 3164/76 on the Community quota for the carriage of goods by road between Member States.

I call Mr Vouel.

Mr Vouel, Member of the Commission. — The Commission does not support Amendments Nos 3, 4 and 5.

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

Mr Pearce. — Mr President, I wonder if your ruling on the quorum was in fact a valid one, because, as I understand it, the voting had already been commenced at the time when Mr Collins raised a point of order and I do not think you had the right to accept a point of order once the voting had started.

President. — That is not true, Mr Pearce. Anybody can challenge the quorum.

(Parliament adopted the preamble and paragraphs 1 and 2)

On paragraph 3, I have Amendment No 2, by Miss Roberts, seeking to replace 'harmonize' with 'to make progress in harmonizing'.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 2, paragraph 3 as amended and paragraph 4)

After paragraph 4, I have Amendment No 1, by Mr Albers, seeking to insert the following paragraph:

4a. Calls upon the Commission to clarify the situation in 1981 as regards the reduction of the bilateral quota *vis-à-vis* the increase in the Community quota.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 1)

On paragraph 5, I have Amendment No 3, by Miss Roberts, seeking to add the following phrase at the end of this paragraph:

and recommends a doubling of the quota for 1981.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 3 and paragraphs 5 and 6)

After paragraph 6, I have Amendment No 4, by Miss Roberts, seeking to insert the following new paragraph:

6a. Recommends that consideration be given to a further allocation for Greece.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 4 and paragraphs 7 and 8)

On paragraph 9, I have Amendment No 5, by Miss Robert, seeking to delete the phrase 'consequently ... understanding' and to substitute 'and demands'.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 5 and paragraph 9 as amended)

I put the motion for a resolution as a whole to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.¹

20. Agenda

President. — As its authors are not present, the oral question, with debate, by Mrs Cassanmagnago Ceretti and others (Doc. 1-586/80) will be held over until the next part-session.

I call Mr Pannella.

¹ OJ C 327 of 15. 12. 1980.

Mr Pannella. — (*F*) I am sorry, Mr President, because this is a very important question. The international press has looked at the Community's activities in this field and rightly or wrongly has written some serious and even insulting things. Our Parliament has no legislative powers but it does have a duty to investigate. The Commissioner has been kind enough to attend and the press will continue to monitor and investigate. Let us at least give this Commission an opportunity to reply. It will take only a few minutes and perhaps some discrediting doubts will be removed straight away or else we shall know what is what. I therefore propose that we continue for a few moments, or long enough at least to hear Mr Gundelach on the subject.

President. — As you know, the President must always give way to the Commission if the Commissioner wishes to speak. There has been no such request.

Mr Pannella. — (*F*) Mr President, I feel this is highly important. I understand that the Commission has not given up its right to speak and if that is the case it should say so. Indeed, I thought that Mr Gundelach wanted to speak.

President. — I call Mr Gundelach.

Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission. — Mr President, Mr Pannella is saying that the Commission has asked for this debate. It has not. A demand was made to the Commission to have this debate even if certain time-limits had not been respected. The Commission is eager, as it has already done in the press, to put this whole thing right, because it is on a very dubious basis, as Mr Pannella says himself. And we have done so to the press. Therefore we accepted to have the debate even if the time-limits had not been respected, just to set the record right. We are eager to have this debate whenever it is convenient; but I have heard you, Mr President, saying that we can keep the interpreters only a few minutes beyond 2 o'clock. It is now 12 minutes past 2 o'clock, but I do not want my failure to speak to be construed as suggesting that the Commission feels it is on slippery ground here and would rather have the debate postponed. I am not on slippery ground, because all the press versions were unfounded, as I have already told the press. I am glad to have the debate whenever it is desired, but the moment does not seem to be now.

(*Applause*)

President. — We quite understand. I am sorry, I am trying as President to meet what I think are the wishes of the whole House in trying to get through our

agenda, because we shall be faced with great difficulties if we do not.

21. *Directive on the safety of containers*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-556/80), without debate, by Mr Key, on behalf of the Committee on Transport, on

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-353/80) for a directive on the harmonized application of the International Convention for Safe Containers (CSC) in the European Economic Community.

I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.¹

22. *Verification of credentials*

President. — At its meeting yesterday, the Bureau verified the credentials of Mr Rieger, whose appointment had already been announced. Pursuant to Rule 3 (1) of the Rules of Procedure, the Bureau has made sure that this appointment complies with the provisions of the Treaties.

It therefore asks the House to ratify this appointment.

Are there any objections?

This appointment is ratified.

23. *Dates of the next part-session*

President. — There are no other items on the agenda. I thank the representatives of both Council and Commission for their contributions to our work.

I call Mr Pearce on a point of order.

Mr Pearce. — Mr President, presumably it will be your job to report to the Council of Ministers on those of their requests which have not yet been met, on which our consultations have not yet taken place. May I suggest that you do this fully, and that in doing so you point out that it is those people over there, the so-called champions of development policy, some of whom support this resolution . . .

President. — Mr Pearce, will you please give way? I have the interests of the interpreters to consider as well as those of the House, and I do not think it is right for you to continue the debate in that way.

¹ OJ C 327 of 15. 12. 1980.

President

(Applause)

The enlarged Bureau proposes that our next sittings be held from 15 to 19 December 1980 in Luxembourg.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

24. *Approval of the minutes*

President. — Rule 17 (2) of the Rules of Procedure requires me to lay before Parliament, for its approval, the minutes of proceedings of the sitting which were written during the debates.

Are there any comments?

The minutes of proceedings are approved.

25. *Adjournment of the session*

President. — I declare the session of the European Parliament adjourned.

The sitting is closed.

(The sitting was closed at 2.15 p.m.)

Price

	United Kingdom	Ireland	Belgium and Luxembourg	Denmark	Germany	France	Italy	Netherlands	Other countries
	UKL	IRL	BFR/LFR	DKR	DM	FF	LIT	HFL	BFR
Annual subscription 1980—1981	21.25	23.25	1 400,—	252,—	87,50	204,—	39 100	96,—	1 400,—
Single copies:									
up to 32 pages	0.60	0.70	40,—	7,20	2,50	5,80	1 120	2,80	40,—
up to 80 pages	1.20	1.40	80,—	14,40	5,—	11,60	2 240	5,60	80,—

more than 80 pages : price set accordingly in each case and shown on cover.

Prices do not include postage.

Debates of the European Parliament, published as an annex to the Official Journal of the European Communities, comprises :

- report of proceedings,
- annual indexes.

Sales

Annual subscriptions run from March, the beginning of the Parliamentary Year, until February.

Orders may be placed with the Secretariat of the European Parliament or the Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Payments to be made only to this Office.

Secretariat of the European Parliament

Centre européen

Plateau du Kirchberg

Boîte postale 1601 — Luxembourg

Office for Official Publications of the European Communities

Boîte postale 1003 — Luxembourg
and 5, rue du Commerce — Luxembourg

Postal cheque account : 19 190-81

Bank current account : B.I.L. 8-109/6003/300

Price. UKL 7.20 / IRL 8.40



OFFICE FOR OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS
OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

ISSN 0378-5041

Boîte postale 1003 — Luxembourg

Catalogue number: AX-AA-80-011-EN-C

