

Annex

Official Journal

of the
European Communities

No 172
March 1974

English edition

Debates of the European Parliament

1973-1974 Session
Report of Proceedings
on 11 March 1974
Europe House, Strasbourg

Contents

Sitting of Monday, 11 March 1974	1
Resumption of the session, p. 2 — Tribute, p. 2 — Appointment of Members and verification of credentials, p. 2 — Reference to committee of two petitions, p. 3 — Authorization of a report, p. 3 — Documents received, p. 3 — Texts of treaties forwarded by the Council, p. 6 — Decision on urgent procedure, p. 6 — Limitation of speaking-time, p. 6 — Order of business, p. 7 — Statement by the President, p. 8 — Number and composition of parliamentary committees, p. 8 — Regulations on the common organization of the market in sugar, p. 12 — Regulation on the common organization of the market in cereals, p. 15 — Regulation on soya bean prices, p. 16 — Regulation on monetary compensatory amounts for processed agricultural products, p. 16 — Directive on health protection against the dangers of ionizing radiations, p. 19 — Approval of the minutes, p. 25 — Closure of the session, p. 25.	

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.

SITTING OF MONDAY, 11 MARCH 1974

Contents

1. Resumption of the session	2		
2. Tribute	2		
3. Appointment of Members and verification of credentials	2		
4. Reference to committee of two petitions	3		
5. Authorization of a report	3		
6. Documents received	3		
7. Texts of treaties forwarded by the Council	6		
8. Decision on urgent procedure	6		
9. Limitation of speaking-time	6		
10. Order of business:			
<i>Mr Bourges, chairman of the Group of European Progressive Democrats ..</i>	7		
<i>Mr De Koning, rapporteur</i>	7		
<i>Mr Durieux, chairman of the Liberal and Allies Group; Sir Douglas Dodds-Parker, rapporteur; Mr Laban; Mr De Koning; Sir Douglas Dodds-Parker; Mr Lange, chairman of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs ..</i>	7		
11. Statement by the President	8		
12. Number and composition of parliamentary committees - Debate on a motion tabled by the chairmen of the political groups: <i>Mr Thiry; Mr Giraud; Mr Thiry; Miss Lulling; Mr Vals, chairman of the Socialist Group; Mr Lagorce; Mr Durieux, chairman of the Liberal and Allies Group; Mr Mem-</i>			
		<i>mel; Mr Lücker, chairman of the Christian-Democratic Group; Mr Wohlfart; Mr Kollwelter; Miss Lulling</i>	
		<i>Adoption of the motion</i>	8
		13. Regulations on the common organization of the market in sugar - Debate on a report by <i>Mr De Koning</i> on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture:	
		<i>Mr De Koning, rapporteur</i>	12
		<i>Mr Liogier, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats; Mr John Hill, on behalf of the European Conservative Group; Mr Cippolla, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group; Mr Scarascia Mugnozza, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities</i>	13
		<i>Adoption of the motion</i>	15
		14. Regulation on the common organization of the market in cereals - Debate on a report by <i>Mr De Koning</i> on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture:	
		<i>Mr De Koning, rapporteur</i>	15
		<i>Mr Scarascia Mugnozza, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities</i>	15
		<i>Adoption of the motion</i>	16
		15. Regulation on soya bean prices - Debate on a report by <i>Mr De Koning</i> on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture:	
		<i>Mr De Koning, rapporteur</i>	16
		<i>Mr Scarascia Mugnozza, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities</i>	16
		<i>Adoption of the motion</i>	16

16. Regulation on monetary compensatory amounts for processed agricultural products - Debate on a report by Mr Héger on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture:		behalf of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment:	
Mr Héger, rapporteur	16	Mrs Walz, rapporteur	19
Mr Scott-Hopkins; Mr Cipolla; Mr Héger; Mr Scarascia Mugnozza, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities	17	Mr Lagorce, on behalf of the Socialist Group; Mr Premoli; Mr Eisma; Mr Scarascia Mugnozza, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities; Mr Premoli; Mr Scarascia Mugnozza	21
Adoption of the motion	19	Adoption of the motion	25
17. Directive on health protection against the dangers of ionizing radiations - Debate on a report by Mrs Walz on		18. Approval of the minutes	25
		19. Closure of the session	25

IN THE CHAIR: MR BERKHOUWER

President

(The sitting was opened at 5.05 p.m.)

President. — The sitting is open.

1. Resumption of the session

President. — I declare resumed the session of the European Parliament adjourned on 14 February 1974.

2. Tribute

President. — I have just received news that will come as a shock to all of us.

I would ask you to rise for a moment.

This morning our colleague André Armengaud died suddenly as a result of a heart attack.

He was about to leave our Parliament because his term of office was coming to an end.

Mr Armengaud was born on 10 January 1901 in Paris, graduated as a civil engineer from the *École Nationale des Ponts et Chaussées* and was a member of the French Senate from 1946.

Mr Armengaud was one of the oldest Members, having been a Member of the Common Assembly from 1956 to 1958 and of the European Parliament from 1959.

For many years, he was the active and capable chairman of the Committee on Budgets and a member of the Committee on Development and Cooperation.

On behalf of us all I have sent condolences to his family.

I suggest that we observe a few moments' silence in memory of our colleague and friend.

(The Assembly observed a minute's silence.)

3. Appointment of Members and Verification of credentials

President. — The next item is the verification of credentials.

On 12 December 1973 the Senate of the French Republic renewed its delegation.

The following were appointed: Mr Houdet, Mr Berthoin, Mr Charles Durand, Mr Jozeau-Marigné, Mr Poher, Mr André Colin, Mr Pierre Giraud, Mr Pintat, Mr Brégégère, Mr Bousch, Mr Caillavet and Mrs Goutmann.

These Members have been appointed with effect from 13 March 1974 and for a term of office of two years.

On 20 February 1974 the German Bundestag appointed Mr Georg Schachtschabel as a Representative of the European Parliament to replace Mr Arndt.

Pursuant to Rule 3(1) of the Rules of Procedure, the Bureau has made sure that these appoint-

President

ments comply with the provisions of the Treaties.

It therefore asks the House to ratify these appointments.

Are there any objections?

These appointments are ratified.

In addition, on 28 February 1974 the Chamber of Deputies of the Italian Republic appointed Mr Giulio Andreotti and Mr Franco Concas Members of the European Parliament to replace Mr Malfatti and Mr Ballardini.

The credentials of these Members will be verified at the Bureau's next meeting, on the understanding that, under Rule 3(3) of the Rules of Procedure, they will provisionally take their seats with the same rights as other Members of Parliament.

I congratulate colleagues whose appointments have been renewed and welcome the new Members.

4. Reference to committee of two petitions

President. — At the sitting of 12 December 1973 I informed the House that I had received from Mr Vogel, Mrs Charbonnier, Mr Monier and 42 other signatories a petition condemning the military régime in Greece.

This petition was entered under No 5/73 in the register stipulated in Rule 48 of the Rules of Procedure and referred to the Legal Affairs Committee for consideration.

By letter of 28 February 1974 the committee informed me that it considered Petition No 5/73 admissible.

Following the committee's proposals, the petition has been referred to the Political Affairs Committee, as the committee responsible, which, pursuant to Rule 48(4) of the Rules of Procedure, is to consider its content and adopt a position on its further treatment, and to the Committee on External Economic Relations, which is to deliver an opinion for the Political Affairs Committee on the economic and commercial aspects of this question.

I propose that the House take note of this reference to committee.

At the sitting of 15 February I informed the House that I had received a petition from Mr Feidt, Mr Bacioccola, Mr Rieffel and 17 other signatories on action taken following the resolution of the European Parliament on the military *coup d'état* in Chile.

This petition was entered under No 6/73 in the register and referred to the Legal Affairs Committee for consideration.

By letter of 28 January 1974 the committee informed me that it considered Petition No 6/73 admissible.

Following the committee's proposal, the petition has been referred to the Political Affairs Committee, which, pursuant to Rule 48(4) of the Rules of Procedure, is to consider its content and adopt a position on its further treatment.

I propose that the House take note of this reference to committee.

5. Authorization of a report

President. — Pursuant to Rule 38 of the Rules of Procedure I have authorized, at its request, the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth to draw up a report on the information programme of the Commission of the European Communities for 1974-75.

6. Documents received

President. — Since the session was adjourned, I have received the following documents:

(a) from the Council of the European Communities, requests for an opinion on:

- a supplement to the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a regulation modifying Regulations (EEC) No 1408/71 and No 574/72 on the application of social security schemes to employed persons and their families moving within the Community (Doc. 347/73 - Supplement).

This document has been referred to the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment;

- the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a regulation supplementing Regulation (EEC) No 2142/70 as regards the import system for carp and trout (Doc. 375/73).

This document has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture, as the committee responsible, and the Committee on External Economic Relations for its opinion;

- the amendments to the proposals from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for

President

- I. the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to analytical, pharmaco-toxicological and clinical standards and protocols in respect of the testing of proprietary medicinal products;
- II. the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to publicity for proprietary medicinal products and to package leaflets;
- III. the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to matters which may be added to proprietary medicinal products for colouring purposes (Doc. 377/73).

This document has been referred to the Committee on Public Health and the Environment;

- the communication from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council on the implementation of the 'Guidelines and priority measures for a Community energy policy' (Doc. 386/73).

This document has been referred to the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, as the committee responsible, and the Committee on Public Health and the Environment and the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs for their opinions;

- the amendments to the proposals from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for

- I. a regulation supplementing Regulation No 1009/67/EEC on the common organization of the market in sugar
- II. a regulation fixing for the 1974/75 sugar marketing year derived inter-intervention prices, intervention prices for raw beet sugar, minimum prices for beet, threshold prices, the guaranteed quantity and the maximum amount of the production levy
- III. a regulation amending Regulation No 120/67/EEC on the common organization of the markets in cereals
- IV. a regulation extending to soya beans the system of prices applicable to oil seeds
(Doc. 388/73).

Parts I and II of this document have been referred to the Committee on

Agriculture, as the committee responsible, and the Committee on External Economic Relations for its opinion, and parts III and IV to the Committee on Agriculture;

- the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a directive amending the Council Directive of 15 February 1971 on health problems affecting trade in fresh poultrymeat (Doc. 389/73).

This document has been referred to the Committee on Public Health and the Environment, as the committee responsible, and the Committee on Agriculture for its opinion;

- the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a directive on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the sulphur content of certain liquid fuels (Doc. 390/73).

This document has been referred to the Committee on Public Health and the Environment, as the committee responsible, and the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology for its opinion;

- the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a regulation amending Article 4(a) of Regulation (EEC) No 974/71 as regards the monetary compensatory amounts applicable to processed agricultural products (Doc. 397/73).

This document has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture, as the committee responsible, and the Committee on Budgets for its opinion;

- the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) N° 3574/73 of the Council of 27 December 1973 wholly or partially suspending common customs tariff duties on certain agricultural products originating in Turkey (Doc. 398/73).

This document has been referred to the Committee on External Economic Relations, as the committee responsible, and the Committee on Agriculture for its opinion;

- (b) from the committees the following reports:

- interim report by Sir Douglas Dodds-Parker on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation on the future sugar policy of the Community,

President

- with particular reference to imports of sugar from the developing countries and in the light of the Commission's Memorandum of 12 July 1973 (Doc. 376/73);
- report by Mr André Rossi on behalf of the Committee on Budgets on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a directive on the harmonization of excise duties on beer (Doc. 378/73);
 - report by Mr André Rossi on behalf of the Committee on Budgets on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a decision setting up a Committee on Excise Duties (Doc. 379/73);
 - report by Mr Pierre-Bernard Cousté on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations on the Agreement between the EEC and the Lebanese Republic (Doc. 380/73);
 - report by Mr Egon Alfred Klepsch on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations on the trade agreement concluded between the European Economic Community and the Federative Republic of Brazil (Doc. 381/73);
 - report by Mr Donal Creed on behalf of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a directive on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the making-up by weight or by volume of certain pre-packaged products (Doc. 382/73);
 - supplementary report by Mr Karl-Heinz Walkhoff on behalf of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment on the amended proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a directive on the approximation of Member States' legislation on cosmetic products (Doc. 383/73);
 - report by Mr James Gibbons on behalf of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment on the proposals from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for
 - I. a decision on the setting up of a general committee on safety at work
 - II. a decision to confer on the Mines Safety and Health Commission the task of continuing its preventative action in the field of safety at work in the whole range of extractive industries (Doc. 384/73);
 - report by Mrs Elisabeth Orth on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a directive supplementary to Council Directive No 71/286/EEC, dated 26 July 1971, concerning statistical surveys to be carried out by Member States to determine the production capacity of certain fruit-tree plantations (Doc. 385/73);
 - report by Mrs Hanna Walz on behalf of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a directive to amend the directives laying down basic safety standards for the health protection of the population and workers against the dangers of ionizing radiations (Doc. 387/73);
 - report by Mr Francis Vals on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture on the amendment to the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 816/70 as regard the definition of liqueur wine and of certain grape musts (Doc. 392/73);
 - report by Mr Jan de Koning on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture on the amendments to the proposals from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for
 - I. a regulation supplementing Regulation No 1009/67/EEC on the common organization of the market on sugar
 - II. a regulation fixing for the 1974/75 sugar marketing year derived intervention prices, intervention prices for raw beet sugar, minimum prices for beet, threshold prices, the guaranteed quantity and the maximum amount of the production levy (Doc. 393/73);
 - report by Mr Jan de Koning on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture on the amendment to the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a regulation amending Regulation No 120/67/EEC on the common organization of the market in cereals (Doc. 394/73);
 - report by Mr Jan de Koning on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture on the amendment to the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a regulation extending to soya beans the system of

President

- prices applicable to oil seeds (Doc. 395/73);
- report by Mr Egon Alfred Klepsch on behalf of the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth on the Convention setting up a European University Institute (Doc. 396/73);
 - report by Mr Charles Emile Héger on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a regulation amending Article 4(a) of Regulation (EEC) No 974/71 as regards the monetary compensatory amounts applicable to processed agricultural products (Doc. 399/73);
 - report by Mr Cornelis Laban on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a directive on the organization of an intermediate survey as part of a programme of surveys on the structure of agricultural holdings (Doc. 400/73);
 - report by Mr Jan Baas on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a regulation concerning the system of trade with third countries in the market in products processed from fruit and vegetables (Doc. 401/73);
 - report by Mr Pierre-Bernard Cousté on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations on the commercial cooperation agreement between the European Economic Community and the Republic of India (Doc. 402/73);
 - report by Mr Giovanni Boano on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a regulation modifying Council Regulation (EEC) No 3574/73 of 27 December 1973 on the total or partial suspension of Common Customs Tariff duties on certain agricultural products originating in Turkey (Doc. 404/73);
 - report by Mr Ferruccio Pisoni on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a regulation modifying Regulations (EEC) No 1408/71 and No 574/72 on the application of social security schemes to employed persons and their families moving within the Community (Doc. 405/73);
 - report by Lord Reay on behalf of the Committee on Development and Co-operation on the results of the Tenth Annual Meeting of the Parliamentary Conference of the EEC-AASM Association (Rome, 30 January to 1 February 1974) — (Doc. 406/73);
 - report by Mr Jean-Eric Bousch on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs on the economic situation in the Community (Doc. 407/73).
- (c) from the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, a motion for a resolution on appropriate medium- and long-term measures for the further alleviation of the energy supply crisis in the European Community (Doc. 344/73 rev.).
7. *Texts of treaties forwarded by the Council*
- President.** — I have received from the Council of the European Communities certified true copies of the following documents:
- Exchange of letters amending Article 5 of Annex 1 to the agreement establishing an association between the European Economic Community and the Kingdom of Morocco;
 - Agreement between the European Economic Community and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan on the supply of common wheat and skimmed milk powder as emergency food aid;
 - Agreement between the European Economic Community and the Republic of Chad on the supply of soft wheat, maize and sorghum as food aid.
- These documents will be placed in the archives of the European Parliament.
8. *Decision on urgent procedure*
- President.** — I propose that Parliament deal by urgent procedure with reports not submitted within the time-limits laid down in the rules of 11 May 1967.
- Are there any objections?
- The adoption of urgent procedure is agreed.
9. *Limitation of speaking-time*
- President.** — In accordance with the usual practice and pursuant to Rule 31(4) of the Rules

President

of Procedure, I propose that speaking-time for all items of the agenda be allocated as follows:

- 15 minutes for the rapporteur and one speaker for each political group;
- 10 minutes for other speakers;
- 5 minutes for speakers on amendments.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

10. *Order of business*

President. — The next item is the order of business for the sitting of today, Monday, 11 March 1974, the last day of the 1973-74 session.

At its meeting of 28 February 1974, the enlarged Bureau prepared a draft agenda, but in view of subsequent developments I propose that Parliament adopt the following order of business:

- Motion for a resolution tabled on behalf of the political groups on the number of committees of the European Parliament and their membership. (Doc. 391/73).

The report by Mr Schwabe on a system of bracket tariffs for the carriage of goods between Member States (Doc. 392/73) is not yet available. It will therefore be considered at a later sitting.

- Report by Mr De Koning on sugar prices (Doc. 393/73);
- Report by Mr De Koning on the common organization of the market in cereals (Doc. 394/73);
- Report by Mr De Koning on soya bean prices (Doc. 395/73);
- Report by Mr Héger on monetary compensatory amounts for processed agricultural products (Doc. 399/73);
- Report by Mrs Walz on health protection against the dangers of ionizing radiations (Doc. 387/73).

I call Mr Bourges.

Mr Bourges, Chairman of the Group of European Progressive Democrats. — (F) Mr President, Mr De Koning's report on the fixing of sugar prices was put on the agenda of the present part-session because a meeting of the Council of Agricultural Ministers was due to take place tomorrow. In the meantime, this meeting has been postponed. In addition, the House will have

occasion to return to this subject on Friday during the discussion of Sir Douglas Dodds-Parker's report on Community sugar policy. In the circumstances, it seems to us to be more logical to arrange a joint debate of these two reports, which could take place on Wednesday or Thursday.

This arrangement would enable the House to conduct a more thorough debate on the Community's sugar policy.

President. — Mr Bourges proposes that Mr De Koning's report on sugar prices should be removed from today's agenda and discussed at a later sitting together with the interim report by Sir Douglas Dodds-Parker on the Community's sugar policy.

I call Mr De Koning.

Mr De Koning, rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President, I have no objection to Mr Bourges' proposal, but I should like to point out two things. Firstly, the connection between the report by Sir Douglas Dodds-Parker and my report is not as close as Mr Bourges assumes. Secondly, I shall myself unfortunately be unable to be here next Friday. If the House accepts Mr Bourges' proposal, I would urge you to place these reports on Wednesday's or Thursday's agenda.

President. — I call Mr Durieux.

Mr Durieux, Chairman of the Liberal and Allies Group. — (F) Mr President, contrary to what some people think, I consider that these two reports should not be dealt with together; on this point I am in agreement with Mr De Koning. In any case, however the House decides, even if it decides for a joint debate on these two reports, I would prefer this debate not to take place on Friday. The number of Members present on Friday would be too small to justify dealing with a report of such importance. It was my intention to make this point on Wednesday morning during the discussion of the agenda for the new part-session.

I therefore see no objection to having a joint discussion of the two reports on condition that it takes place on Wednesday or Thursday at the latest, but in any case not on Friday.

President. — We still have to decide whether we are to discuss the report by Sir Douglas Doods-Parker on Wednesday or Thursday or whether we should postpone its discussion until a later part-session.

I call Sir Douglas Dodds-Parker.

Sir Douglas Dodds-Parker, rapporteur. — I am delighted to hear the suggestion that my report should be discussed on Wednesday or Thursday. I was invited to draw up this report last September. I have been ready to present it since November, and I think that four months since then is quite long enough a delay. May I ask that it be taken on Wednesday? That is the day on which I was told last week it would be discussed.

President. — In view of the proposals that have been made, I should like to suggest to the House that these reports should not be discussed this evening but that we should take them together on Wednesday. The time required for preparation will prevent us from doing this today.

I call Mr Laban.

Mr Laban. — (NL) Mr President, I should like to express my support for the view advanced by the rapporteur, Mr De Koning. There is hardly any connection between the reports and, as I see it, we run the risk of seeing Sir Douglas Dodds-Parker's report removed from the agenda.

The important thing is that the sugar producers should know as quickly as possible what their production objectives should be. The reports caused no controversy in the Committee on Agriculture. I consider it most important that all three of Mr De Koning's reports be dealt with as quickly as possible.

President. — Mr Laban moves that Mr De Koning's report be dealt with separately from Sir Douglas Dodds-Parker's report.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr De Koning, rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President, I accept Mr Laban's proposal.

President. — The rapporteur agrees that his report could be discussed separately this evening.

I put to the vote the proposal made by Mr Laban and seconded by the rapporteur that the De Koning report on sugar be discussed this evening.

The proposal is adopted.

The problem remains as to when the House should deal with Sir Douglas Dodds-Parker's report. I call Sir Douglas Dodds-Parker.

Sir Douglas-Dodds-Parker, rapporteur. — Mr President, I assume from what you have just said that it can be taken Wednesday, which would appear to be the agreement of the

Assembly before we put this other point to the vote.

President. — I call Mr Lange.

Mr Lange, chairman of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs. — (D) Mr President, I have no objection to Sir Douglas Dodds-Parker's report being dealt with on Wednesday, except that it should be taken before and not after the economic policy question, so that we do not have to go on into the evening with our discussion of these very important economic policy matters. In any case, Mr President, we shall be fixing the agenda tomorrow or Wednesday and need not therefore debate this now. That is all I wanted to say.

President. — We cannot reach a formal decision on this point during this sitting. The general view is, however, that we should discuss this report on Wednesday instead of on Friday.

Are there any objections to the proposed order of business?

That is agreed.

11. Statement by the President

President. — Contrary to the notice which has been distributed, the constituent meetings of the committees will take place tomorrow, 12 March 1974, and not today.

12. Number and composition of parliamentary committees - Debate on a motion tabled by the chairmen of the political groups

President. — I have received a motion for a resolution, with request that it be considered by urgent procedure pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure, on the number of committees of the European Parliament and their membership, tabled by Mr Lückner on behalf of the Christian-Democratic Group, Mr Radoux on behalf of the Socialist Group, Mr Durieux on behalf of the Liberal and Allies Group, Mr Liogier on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, Sir John Peel on behalf of the European Conservative Group, and Mr Amendola on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group (Doc. 391/73).

I would remind the House that we have already decided to treat all items on the agenda as urgent.

I therefore propose that we consider this motion for a resolution immediately.

President

Does anyone wish to speak?

I call Mr Thiry.

Mr Thiry. — (F) Mr President, I should like to draw your attention to the following points. The text, at least in the French version, seems to me to say something other than what it was intended to say. I am referring to paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of Part II of the motion for a resolution, the first of which reads: 'Delegations 1 and 2 shall each consist of 15 members. These members shall be full members of the Committee on External Monetary Relations'.

Grammatically, Mr President, I think this last sentence signifies that we are to appoint the members of these delegations and that they automatically become members of the Committee on External Economic Relations, whereas we obviously mean that they shall be chosen *from among* the members of the committee.

To make the wording clear, I think it would suffice to add the word *des*: 'leurs membres sont des membres titulaires de la commission des relations économiques extérieures'. There would then be no ambiguity: it would be clear that they were chosen from the committees in question.

Excuse me, Mr President, if my observation seems futile, but the wording as it is does not seem to me to be readily comprehensible.

President. — Mr Thiry is right. There are a number of United Nations resolutions in which the French word *des* has played an important role. We have noted what Mr Thiry has said.

I call Mr Giraud.

Mr Giraud. — (F) With reference to Mr Thiry's observation, I think it would be best to say: 'Their members shall be chosen from among the full members...' That would be even clearer.

President. — Do you agree to this text, Mr Thiry?

Mr Thiry. — (F) Of course, Mr President.

President. — I have noted your agreement.

I call Miss Lulling.

Miss Lulling. — (F) Mr President, the motion for a resolution is designed to extend the term of validity of the resolution of 12 March 1973 concerning the number and composition of committees of the European Parliament.

My purpose in speaking now amounts to giving an explanation of vote. I shall vote for the motion, but ask that it be applied according to the spirit and letter of Rule 37(2) of our Rules of Procedure, which reads:

'Committee members shall be elected at the beginning of the session, which opens each year on the second Tuesday in March. Candidatures shall be addressed to the Bureau of Parliament, which shall place before Parliament proposals designed to ensure fair representation of Member States and of political views.'

The government and parliament of my country were disturbed by the fact that during the last session not a single Luxembourg deputy figured among the members of two important committees, the Political Affairs Committee and the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs.

It is becoming increasingly clear that the Political Affairs Committee is on the way to becoming the regular and privileged spokesman of this House *vis-à-vis* the ministers of foreign affairs on all questions concerning political cooperation.

I pass no judgement on the role which the Political Affairs Committee should play; moreover, I do not think it is the one I have just referred to; but, given the facts, I am of the opinion that all Member States should be represented on it as on the other committees, at least on those which are the most important in this House.

When voting on the motion for a resolution of 12 March 1973, we deleted a paragraph which was of great importance for the smaller Member States of our Community. This said that attention would be paid to the equitable representation of Member States, and laid down the minimum representation of the various Member States on the committees, both big and small.

We deleted this provision, but our Rules of Procedure remain in force—unless they should be modified, the quorum necessary for this purpose being found in this House.

Mr President, I therefore ask the Bureau—for according to our Rules of Procedure it is the Bureau that places before Parliament proposals for a fair representation of Member States and of political views—whether it intends to help establish the necessary coordination among the political groups—since it is the political groups that propose the candidates—in order to obviate a situation in which one or other of the Member States, or particularly the smaller ones, are not represented in certain committees.

I shall be able to vote for this motion only if I have an assurance that the Bureau will pay attention to the need for ensuring the necessary

Lulling

cooperation among the different political groups. In my view, we still represent our Member States in this House, and in view of the present state of institutional disequilibrium it is still necessary that all Member States, however small they may be, are represented on all the Committees.

President. — I still have four speakers listed on this point. To prevent this list from becoming any longer, I should like to remind you of the provisions of Rule 37 of the Rules of procedure.

What we are concerned with today is Rule 37(1), the first sentence of which reads:

'Parliament shall set up standing or temporary, general or special committees, and shall define their powers.'

'Committee members shall be elected at the beginning of the session, which opens each year on the second Tuesday in March.'

I do not want to go into the question how the members of our committees are appointed. I should like to say in any case that this is not the task of the national parliaments, but that we do this ourselves on the basis of an agreement reached by the political groups.

I should therefore like to ask all those Members who wish to speak on this point to keep their speeches short, since all we are faced with today is the task of constituting the committees. Committee members will be appointed tomorrow in the normal, prescribed manner.

I call Mr Vals.

Mr Vals, chairman of the Socialist Group. — (F) Mr President, the delegations to the Joint Parliamentary Committees of the EEC Associations with Greece and Turkey consist of members who are chosen from among the full members of the Committee on External Monetary Relations.

It has, however, also been agreed that, in the event of a vacancy occurring on one of these committees, the group chooses a replacement from another committee. And indeed, if, for some exceptional reason, a group could not allow members of the Committee on External Monetary Relations to participate in the work of the other committee, the appointment of replacements would be inevitable. If the members are also members of the Committee on External Economic Relations, this does not mean that they cannot be replaced by Representatives who do not belong to the Committee on External Economic Relations.

That is, I believe, the correct interpretation? I shall therefore vote in favour of the motion.

I come now to the problem raised by Miss Lulling in order to express my regret that she should have found it necessary to take up such a position on her own account.

Only a short while ago, Mr Wohlfart, on behalf of the Luxembourg delegation explained to my group what he considered was important.

The Luxembourg delegation is composed of six members, and this House has twelve committees. Since the Rules of Procedure allow each committee member to be a member of two committees and since there are six members and twelve committees, this problem could be easily solved on the basis of an agreement among the political groups.

This is the position which has been taken up by my group and which I have been authorized to advocate in the House.

I would ask the chairmen of the Liberal and Allies Group and the Christian-Democratic Group to agree to a discussion which would enable us to solve this problem. The problem is undoubtedly of importance to the Luxembourg delegation, but it can be very easily cleared up—at least, that is my view—by the chairmen of the political groups.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Lagorce.

Mr Lagorce. — (F) While asking you to excuse my ignorance of the Rules of Procedure, I would ask you, Mr President, whether the amendment proposed by Mr Thiry and modified by Mr Giraud applies to the last two paragraphs of the second part of the motion for a resolution. Are, in fact, the members of Delegation 3 to be chosen from among the full members of the Committee on Development and Cooperation, and are the European members of the Joint Committee appointed by the EEC-AASM Parliamentary Conference to be chosen from among the full members of the Committee on Development and Cooperation?

President. — It would appear to me that the improved texts proposed by Mr Thiry and Mr Giraud should also apply to Delegation 3 to obviate any doubt on the subject. It seems to me that this is now settled, also to the satisfaction of Mr Lagorce.

I call Mr Durieux.

Mr Durieux, chairman of the Liberal and Allies Group. — (F) Mr President, I believe I can

Durieux

satisfy, at least in part, both Mr Vals and Miss Lulling by stating straight away that our Luxembourg Representative, Miss Flesch, has a good chance of being a member of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs.

That means that there is already one committee which will include a Luxembourg Member.

President. — I call Mr Memmel.

Mr Memmel. — (D) Mr President, just two points. Firstly, with regard to what Miss Lulling has said: I cannot escape the impression that elections are forthcoming in Luxembourg. This debate on the composition of delegations would not have been necessary today. All we have to decide on today is the number of committees and of members, not on the members themselves.

Secondly, we do not work in this Parliament on the basis of national delegations but of political groups. Why, then, must this problem, which can be solved within the political groups, be so 'played up'—if you will excuse the expression—that national composition is also taken into consideration?

One final remark on the second part of the motion: the text, Mr President, would be perfect if we were to say 'Only full members of the Committee on Development and Cooperation or of the Committee on External Economic Relations may be full members of these delegations.' That would solve the problem.

President. — I call Mr Lücker.

Mr Lücker, *chairman of the Christian-Democratic Group.* — (D) Mr President, when I asked for the floor I wanted to speak on the order of business and to ask you not to allow a debate here on the subject which was raised by Miss Lulling and which we all understand.

Mr President, all the political groups are today concerned with this problem or request. There is no question of any reluctance to meet this request. Mr Vals has said that there are six Members of this Parliament from Luxembourg, each of them on two committees. The satisfaction of this request is a matter for cooperation among the political groups. My group is willing to do this. Mr Kollwelter confronted me with the same problem today and made the same request. I feel that this is a matter of cooperation between the political groups this evening and tomorrow. We should allow the groups enough time to do this work as well as possible.

The second part of your remarks, Mr Vals, came as something of a surprise to me. There have,

after all, been talks on a different method of making up the delegations. Now I hear you suggesting that delegations be composed so that there are members and deputies. I do not know if I understood you correctly. It was the desire of these delegations, including those concerned with Turkey and Greece, that the delegations should be composed from other points of view.

From the formal point of view you are, of course, right: if we adopt this motion for a resolution, we shall theoretically be committing ourselves on the composition of the delegations.

I therefore feel, Mr President, that we should accept this text today in principle, but with the reservation that the groups discuss today and tomorrow another method of appointing members to the delegations and submit to this House a proposal on how these committees and delegations should be formed. Perhaps Mr Vals would be prepared to agree to this interpretation.

President. — While any Member can ask for the floor on any motion for a resolution, this does not stop me from appealing to Members of this House to be as brief as possible.

I call Mr Wohlfart.

Mr Wohlfart. — (D) Mr President, I did not think I should be intervening in this debate at this time. My friend Mr Vals has clearly stated what we in our group have decided. I very much regret having to speak now, albeit very briefly, to clarify this matter. This is my tenth year in this Parliament, where there have never been debates on the appointment of committee members and seats. I maintain the view which we, the Luxembourg Representatives, discussed among ourselves and adopted at midday, i.e., I did not want this House to discuss such a secondary matter at this time. Such matters may be of interest to Luxembourg, but I must stress, Mr President, that we reached a decision among ourselves and laid it before the political groups; it was to be discussed and has been discussed by them. I maintain my view as chairman of the Luxembourg Delegation that in this House we must above all represent Luxembourg's interests at international level and not become involved in national pre-election campaigns; that is my personal opinion.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Kollwelter.

Mr Kollwelter. — Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should just like to emphasize briefly that I am grateful to the three political group chairmen who have spoken here for the understanding they have shown for our situation.

President. — I assume, Miss Lulling, that you will be speaking as briefly as Mr Kollwelter.

Miss Lulling. — (D) Mr President, as my remarks are directed at Mr Memmel and Mr Wohlfart, I shall speak in German. I regret the very unfair remarks made about pre-election campaigns, which have nothing to do with this problem.

I feel that every Member of this Parliament has the right to insist that motions for resolutions on which we vote here should be discussed in accordance with the Rules of Procedure. I simply asked the President to give me an assurance in view of the uneven distribution of Luxembourgers among the various committees—since we do not know what form the coordination between the political groups will take—that the motion for a resolution would be discussed in accordance with Rule 37(2) of the Rules of Procedure, which clearly states that the Bureau, and not the groups is to submit proposals on the composition of the committees. I merely wanted to make sure, Mr President—since there was no coordination during the last session—that if the case should arise again, the Bureau will ensure fair representation pursuant to Rule 37(2) of the Rules of Procedure. This has absolutely nothing to do with elections in Luxembourg. I will not stand for such malicious remarks when I take advantage of the right I have as a Member of this Parliament and representative of my country. As our Foreign Affairs Minister and President of our Chamber of Deputies has drawn our attention to this problem, I felt it was my duty to point out that Rule 37(2) should be applied if there is no coordination.

Mr President, what I have said was not meant emotionally, I had hoped that other Members of this House would be just as unemotional. I have every confidence that you, Mr President, will ensure that this is the case.

I, too, wish to thank the chairmen of the political groups for their efforts. I do not yet know what the results of these efforts will be. That is why I made my request, as is my right and my duty.

President. — The debate on the motion for a resolution is closed.

I should like to point out to Miss Lulling that the assurance she has requested from me can only be given by the President in the chair during tomorrow's sitting.

I put to the vote the motion for a resolution embodying the amendments proposed by Mr Thiry and Mr Giraud.

Are you voting in favour, Mr Giraud, or are you abstaining?

Mr Giraud. — (F) I am voting against, Mr President.

President. — The resolution is adopted.¹

13. *Regulations on the common organization of the market in sugar*

President. — The next item is a debate on the report drawn up by Mr De Koning on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture on the amendments to the proposals from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for:

- I. a regulation supplementing Regulation No 1009/67/EEC on the common organization of the market on sugar; and
- II. a regulation fixing for the 1974-75 sugar-marketing year derived intervention prices, intervention prices for raw beet sugar, minimum prices for beet, threshold prices, the guaranteed quantity and the maximum amount of the production levy (Doc. 393/73).

I call Mr De Koning, who has asked to present his report.

Mr De Koning, rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President, my report concerns an amendment to the proposal for a regulation fixing a number of prices for raw beet sugar and the guaranteed quantities to which these prices refer.

As a rule, the Commission submits a proposal to the Council, after which we deliver an opinion, and the price of sugar and the quantity to which it refers is then fixed.

The guaranteed quantity to which the sugar price for a given year applies is fixed after an estimate of human consumption in the Community has been made. This quantity is reduced by the Community's import obligations, particularly those arising from Protocol No 17 of the Act of Accession of the United Kingdom. The remainder is the guaranteed quantity, which the beet growers, the sugar producers of the Community can sell at a certain price.

Consumption in the Community in 1974-75 is estimated at almost 10 million tonnes. It is assumed that almost 1.75 million tonnes will be exported under the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement. This leaves a guaranteed quantity of approximately 8.25 million tonnes, to which the agreed price applies.

¹ OJ C of 8. 4. 74.

De Koning

The trouble is that the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement, which governs the import of sugar, expires on 31 December 1974 that is to say, in the middle of the sugar-marketing year. A new ruling on imports of sugar from the developing countries has not yet been established.

This means that the Commission cannot really make its subtraction because one of the elements of the equation is missing. It is not therefore possible for a subtraction to produce a result. The Commission therefore proposes that the fixing of the guaranteed quantity should be postponed until it is known what quantities are to be imported into the Community under an extended or renewed Commonwealth Sugar Agreement.

The Committee on Agriculture is aware of the difficulties facing the Community if it intends fixing a guaranteed quantity at the present time. The committee therefore feels that the Commission's proposal can be accepted, but only if one addition is made. It is of the view that the guaranteed quantity is an extremely important element in the fixing of prices for producers in the Community. It therefore feels that the Commission's proposal should be supplemented by the provision that the guaranteed quantity should not be fixed at less than 8.29 million tonnes of white sugar.

The Committee on Agriculture is thus of the opinion that the guaranteed quantity should not fall below that originally proposed by the Commission. It feels that this will give producers in the Community a safe guarantee. It further considers it extremely unlikely that the guaranteed quantity can be fixed at a lower level. It is much more likely that the guaranteed quantity will have to be set at a higher level afterwards. That is my explanation. The Committee on Agriculture moves that the Commission's proposal be approved with the addition I have just mentioned.

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

Mr Liogier. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I shall be very brief. Last part-session, we delivered an opinion on the basic regulation on sugar. This regulation, which is to be decided upon by the Council in the near future, lays down, among other things, that when derived intervention prices are being fixed, the guaranteed total production quantities must be fixed at the same time. One may ask, how does the Commission calculate these fixed guarantees?—Quite simply by deducting from this year's estimated consumption of 9,800,000 tons the estimated total imports, which, ac-

ording to the world agreements, at present amount to 1,600,000 tons, which thus gives a guarantee of 8,200,000 tons.

The Commission, however, omitted to determine these quantities for us, quite simply because it did not consider itself in a position to do so, since the world agreements are due to lapse on 31 December 1974 and will evidently have to be renegotiated.

In these circumstances, we accept the basic regulation on sugar on condition that the 8,200,000 tons of white sugar at least be guaranteed. Otherwise, sugar-beet farmers, who are now sowing for the 1974-75 campaign, will not be able to take us seriously, particularly in view of the high world prices and the shortage which we are experiencing and which we shall merely perpetuate by encouraging these farmers to switch over to other crops that pay much better and require less investment.

We find it surprising that the Commission should have drawn up for us a preliminary draft on imports of white sugar from the developing countries at a time when it seemed to be unaware of the content of this draft when drawing up its first proposals for a regulation on sugar.

Those, Mr President, are the few remarks that I wanted to make on this question.

President. — I call Mr John Hill to speak on behalf of the European Conservative Group.

Mr John Hill. — I can well understand, speaking on behalf of the European Conservative Group, Mr Liogier's anxiety that the European beet sugar producer should know where he stands for the year. Therefore, I accept Mr De Koning's amendment which aims at setting a firm minimum figure of 8.29 million tonnes.

Having said that, I think that this is an important alteration because of the implications behind it. The amendment proposes a new definition of consumption less the amounts to be imported from certain developing countries under arrangements yet to be made. I hope that these arrangements can be made within a short time—a matter of a month or two—and certainly not stretched out into the distant future.

Like the European sugar beet producers, the cane producers in the developing countries want to know where they are. The effect of deferring this quantity should enable arrangements to be made to bridge the gap that lies between the end of deliveries under the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement, namely, February of next year, and the end of our own sugar year, which is June of next year, and to provide a mechanism for future years.

John Hill

It may all seem rather academic today because the price of world sugar is so high that none of the mechanisms we are talking about for restriction of one sort or another is likely to be needed. However, I think in times of shortage it is no bad opportunity for getting clear-cut mechanisms and procedures agreed for the return eventually, as I think must come about, of a degree of relative surplus.

The importance of this will become clear when Sir Douglas Dodds-Parker's resolution is debated, as I certainly hope it will be, on Wednesday. I do not want to touch on that except to say that lying behind this is the question of how firm an undertaking is built into our sugar regime to take this quantity from the developing countries, a quantity which we believe under the Protocol and the Accession Treaties should be 1.4 million tonnes, to be taken as an integral part of the Community's sugar supplies.

For that reason, we support Mr de Koning's resolution but very much hope that we can debate the broader subject, certainly this part-session, when we can go into more detail.

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

Mr Cipolla. — (I) Mr President, I was unable to attend the meeting of the Committee on Agriculture on account of the 'system of communication' between Parliament and its individual members, which has proved somewhat faulty. I should like to point out here that it would be advisable not to depend on the mails alone when communicating postponements of parliamentary committee meetings.

I should like to avail myself of this opportunity to explain that I am opposed, not just to the amendment, but to the Commission's proposed regulation.

The Commission is helping to destroy—I do not know whether this is to its credit or otherwise—the entire Community organization of agricultural markets that had been built up, and it is doing this by failing to adapt Community regulations to the real needs.

At the beginning of 1973, when the Commission denounced some of the Community's major sugar industries, we agreed with it, because this denunciation was not merely the castigation of a single act of evasion but, by reason of the very serious nature of the evasion itself, called for adjustments on the basis of which the Commission, in the course of that investigation, came to its decision.

The new Commission has thought it best not to take any account at all of the results of the inquiry carried out by the previous Commission and this has not made it easy to fix the quota. Indeed, if the fixing of the quota is to be always left in the hands of the industrial bodies without any control on the part of the producers and local public bodies, then the quota, as I have said on another occasion, will not be a genuine prop for the agricultural producer but will hold him up only as the rope holds up the hangman's victim and will be manipulated in a manner contrary to the interests of producers and consumers, as has happened in the past.

Moreover, in all these proposals submitted by it, including the proposal on sugar, the Commission has not taken account of the vast changes which have come about in the system of world markets and still thinks along old lines of protective defence, whereas the front on which the fight ought to be fought is now a completely different one.

I should like to quote an example. My English colleagues will recall that during the last World War England had an enormous fortress in Singapore of the most modern design and with the most powerful armaments, and all precautions had been taken to ensure that it could never be attacked from the sea. The Japanese, however, did not attack it from the sea but from the jungle and took it.

The Commission continues to submit its regulations as if we were still in the same situation as we were five years ago, that is to say, in a situation where international prices are lower than those of the Community, a situation of surplus and not one of shortage. This manner of acting is futile and harmful in that illusions and imbalances are created to the extent that problems connected with a new surge forward in European agriculture are not resolutely tackled, that is a policy designed to counter limited threats is being pursued instead of a broad-ranging policy suited to our times.

For this reason, Mr President, we cannot approve Mr De Koning's report, much less the regulation put before us by the Commission.

President. — I call Mr Scarascia Mugnozza.

Mr Scarascia Mugnozza, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities. — (I) Mr President, I wish to thank the rapporteur, Mr De Koning, very warmly and also the Committee on Agriculture, which considered this proposal from the Commission with remarkable promptness, even if the time given them for this turned out to be more generous than was origin-

Scarascia Mugnozza

ally planned on account of the postponement of the meeting of the Ministers for Agriculture.

I wish to thank Mr Liogier and Mr Hill also for their speeches and to state that the Commission takes note of the concern expressed by the rapporteur and shared by the Committee on Agriculture and that it accepts as a minimum guaranteed limit the quantity indicated by the rapporteur, namely, 8 290 000 tonnes of white sugar.

With regard to Mr Cipolla's speech, I should like to say two things. Firstly, when the Commission decided to penalize the sugar producing companies, it did so not on the basis of agricultural regulations but on the basis of regulations on competition; this Commission decision, as Mr Cipolla is aware, was contested in the Court of Justice, which has not yet handed down its judgement. Secondly, I feel that the wider problem raised by Mr Cipolla today can be more appropriately discussed at next Wednesday's sitting when we shall be dealing with the basic regulation, as our debate today is centred mainly on the determination of sugar prices for 1974-75.

President. — Thank you, Mr Scarascia Mugnozza.

Does anyone else wish to speak?

The general debate is closed.

We shall now consider the motion for a resolution

I have no amendments or speakers listed.

Does anyone wish to speak?

I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.¹

14. *Regulation on the common organization of the market in cereals*

President. — The next item is a debate on the report drawn up by Mr De Koning on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture on the amendment to the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a regulation amending regulation No 120/67/EEC on the common organization of the market in cereals (Doc. 394/73).

I call Mr De Koning, who has asked to present his report.

Mr De Koning, rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President, the motion for a resolution proposed by the Committee on Agriculture relates to an amendment to the proposal for a regulation on the common organization of the market in cereals with particular reference to one point, namely, compensatory amounts for maize remaining unsold at the end of the season. There is a system of compensatory amounts for all cereals when stocks are left over at the end of the season, a sum amounting at the most to the difference between this year's target price and next year's being paid on the quantity of cereals remaining in the granaries.

It is logical for the price of the cereals to be adapted to the new price-level.

The Commission proposes that the same system should apply to maize as to other types of cereal. Up to now, the system for maize has been obligatory and that for other cereals optional. The proposal is therefore that this system should also be made optional for maize.

Secondly, the Commission proposes that the date on which the payment is made for maize should be adapted to the crop year. This date is 1 November for maize and 1 August for the other cereals.

Thirdly, the Commission proposes that compensatory amounts should not be paid this year because the pattern of market prices for all cereals—including maize—within the Community obviates the necessity for payment.

The Committee on Agriculture has considered these three elements of the amendment proposed by the Commission. The committee feels that it can accept the proposal. It therefore asks the House to approve the Commission's proposal.

President. — I call Mr Scarascia Mugnozza to state the position of the Commission of the European Communities.

Mr Scarascia Mugnozza, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities. — (I) Mr President, I should just like to thank the rapporteur and the committee.

President. — Thank you, Mr Scarascia Mugnozza.

Does anyone else wish to speak?

The general debate is closed.

We shall now consider the motion for a resolution.

I have no amendments or speakers listed.

¹ OJ C of 8. 4. 74.

President

I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.¹

15. *Regulation on soya bean prices*

President. — The next item is a debate on the report drawn up by Mr De Koning on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture on the amendment to the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a regulation extending to soya beans the system of prices applicable to oilseeds (Doc. 395/73).

I call Mr De Koning, who has asked to present his report.

Mr De Koning, rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President, here, too, we are concerned with the amendment to a proposal for a regulation previously submitted to us. In the latest price proposals soya beans are to come under the ruling on oilseeds. This means that soya beans would be formally included in the system of import certificates. A system of import certificates could, of course, be easily applied to sunflower oil, rapeseed oil and similar products, but it would be difficult to apply it to soya beans, considering the vast quantities of soya beans imported. It would also be in conflict with the Commission's formal assurance that the import ruling on soya beans will not be amended through the extension of the ruling on oilseeds to soya beans.

In view of these two factors, the Commission is at present proposing that the system of import certificates should not be introduced for soya beans. The Committee on Agriculture feels that this is a reasonable proposal and that Parliament should therefore approve it.

President. — I call Mr Scarascia Mugnozza to state the Commission's position.

Mr Scarascia Mugnozza, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities. — (I) I agree with the rapporteur, whom I thank for the work he has done.

President. — Thank you, Mr Scarascia Mugnozza.

Does anyone else wish to speak?

The general debate is closed.

We shall now consider the motion for a resolution.

I have no amendments or speakers listed.

I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.¹

16. *Regulation on monetary compensatory amounts for processed agricultural products*

President. — The next item is a debate on the report drawn up by Mr Héger, who has asked to present his report.

Mr Héger, rapporteur. — (F) Mr President, permit me to quote the title of this proposal: '...proposal...for a regulation amending Article 4(a) (I repeat, 4(a)) of Regulation (EEC) No 974/71 as regards the monetary compensatory amounts applicable to processed agricultural products.'

I shall not conceal the surprise experienced by members of the Committee on Agriculture when this document was distributed during the meeting of 28 February. Filled with admiration for the Commission's zeal, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture proposed that this document which, if I may put it like that, had descended like a bolt from the blue, accelerated by a most extraordinary zeal, be entered on the agenda. Obviously, the Committee on Agriculture could hardly fail to respond with enthusiasm to the Commission's zeal, and entered on the agenda the document we are dealing with today.

Moreover, a rapporteur had to be appointed forthwith, for the victim had but a few hours to prepare a verbal report.

This surprise and admiration soon gave way, however, to perplexity, for when your rapporteur returned home with the object of preparing a verbal report for the following day it was in vain that he searched for Article 4(a) of Regulation (EEC) No 974/71, an article to be amended of which he could not find the original text.

This was the beginning of a nightmare, which fortunately did not last very long, for the following morning your rapporteur had the good fortune to come across a soul as competent as it was charitable who explained to him that by means of a private radar system it had discovered the existence of a Regulation No 509/73—a regulation which, consequently, was two years younger than the one submitted to us and which had given birth to this notorious Article 4 (a).

¹ OJ C of 8. 4. 74.

¹ OJ C of 8. 4. 74.

Héger

May I say that I am a just admirer of conundrums, but they must not be repeated too often if they are not to lose something of their attraction?

Once these quite amusing problems had been resolved, it was a matter of determining the essential point of the proposal, and there, I must say, the business became a little less amusing. It was necessary, in fact, to scrutinize the proposal in an attempt to eliminate accessory material and lay bare the essentials, in order to discover the key to the problem.

Once this dissection has been performed, one finds that the point of the text is simply to establish with regard to import charges what has to be taken as a basis for fixing compensatory payments. What we have to avoid when assessing import charges is adding the mobile element to the fixed element as though they were one and the same thing. And so, the surgical operation on the Commission's proposal consists in cutting the umbilical cord between these two twins so as to dissociate the mobile from the fixed element in the assessment of the protection due to processed goods.

Under the arrangements hitherto in force, this was impossible, with the result that processed goods were either penalized or placed in a less favourable situation than basic products.

Reduced in this way to its simplest terms, the entertainment may today be applauded by the entire House, and this is what I have the honour of proposing to you on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture.

President. — I call Mr Scott-Hopkins.

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — I am grateful to our rapporteur for explaining so carefully and simply the purpose of the report and the basic document. I must admit, however, that I am not quite as clear as he might like me to be about what will be the result. He says that this is a clear cutting of the umbilical cord between two parts, one of them concerning import charges, and that it gives the Commission more flexibility. At least, I thought that was what he said.

Unhappily, I have not had the pleasure of being in the committee, having been otherwise engaged in my country. Nevertheless, I should like to ask the rapporteur or the Vice-President of the Commission what, in his view, will be the application of this regulation if it is passed in its present form. What will be the effect on individual countries? Will there be a rise or a fall in the

price of food because of it? Will there be a rise or fall in the levels of compensatory payments?

Is it right to do this at a time when, unfortunately, currencies within the Community are fluctuating at such speed? Might it not be more sensible, perhaps, to wait a little longer before introducing a regulation of this kind, until there is greater stability in the monetary field between the nine of us, when it might be much easier to deal with this matter?

Surely the ultimate objective of all of us must be to do away with monetary compensatory amounts. I have always understood it to be the purpose of both the Commission and this House that ultimately we should be able to do away with monetary compensatory amounts, which only bedevil the levels of trade between us.

I question whether this is the right moment for the Commission to bring in this proposal. I am glad that our rapporteur was surprised, as I was when I managed to get round to looking into this matter. I was very surprised that it had been forwarded to us at such short notice because I believe that it will have a quite profound effect.

I should be grateful if we could have an answer about what effect either the Commission or the rapporteur thinks will result from this proposal should it be put into practice.

President. — I call Mr Cipolla.

Mr Cipolla. — (I) Mr President, at this point I am so impressed by the arguments put forward by the rapporteur, supported by the very persuasive words of my colleague, Mr Scott-Hopkins, that I should like to ask my colleagues if they do not consider it more advisable to postpone this problem. I am not asking that it be postponed until the monetary situation is stabilized, as that would mean our having to wait too long, but simply that it be referred back to committee for a more thorough examination. Some hard thinking will be needed on the serious implications of this matter, not only for the cost of living but also for industrial employment.

This is not, of course, a burning problem nor one that has to be solved within a given time. Nevertheless, I think it would be advisable to have it considered more thoroughly in committee.

President. — I call Mr Héger.

Mr Héger, rapporteur. — (F) I should simply like to say to Mr Scott-Hopkins that the

Héger

explanation he was looking for in the Explanatory Statement is, in fact, the following: If, for example, the compensatory amount for wheat is equal to zero as a result of applying Article 4 (a), a compensatory amount continues to be granted for the import of processed wheat products, since a fixed element remains applicable. The compensatory amount is then equal to the fixed element.

This does not appear to be very logical, but it is the argument advanced by the Commission.

At the present moment, Mr President, you have a request to refer this proposal to committee for the purpose of subjecting it to more thoroughgoing study. One may well, of course, imagine that, when sending—incidentally, in rather a surreptitious manner—this proposal to the Committee on Agriculture, the Commission hoped that this Parliament would deliver its opinion during the present part-session and that the Council's decision would be taken in March 1974. If the situation had remained unchanged and the Community had undergone no modification of a political nature, it is quite possible that the Council of Agricultural Ministers would have been able to reach a decision on the question today or tomorrow, after receiving this Parliament's opinion delivered this evening. Today, however, we do not know when the Council of Ministers will meet, and the degree of urgency has perhaps been reduced.

In any case, I think the problem is simple enough and has been made sufficiently clear in the Commission's proposal for this regulation to be able to be adopted today without entailing any serious consequences. It is a matter of re-establishing an equilibrium between basic products and processed products, in default of which a kind of distortion of competition will take effect which is always harmful to the producer and to the consumer. That, Mr President, is why I should like to press for an adoption of this proposal today.

President. — I call Mr Scarascia Mugnozza.

Mr Scarascia Mugnozza, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities. — (I) Mr President, I should like first of all to thank the rapporteur, Mr Héger, who has told us in a most amusing fashion of the avenues he had to explore in order to find out Article 4 (a). I am very grateful to him for his very deserving efforts; and while in his own witty manner he made light of his labours, I wish to thank him for his success in submitting his report in time to have it debated in the plenary Assembly.

I should like to make it clear that I associate myself with the last part of his speech in which he urges Parliament, provided there are no serious difficulties in the way, to approve the motion for a resolution, since I do not believe that the Council meeting of Ministers for Agriculture can be postponed until after the next part-session of the European Parliament in April. It is essential, therefore, that the document be put before the Council before its next meeting, which is planned for sometime before the end of March.

I share fully the concern that has been expressed here, but I feel, on the other hand, that the document must be approved now, as the Council meeting will definitely be held before the next part-session of the European Parliament.

With regard to the compensatory amounts, it is a matter of common knowledge that these are a direct result of the fluctuations in currencies. On the other hand, the recent decision taken by the Council to permit a certain devaluation designed to facilitate the solution of agricultural problems, especially in the case of the Italian lira, is motivated precisely by the need to avoid the application of these compensatory amounts. In fact, we realize now that the problem of fluctuation calls for a mobile element capable of averting harm that may be done to various countries and a fixed element which must serve to ensure a certain protection to processing industries.

If these elements were not taken into consideration by Parliament and by the Council, it might give rise, as Mr Héger has pointed out, to serious disturbances on the international market. If, on the contrary, the Assembly decides, as I hope it will do, to approve the measure proposed by the Commission, we shall succeed, if not in finding the remedy for every evil, at least in alleviating the hardships resulting from them, always with the hope that parity will be restored between the currencies as soon as possible. In this case, we should be able to do away with these compensatory measures, which we have been obliged to adopt precisely in order to avoid the emergence of imbalances harmful to production.

With renewed gratitude to Mr Héger, I strongly appeal once again to Parliament to approve the Commission's proposed measure.

President. — Thank you, Mr Scarascia Mugnozza.

Does anyone else wish to speak?

President

I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.¹

17. *Directive on health protection against the dangers of ionizing radiations*

President. — The next item is a debate on the report drawn up by Mrs Walz on behalf of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a directive to amend the directives laying down Basic Safety Standards for the health protection of the population and workers against the dangers of ionizing radiations (Doc. 387/73).

I call Mrs Walz, who has asked to present her report.

Mrs Walz, rapporteur. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the object of the Commission's proposal for the directive now before the Committee on Public Health and the Environment is to amend, for the third time, the directives of 2 February 1959 laying down basic safety standards for the health protection of the population and workers against the dangers of ionizing radiations. Its purpose is to take account of the advances that have taken place in scientific knowledge and practical experience.

There is no question of challenging the basic principles underlying the standards of 1959. The object is rather to introduce into the new text a number of concepts in such a way that the organization of radiological protection is improved and better adapted to requirements without the quality of protection suffering in any way.

The most important amendment is to the general clause in Article 6(a) of the basic standards, which, it is proposed, should read as follows: 'the exposure of persons and the number of persons exposed to ionizing radiation must be kept as low as reasonably practicable.' The amendment consists in the addition of the words 'as reasonably practicable'.

The second amendment consists in the proposal that the doses recommended must in all cases be kept below the maximum permissible doses for workers and the dose limits for the population specified in Title III.

The third amendment appears in Article 12 and concerns the genetic dose for the whole population, which is to be kept to an absolute mini-

mum, so that the total exposure in any generation does not exceed 5 rem. The exposure of the population to radiation for medical purposes must be given especial consideration, for it must be assumed that there is no absolutely safe radiation dose and that consequently every dose still admitted may be dangerous.

Finally, the provision contained in Article 41, requiring each Member State to put into effect the necessary measures within a period of two years from the date of notification, is of great practical significance. To the best of our knowledge, workers and the population at large are sufficiently protected; here we, as politicians, have had to rely upon the experts of the International Commission on Radiological Protection, the International Commission on Radiation Units and Measurement, and the experts of the Commission.

I should like, however, to extend my coverage to something more than this, in order, so far as possible, to allay the anxiety of the population over its own increasing exposure to radiation from nuclear power stations, the threat to the environment and to those workers who are employed in nuclear research. As discussion in the committee reveals, a special problem has emerged—namely, the disposal of atomic waste, including not only storage on firms' premises but also the transportation and final dumping of such waste.

I should like to quote from a report entitled 'Energy and the Environment' issued by the Swiss Federal Council in February 1973:

'Probably in no other sphere of technology have the dangers been recognized and consequently the necessary security measures laid down with such promptness as in the sphere of nuclear energy.

Despite all reports to the contrary, the degree of security at nuclear power stations is, on balance, unprecedented. In the few cases of injury which have so far occurred at civilian nuclear plants, including experimental and research stations, no persons outside these plants have suffered any injury from radiation. At the nuclear power stations themselves, so many mutually independent security precautions have been taken that even in the event of serious breakdowns within the plant or serious disturbances from outside the possibility of endangering the environment can be ignored.'

Thus the Swiss Federal Council.

The Congress held at Aix-en-Provence in 1973 by the International Atomic Energy Agency, the Nuclear Energy Agency of the OECD and the World Health Organization and attended by

¹ OJ C of 8. 4. 74.

Walz

250 scientists from 30 countries came to the following conclusion:

'The radic-active substances released by nuclear energy plants into ecological systems of the earth and into fresh water are so small in extent that, even when extrapolated to the year 2 000, they would amount to less than 1 per cent of the natural dose.'

Thus, the greatest possible precautions have been taken for protecting the environment.

Why, then, is the fear of injury and even death from radiation and of large-scale breakdowns at nuclear power stations so widespread? The radiologist Ernest Sternglass has stated that in the last few years about 375 000 American babies have died in their first year of life from the effects of radiation by strontium 90. Recently, the Circuit Court of Appeal for the District of Columbia issued a judgement according to which a fastbreeder demonstration power station requires not only a safety report concerning its effects on the environment but also an analysis of the effects on the environment of fastbreeder development as a whole.

Both are right. But it should be added that another opinion, contrary to that of Sternglass, has been issued by Charles B. Yulish and others, in which scientists in very different fields accused Sternglass of making erroneous interpretations and produced evidence to show that he had simply ignored material pointing to the contrary. And the judgement of the US court already mentioned has not resulted in stopping the fast-breeder programme: on the contrary, the contracts were signed and not only the court already mentioned but also the Supreme Court refused to issue provisional injunctions.

In 1972 there appeared a new edition of the famous Brookhaven Report of the American Atomic Energy Commission (WASH - 1250), which contains information on the probability of serious breakdowns based on the experience of 1 000 reactor operating years. The probability of a fracture in the main coolant duct is once in 20 000 years; the danger of a serious accident due to radio-activity is one in 100 million, and the chance of a sudden release of radio-activity amounting to 10 curies is once a year for every 1 000 reactors. It is further calculated that in the year 2 000, with a US population of 300 million, exposure to radiation will contribute 10 deaths to an annual rate of 486 000 deaths from cancer. The danger to the environment is thus much less than with other forms of energy and even lower than with injurious chemicals.

That particularly high demands must be made of radiological protection for workers employed in nuclear research goes without saying,

particularly as regards uranium-mining, where radon may be particularly dangerous. There is no difficulty in the production of fuel elements where uranium is used. Only the use of the rare and extremely poisonous reactor fuel plutonium may lead to problems that are difficult to solve. The Commission and the International Commission on Radiological Protection will therefore have to devote especial attention to the possibility of delayed effects from plutonium.

Very high doses of radiation occur during the reprocessing of fuel elements. In this connection workers sometimes have to absent themselves for days or even weeks in order to avoid receiving more than the radiation dose permitted them. In such cases, no one must be forced, as appears to happen in some countries, to return to work. In fact, however, the reverse is usually the case: those concerned feel the innumerable controls and regulations to be carried too far—although this feeling is by no means justified.

The Committee is concerned that the increasing exposure of the population to radiation for medical purposes: hence paragraph 4 of the motion for a resolution. Whereas exposure to natural radiation, i.e. to cosmic and terrestrial rays, amounts in the German Federal Republic on an average to 125 millirems (which may be compared with 2 600 millirems in Kerala (India) and with 8 700 millirems on the Atlantic coast of Brazil), exposure from the operation of nuclear power stations amounts to 1 millirem at the most and from an X-ray examination to anything between 20 and 100 millirems. With the innumerable medical examinations to which people nowadays are subjected, exposure from these causes can mount up very rapidly, and it must therefore be very carefully considered whether exposure to radiation for medical purposes is even necessary. This responsibility must be borne by the medical profession.

Your committee recommends all the bodies concerned to pay particular attention to observation of the strict and detailed security precautions for transport, which are based on principles laid down by the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna in 1967. The final disposal of atomic waste must be such as to ensure that no dangerous quantities of radio-active material can find their way back into the biosphere. No matter whether the waste is deposited in abandoned coal pits, in natural or artificial caverns deep under the earth, is sunk into the depths of the ocean or buried in the ground (this last-named solution being feasible only in a very few thinly-inhabited areas), we must do everything to avoid saddling our progeny with a white elephant which might create

Walz

problems for centuries to come. At the end of February, the Soviet Union claimed, in an article published in *Pravda*, to have discovered a system for disposing of both solid and liquid atomic waste with complete safety by combining it with a special rapidly-drying cement. It also claims to be able to dispose of such waste with complete safety in subterranean tanks. However, in view of what has been experienced in the sphere of space travel, the response to this is somewhat sceptical.

Finally, in paragraph 5(a) of the motion, the committee calls for efforts to 'provide the general public with full details of all safety and health risks connected with nuclear reactors', and this, in your rapporteur's view, should help to allay exaggerated fears. The only question is: how is one to provide the general public with information on highly complex technologies? The layman cannot hope to attain the same scientific level as the expert; at best, he can check the expert's qualifications. Obviously, something could be done by following up each scientific congress of experts with a report indicating what they had agreed upon and what new ideas had been brought forward. This material would then have to be presented to the public by scientific correspondents making use of all communications media in such a way as to awaken interest and understanding for the problem of the risks entailed, since it is impossible to distinguish with certainty between technologies that are safe and those that are dangerous. If the public were called upon to express a decision on particular estimates of such risks, it would have to be very well informed of the problems involved, and we can only hope that we Parliamentarians, at any rate, may reach this stage at some time in the distant future.

(Applause)

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

Mr Lagorce. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, 'it is...better to work on the principle that there is no absolutely safe radiation dose, and that every dose is dangerous.' These words are not my own: they are taken from the first sub-paragraph of paragraph 6 of the explanatory statement contained in Mrs Walz's report—an excellent report, I hasten to add, although in my view, perhaps, a little too optimistic. At the same time, it is true that the optimism of Mrs Walz's written report is slightly modified by the oral report she has just given us.

However that may be, the phrase I have just quoted is the main reason for my speaking in

this debate. My sole purpose in doing so is to give expression to a certain anxiety which not only I but, above all, the man in the street feels with regard to a sphere whose growing importance in the years to come may be easily foreseen.

This anxiety is based on three points which I shall put to you very briefly. The first is that this proposal from the Commission to the Council concerns a directive amending directives already in force on protection against the dangers of ionizing radiation. These directives were originally approved in 1959; they were amended in 1962, and again in 1966. The amendment under consideration today is therefore the third, and it may well not be the last.

Admittedly, we are assured that—I quote—'there is no question of challenging the basic principles underlying the 1959 standards'—that is to say, the basic standards—but merely of ensuring 'that the organization of radiological protection is improved and better adapted to requirements.'

In so far as the protection not only of the workers concerned but also of the population at large is improved, neither I nor any man of commonsense can do other than subscribe to the measures proposed; but I make no secret of the fact that I am somewhat concerned by this headlong race—so, it seems to me, it should be described—between the dangers of radio-active activity, which, this report, incidentally, recognizes, as I said at the beginning, and the measures designed to remove them, for these measures are proving to be less and less adequate, as seems to have been the case in 1962 and in 1966 as well as now.

The second reason for my concern derives from the first. It is the growing importance which the use of nuclear energy will assume in the years to come.

In paragraph 3 of her resolution, Mrs Walz says that this Parliament 'notes that exposure resulting from natural background radiation and medical treatment is much higher than exposure through nuclear research and nuclear industry'.

This may be, it almost certainly is, true at the present moment. But can we affirm that it will be true in 5 years, in 10 years, in 20 years' time, when nuclear energy, more particularly plutonium, will be in full use and breeder reactors have been put into service?

That is why I should have liked to see some reference to the present time added to the paragraph I have just quoted. I do not insist upon

Lagorce

this point, and therefore shall not table an amendment.

On the other hand, should we also not take account of the fact that there may be—I say 'may be', I will not commit myself, for I am not qualified to do so—a fundamental difference between natural and artificial radio-activity. I should like to quote the following passage:

'Natural radio-activity has been in existence, without any great variations, for thousands of years. All living organisms have long since acclimatized themselves to it. On the other hand, artificial radio-activity, by its very nature, soon entails a rapidly-growing contamination of a large number of alimentary links which finally end in man—that of milk, for example, the basic food of children. Nonetheless, all supposedly legitimate norms are based on the implicit and explicit assumption that artificial radio-activity constitutes quite simply a small addition to natural radio-activity, an addition which, according to propaganda publications calculated to set the public mind at rest, remains consistently negligible.'

To the question which I raised on this subject during a recent meeting of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, members of this committee told me, without the shadow of hesitation, that there was no difference, either quantitative or qualitative, between natural and artificial radio-activity.

What disturbs me is that what I have just read out to you does not come from me, who am neither a technician nor an expert, let alone a scientist: I found it in a publication bearing the names of technicians, experts and the most eminent scientists.

This brings me to the third reason for my concern. Towards the end of paragraph 6 of the explanatory statement, we are told that 'the committee...bases its opinion on the scientific recommendations' of 'acknowledged experts' who 'are voting members' of the two international commissions concerned with these questions, the International Commission on Radiological Protection and the International Commission on Radiation Units and Measurements.

It appears, however, that other experts and scientists are not entirely in agreement on this point. Internationally recognized biologists such as Jean Rostand, professors such as Philippe Lebreton, biologists such as Ernest Sternglass—some of whose views are, as I am quite well aware, occasionally disputed—radiologists such as the Americans Gofman and Tamplin, physicians such as Dr Frank Barnaby, Nobel

Prize winners such as Hannes Alfvén, who won the Nobel Prize for physics in 1970, Edward Teller, the father of the H-bomb, and many others—the list is far from being exhaustive—are every day raising the alarm on account of the dangers of the atom.

Whom are we then to believe? This is what the man in the street is asking, and Mrs Walz was right to speak of a psychosis. Without encouraging any anti-nuclear hysteria, without going so far as to take at their face value apocalyptic descriptions of what is supposed to await humanity as a result of using nuclear energy, it is certain that the greatest precautions must now be taken in the sphere we are discussing today.

The report says that nuclear energy is less polluting than other forms of energy. That may be, but its waste is more dangerous in another way than that produced by the other forms of energy, and one may ask oneself whether the precautions taken with regard to stock-piling and control and to disposal of this waste are always adequate.

I have done no more than touch upon this aspect of the matter. Nonetheless, I know for a fact—and I repeat—that this aspect is a cause of particularly grave concern among the general public.

I conclude briefly. I am quite prepared to accept the assertion contained in the last subparagraph of paragraph 2 of Mrs Waltz's explanatory statement, namely, that 'the benefits which humanity stands to gain from the use of ionizing radiation are much greater than the risks involved', although we may note in passing that this assertion appears to be slightly inconsistent with the one I quoted at the beginning, that it is better to 'work on the principle that there is no absolutely safe radiation dose, and that every dose is dangerous'.

If, despite everything, this is true, it should be publicized as widely and as skilfully as possible, for public opinion is, I repeat once more, disturbed.

While admitting that today's debate is not exactly being skimmed, I, for my part, regret that it has not assumed a larger scale than it has done.

In a word, I agree with the report not only where it advocates the extension and maximum application of measures to protect workers and the population at large from the dangers of ionizing radiation, but also where it says, as indicated in paragraph 5 of the motion and also of the explanatory statement, that a large-scale campaign, of all the greater interest and impact

Lagorce

for being conducted on a Community scale, should be undertaken to inform the public of the high degree of safety ensured by the use of nuclear energy and, above all, to reassure public opinion—for its sake, for our sake and for that of our children, whose future, we must not forget, is in our hands.

(*Applause*)

President. — I call Mr Premoli.

Mr Premoli. — (*I*) Mr President, the oil supply crisis is leading at the present time to a boom in nuclear centres for the production of a substitute source of energy. That this process of replacing oil by other sources of energy has not been carried out with the vigour and promptness it deserved is due to the shortsighted policy of our governments, the Italian government included. We may recall here the very courageous vote in the European Parliament some years ago which denied approval to the Euratom budget in order to protest against the dilatory attitude of the Council of Ministers, which was dictated entirely by the *juste retour* idea and inspired, in practice, by the narrow vision of petty bookkeepers rather than by any wide-ranging political vision.

Let us, however, now leave these continual regrets for what could have been done, for lost opportunities, and rather concentrate our attention on what we can do to-day to make the atom available for peaceful uses in our daily lives, while at the same time restricting as much as possible the risks to citizens of the Community.

In this connection let us pay a warm tribute to Mrs Walz, who has put before us a document aimed at bridging the gaps in Community legislation before it is too late. We see how important this is when we reflect that often waste from nuclear centres is discharged into bodies of water which eventually, after purification, may be used for drinking water, though it is as yet difficult to establish with what degree of success this purification from radiations can be carried out.

On the other hand, prudent action must be taken in good time to ensure that nuclear fuels, either in their natural state or enriched, are safely stored. Neither should we gloss over in silence the problem of radioactive slag, which must be deposited in safe places in order to avert those forms of widespread contamination with which we are threatened by pessimistic futurologists.

Finally I should be doing an injustice to my own intellectual honesty if I did not express my solidarity with the amendment proposed

to Article 34 of the directive, for which I also fought hard in committee. We have always taken for granted the courage shown by workers in going down into the mines, into the bowels of the earth, and facing dangers down there, and doing so of their own free will and not because they were forced to do so. By analogy it seemed right that when the dread spectre of the danger from ionizing radiations has been banished, workers should still be at liberty to give their services freely. It is of interest to us all that the worker should be given the greatest possible opportunity of absenting himself from his job in these circumstances without any effect on the security of his employment.

Finally, I agree with our gracious lady rapporteur that more thorough study is required of the doses which may safely be absorbed by the human body, so that we may avoid the practice, increasingly frequent nowadays, of resorting without sufficient thought to radiations for therapeutic and medicinal purposes, even though the harm done by them to the human organism may outweigh the benefits it is hoped to achieve.

But on the matter of nuclear radiations, it seems to me that greater strictness would be desirable, whereas in the document we are considering it seems to me to be taken rather lightly or, let us say, in an off-hand manner which is certainly not suited to such an important and delicate matter. The risks involved in this matter are so great that a greater degree of caution, far from indicating any lack of vigour, would show that we were taking our task seriously. The dispute that we have witnessed over plans and blueprints should warm us to weigh up carefully the pros and cons before getting too carelessly involved in the development company. The apparent material advantages to us might well be vastly outweighed by other misfortunes.

President. — I call Mr Eisma.

Mr Eisma. — (*NL*) Mr President, I should just like to say a word about paragraph 5 of the motion for a resolution contained in the report drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment.

Something has gone wrong with this paragraph 5. I recall that at the meeting of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment in Brussels the paragraph 5 we saw spoke with praise and enthusiasm of radioactivity. We suggested to the rapporteur that she temper this enthusiasm somewhat. From the present text of the paragraph it appears that she has now gone to the other extreme. The original text spoke of

Eisma

informing people of the advantages of radioactivity. Paragraph 5 now warns of the disadvantages of nuclear reactors. I am not too unhappy about this, because I feel that this subject cannot be approached carefully enough. There are in particular—and now I am not thinking of the uranium enrichment process so much as fast breeder reactors—still so many uncertainties as regards the storage and transport of waste products what we cannot be too careful.

It is hardly surprising that—and I am thinking of my own country here—groups against the joint project between Germany, the Netherlands and Belgium for the development of fast breeder reactors should have formed. I also recall the hesitation shown by the Dutch Minister of Economic Affairs when dealing with his budget with regard to the secondary but very important dangers inherent in fastbreeder reactors. As a result, the extremely optimistic view in the original text has given way to a pessimistic view. I am not objecting to this, since care is needed in this field, which should never be coloured with too much optimism. I am grateful to Mrs Walz for expressing this so clearly in her motion for a resolution.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Scarascia Mugnozza.

Mr Scarascia Mugnozza, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities. — (I) Mr President, I should like to compliment Mrs Walz on her first report presented in this chamber and to thank her for her speech. I feel that I should also extend to her my warmest good wishes for her future work. I should like also to thank Mr Lagorce and the other speakers who have taken part in the debate.

This is a very big problem and it is quite obvious that we cannot go into it in depth this evening; I feel, however, that I should emphasize the fact that it has been very carefully studied, both from the health point of view—my colleague, Mr Hillery, for whom I am now deputizing, is responsible for this department—and from the point of view of environmental protection, the sector for which I am myself directly responsible.

We have noted the fact that while, on the one hand, recent events have highlighted the deficiencies in the energy sector and shown the need for an increase in the number of nuclear stations for the production of energy, an intensive campaign is being waged in the press, on the other hand, to draw the attention of the peoples, their governments and their members of parliament to the problem of ionizing radiations.

I must say that we ourselves are in a rather embarrassing position because, as Mr Lagorce has pointed out, even the specialists and the top-ranking scholars themselves are divided on the issue. It is clear that only time and experience can tell what will be the effective influence of these radiations on mankind and on vegetable and animal life in general. It is equally true, however, that we cannot overlook the data at present in our possession and it is for this reason that the Commission has been induced to submit the proposal for a directive which we are debating.

I should like to say to Mr Lagorce that in submitting this directive we have taken account of the data, the surveys and the results compiled over the past years. This directive therefore represents the best proposal that could possibly be made for the protection of workers and of the population in general against the dangers of ionizing radiations.

It is clear that the work of compiling information, initiated by the Commission in 1959, must be continually expanded. In 1969 seminars were held, which were attended by experts and also by Members of Parliament. We shall continue with these activities in the future and we would hope, by means of these studies, to be able to secure, on the one hand, the energy needs of our Community and, on the other hand, to do so in such a way that these needs will not be in conflict with the most elementary rules for the safety of the people most exposed to radiations and of the population in general.

Mr President, since Mr Premoli has avowed his enthusiastic support for the amendment to Article 34, there is something I should like to ask him. It seems to me that Article 34 is worded in such a general way that some confusion could be caused, since, moreover, what we have here is not a piece of Community legislation effective in the Member States but a directive which must be transformed into national law in the various states.

Article 34 says: 'the approved medical practitioner' (that is to say, doctors who have followed special courses of study) 'shall decide whether the worker should remain in a post involving exposure to ionizing radiations'. Then, if the following words are added: 'In this case workers may be absent from their work without any effect on their contract of employment', this means that, whatever the diagnosis of the doctor (who will not be the doctor employed by the company concerned), the worker can refuse to accept this diagnosis. In this case, the worker will not be dismissed for absenting himself from his work.

Scarascia Mugnozza

I agree that the worker should be able to challenge the doctor's diagnosis, but some kind of appropriate procedure should be set up to regulate this matter, such as, for instance, an appeals committee or something of that nature, since a worker may, for reasons that have nothing to do with health protection, declare himself dissatisfied with the doctor's diagnosis and refuse to go to work in the knowledge that he will not lose his job.

I still have some doubts on this point and I should like to ask Mr Premoli for some explanations. As it stands at present, a wording of this kind could not be accepted by the Member States.

President. — I call Mr Premoli.

Mr Premoli. — (I) I am very happy to have this opportunity to give the explanation requested.

It seems to me that in our discussions in committee it was clearly brought out that there are three stages of danger: first of all, a situation which we could call the normal one, secondly, an abnormal situation corresponding to a first degree of danger and finally, over and above this first degree, it seems to me that danger provided for in Article 34.

We felt, moreover, that while the doctor's diagnosis may be sufficient in the first degree of danger, in the second degree, which is called exceptional in the directive, the heightened nature of the dangers can leave the worker not only with an uneasy suspicion of being affected but even with a genuine crippling anxiety of such a kind that not even the doctor's scientific judgment would be able to restore his peace of mind completely.

In this second degree of danger, which not only goes beyond normal limits but even beyond the limits of the first stage, it seems to me that the final decision ought to be left to the worker himself. If, notwithstanding the doctor's opinion, he does not feel himself completely protected, he must nevertheless enjoy a full guarantee with regard to the permanence of his employment.

This was the burden of my speech, which was not in the least intended to be polemic, and this was the general line taken in our discussions in committee.

I will conclude by saying that I am aware myself (as was pointed out in committee) that this directive unfortunately contains some elements that are mildly superfluous, but this is due to the manner in which it is worded, with its distinction between two degrees of danger and two stages of exceptional risk.

President. — I call Mr Scarascia Mugnozza.

Mr Scarascia Mugnozza, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities. — (I) I have listened attentively to Mr Premoli's explanations, but my doubts with regard to the wording remain.

President. — Thank you, Mr Scarascia Mugnozza.

Does anyone else wish to speak?

The general debate is closed.

We shall now consider the motion for a resolution.

I have no amendments or speakers listed.

I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.¹

18. Approval of the minutes

President. — Rule 17(2) of the Rules of Procedure requires me to lay before Parliament, for its approval, the minutes of proceedings of this sitting, which were written during the debates.

Are there any comments?

The minutes of proceedings are approved.

Closure of the session

President. — I declare the 1973-74 annual session of the European Parliament closed.

I would remind the House that, pursuant to the provisions of the Treaties, Parliament will meet tomorrow, Tuesday, 12 March 1974, at 11 a.m.

The sitting is closed.

The sitting was closed at 7.15 p.m.)

¹ OJ C of 8. 4. 74.

