

Annex

Official Journal of the European Communities

No 2-322

English edition

Debates of the European Parliament

1984-1985 Session
Report of Proceedings
from 11 to 15 February 1985
Europe House, Strasbourg

Contents

Monday, 11 February 1985	1
Resumption, p. 1 — Agenda, p. 1 — Welcome, p. 4 — Hydrocarbons, p. 4	
Tuesday, 12 February 1985	11
Decision on urgency, p. 12 — Social Fund, p. 12 — Agricultural prices 1985/86, p. 23 — Formal sitting, p. 38 — Welcome, p. 43 — Question Time, p. 44 — Agricultural prices 1985/86 (continuation), p. 56 — Supplementary budget 1984 (Agricultural sector 1985), p. 60 — Votes, p. 65 — Supplementary budget 1984 (Agricultural sector 1985) (continuation), p. 66 — Annex, p. 71	
Wednesday, 13 February 1985	76
Decision on urgency, p. 77 — Supplementary budget 1984 (Agricultural sector 1985) (continuation), p. 78 — ERDF, p. 84 — Welcome, p. 90 — Integrated Mediterranean programmes, p. 91 — Welcome, p. 112 — Question Time (continuation), p. 112 — Provisional twelfths, p. 126 — Combating terrorism, p. 128 — Votes, p. 136 — Combating terrorism (continuation), p. 138 — Annex 'Question Time', p. 144	
Thursday, 14 February 1985	182
Minutes, p. 183 — Decision on urgency, p. 183 — Topical and urgent debate, p. 184 — Market in wine, p. 202 — Customs debate, p. 215 — Protocol extending to Brunei-Darussalam the Cooperation Agreement between the EEC, Indonesia and other members of ASEAN, p. 215 — Ratification of Torremolinos, p. 219 — Milk and milk products, p. 223 — Votes, p. 227 — Milk and milk products (continuation), p. 233 — Protection of workers, p. 234	
Friday, 15 February 1985	240
Votes, p. 240 — Food aid, p. 242 — Dairy sector, p. 247 — Mediterranean regions, p. 247 — Goods contained in travellers' personal luggage, p. 248 — Adjournment, p. 251	

NOTE TO READER

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

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

SITTING OF MONDAY, 11 FEBRUARY 1985

Contents

1. Resumption of the session	1	4. Hydrocarbons — Report (Doc. 2-1331/84) by Mr Ippolito:	
2. Agenda: Mr Paisley; Mr Arndt; Mr Cottrell; Mrs Veil; Mr de la Malène; Mr Klepsch; Mr von der Vring; Mr Seal; Mr Arndt	1	Mr Ippolito; Mrs Viehoff; Mr Sälzer; Mr Turner; Mr Alavanos; Mr Fitzsimons; Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz; Mr Romualdi; Mr Tortora; Mr Narjes (Commission); Mrs Viehoff; Mr Narjes; Mrs Viehoff; Mr Kuijpers	4
3. Welcome	4		

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

President

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

1. Resumption of the session

President. — I declare resumed the session of the European Parliament adjourned on 18 January 1985.¹

2. Agenda

President. — At its meeting of 15 January 1985 the enlarged Bureau drew up the draft agenda which has been distributed to Members.

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

Tuesday:

¹ Approval of Minutes — Membership of Parliament — Setting up of two committees of enquiry — Petitions — Written declarations (Rule 49) — Referral to committees — Documents received — Texts of Treaties forwarded by the Council — Membership of committees: see Minutes.

After the report (Doc. 2-1333/84) by Mr Raggio, there will be a joint debate on a statement by Mr Andriessen on agricultural prices, the oral question (Doc. 2-1456/84) by Mr Pranchère on the same subject and the oral question (Doc. 2-1455/84) by Mr Woltjer on the superlevy.

However, I have received from Mr Dalsass and 22 other signatories a request that Mr Pranchère's oral question be withdrawn from the agenda on the grounds that this question has lapsed as a result of the fact that the Commission has presented its proposals on 31 January 1985.

Mr Paisley (NI). — Mr President, I wonder if we could have some light in these back rows of the Chamber?

President. — I shall have that attended to by the administration, Mr Paisley, and I hope that they will come up quickly with some way of throwing light on everything for us.

(Laughter)

I shall put Mr Dalsass's request therefore to the vote.

(Parliament agreed to the request)

Added on to the oral question (Doc. 2-1304/84) tabled by six political groups on expenditure in the agricultural sector will be an oral question by the Group of the European Right on the same subject.

President

We have also received from the European Democratic Group a request that an oral question by Mr Elles and others to the Commission on the net cost of enlargement be included in the aforementioned joint debate.

Mr Arndt (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, under our Rules of Procedure we have a fixed rule concerning oral questions with debate, and that rule has not been adhered to. The whole thing does not hang together at all. The oral question by the Committee on Budgets concerns the 1984 supplementary budget and expected expenditure for 1985, whilst Mr Elles's oral question asks about the net cost or benefit to the European Community of accession by the two Iberian countries. The two things have nothing to do with each other. Combining the two would mean changing the proposal by the Budgets Committee on an extremely important subject. Furthermore, we in the House have not yet been provided with a translation of this oral question, and the enlarged Bureau has not had it in writing either. According to our Rules, therefore, you can only include it on the agenda if there are compelling reasons which explain why it has not previously been forthcoming. There were no such reasons!

I therefore resolutely voice my opposition to the inclusion of this oral question, in contravention of our Rules of Procedure, on today's agenda.

I also understood the Commission spokesman to say that the Commission will not be replying to the oral question until March. If this is so, then it cannot under the Rules of Procedure feature on the agenda for the February part-session! Consequently I agree with my Group that we ought to vote against including this oral question with debate on the agenda.

Mr Cottrell (ED). — Mr President, I speak in favour of having this matter dealt with. It strikes me as an extraordinary thing that Mr Arndt should suggest to this House that we should not — at what is, after all, an opportune moment — discuss what the costs of enlargement will be. Since so much of the Community's budget is consumed by agriculture, the burden of these costs will fall mainly upon the common agricultural policy. Mr Arndt may be specifically right in suggesting that the rule has not been strictly adhered to. However, Mr Arndt is always willing to see the rules in a slightly different way when it gives him an advantage.

The truth about this is that it does provide a very suitable opportunity indeed for this Parliament to discuss the costs of enlargement to include the two Iberian countries. This event — if we are to believe the fates — is no more than one year away. We have never discussed this subject so far. I am even more appalled to hear from Mr Arndt that the Commission does not propose to discuss it until March, by which time, of course, it will be extremely late in the day for Parlia-

ment to have any influence on the matter at all. I do urge Mr Arndt therefore to change his mind and see the wisdom of having a preliminary discussion at this early opportunity on one of the most important topics to face the Community in this decade.

Mrs Veil (L). — *(FR)* I too endorse the proposal. On many occasions we have considered the prospect of enlargement and each time, on behalf of my group, I have asked what the cost of enlargement would be. We have never had an answer, either from the Commission or from the Council. And yet it seems risky to me to go further without knowing what the cost is to be, especially now when everyone is talking about budgetary discipline and about limiting Community spending, particularly in the agricultural sector.

Parliament must know where we are going. Not because we want to veto enlargement, but because we need to plan for the costs it will entail. Let us not put the cart before the horse, as we are doing at present.

As regards procedure, I would point out that under our Rules the President of Parliament is perfectly at liberty to submit a resolution which has not been included on the agenda, as he has in fact done. It is then up to the plenary sitting to decide whether it shall feature on the agenda or not.

President. — It is not for me obviously to give any view on the substance of the matter. However, since Mr Arndt has taken his stand on the principle of respect for the Rules of Procedure, I must point out to him by way of reply that Rule 42(2) provides as follows:

In urgent cases, the President may propose directly to Parliament that a question which could not be placed before the enlarged Bureau under the foregoing conditions be placed on the agenda.

I felt that it was my duty to do this.

(Parliament rejected the request)

Mr de la Malène (RDE). — *(FR)* Mr President, we have just done two things. At the request of the Group of the European People's Party we have voted to withdraw Mr Pranchère's question on farm prices, and we have rejected the European Democratic Group's proposal to add a question on the cost of enlargement. Do you think the agenda proposed for Tuesday will be full enough to allow intelligent use to be made of the day?

President. — As you know, Mr de la Malène, we shall be hearing the statement by Mr Andriessen on agricultural prices, which is normally followed by questions for half an hour. The questions could even go on for a little longer.

President

After that we shall have the oral question with debate by Mr Woltjer and others on the statement by the Ministers for Agriculture of Belgium, Germany, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom on the date of collection of the superlevy.

Then we shall have the oral question with debate, tabled by virtually all the political groups and addressed to the Commission, on actual expenditure under the 1984 supplementary budget and prospects for actual expenditure in the agricultural section in 1985, and do not forget that all these matters come after the Raggio report, which keeps its place at the head of the agenda.

I feel therefore, Mr de la Malène, that you need have no fear that our agenda will turn out to be too light. Having said that, however, I do appreciate the zeal that prompted your remarks.

Mr Klepsch (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, on behalf of my Group I should like to propose a motion under Rule 40(2). We are talking here of Commissioner Andriessen's statement and the half-hour provided for any questions arising out of it. Because of it, and my Group voted in favour, we have withdrawn Mr Pranchère's question from the agenda. But with reference to Rule 40(2) we believe it would be desirable and feasible to add a further half-hour to the existing half-hour, so that the groups can have a chance of stating their positions briefly on the broad lines of Commissioner Andriessen's statement. I thus request that we add to the 30-minute question period a further half-hour for initial general reactions by the groups.

President. — Mr Klepsch, after Mr Andriessen's statement there will be a joint debate which will include the oral question with debate by Mr Woltjer and others on the superlevy. In this joint debate there is no limitation on speaking time, so that this will give the groups an opportunity to state their views.

Wednesday:

Added to the agenda would be an oral question with debate by the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning to the Commission on integrated Mediterranean programmes and a report by Mr Curry and Mr Fich, on behalf of the Committee on Budgets, on provisional twelfths.

The Newman report on the ERDF, which was not adopted in committee, has been withdrawn from the agenda.

In order to enable Mr Delors, President of the Commission, to speak in the debate on integrated Mediterranean programmes, it is proposed to organize the agenda as follows:

— possibly, continuation of Tuesday's agenda,

- De Pasquale report on the ERDF (Doc. 2-1544/84),
- joint debate on three oral questions on integrated Mediterranean programmes (Docs. 2-1457/84, 2-1591/84 and 2-1458/84),
- report by Mr Curry and Mr Fich on provisional twelfths (Doc. 2-1550/84),
- oral questions on combating terrorism (Docs. 2-1451/84/rev. II and 2-1452/84/rev.).

Mr von der Vring (S). — (DE) Mr President, I have heard that the Commission President proposes to make a statement on the integrated Mediterranean programmes in connection with this oral question, but that this is scheduled for Wednesday afternoon. Has the order been changed?

President. — It will be towards the end of the morning sitting, Mr von der Vring.

Thursday:

The report by Mr Wolff on the Community loan mechanism, which was not adopted in committee, has been withdrawn from the agenda.

Added to the end of the agenda is the report (Doc. 2-1568/84) by Mr Cassidy, on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy, on goods in travellers' personal luggage.

(The President read the list of requests for urgent procedure)¹

Mr Seal (S). — Mr President, you have just announced that the report by Mr Wolff on Community loans has been taken off the agenda. As I understand it, you are now saying that the Council is asking that this same item should be considered for urgent procedure and that we will be voting on the request tomorrow. Is that correct?

President. — Parliament will be asked to decide on this request at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

Mr Arndt (S). — (DE) Mr President, I would ask you at least to consider this question. The Committee on Budgets is to examine the provisional twelfths at its meeting today. We propose that the committee's report be placed on the agenda for Wednesday so that we can, if appropriate, vote on it that same evening at 6 p.m., for if I am not mistaken we need 218 votes for

¹ See Minutes.

Arndt

it to be approved, and the groups will have to see to it that we can get these 218 votes together.

President. — Mr Arndt, I shall repeat what I have already said; perhaps I did not make myself quite clear. It is proposed to add the report by Mr Curry and Mr Fich on provisional twelfths to Wednesday's agenda immediately after the oral question on integrated Mediterranean programmes.

(Parliament adopted the draft agenda thus amended)¹

3. Welcome

President. — I now have the very pleasant duty of welcoming, on behalf of Parliament, a delegation from the Irish Parliament who have just taken their seats in the Official Gallery.

(Applause)

4. Hydrocarbons

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 2-1331/84) by Mr Ippolito, on behalf of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, on

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-340/84 — COM(84) 273 final) for a decision adopting a research and development programme for the optimization of the production and utilization of hydrocarbons 1984-1987.

Mr Ippolito (COM), rapporteur. — *(IT)* Mr President, the research and development programme for the optimization and utilization of hydrocarbons 1984-1987 is of considerable scientific interest, even though it was not possible to include it as an urgent and priority programme because of the Community's financial circumstances which meant that adequate funds could not be earmarked for the purpose. The state-owned and private oil companies, however, are already devoting sizeable resources to this matter.

To my mind the value of the programme lies in the fact that, whilst the oil companies are all operating in their own individual interest here and keeping their findings quiet, a research programme financed even partly by the Community would enable all the companies to learn the findings of the others and thus achieve a significant improvement in the production of hydrocarbons and in research in the field.

Personally, I have indicated my own doubts in comparing this programme with the financial circumstances of our Community, which I have already alluded to. But since the Energy Committee voted by a large majority to adopt the proposal, I have, as rapporteur for the committee, accepted their vote, subject to just one or two conditions: specifically, I have pressed for sizeable cooperation by the oil companies and industries concerned to ensure that the Community's contribution should represent only a small part of the total cost of the research; I would also urge that no priority be given to that part of the programme which concerns the utilization of heavy oil fractions and the adaptation of engines, since this lies outside the scope of the research and exploitation of resources for which this programme was designed. In fact, having a programme as vast as this with very little money to back it would simply make those funds inadequate.

Nevertheless I have drawn up the report and the resolution, incorporating a number of these reservations in the explanatory statement, and in the text of the resolution we are to vote on I have called on the Commission to make use of the financial means provided by the major oil companies and to involve the national organizations in the sector. I have also asked that use should be made not only of the management committees provided for in the rules currently in force but also of the opinions of advisers who are experts on the various specific subjects of this programme. I have also asked that the approval of this programme should not lead to the cutting back of funds for other research and development programmes which should, in my view, take priority.

With these reservations, and with the proviso that no priority should be given to that part I have mentioned, I believe that the Commission's programme may be approved and that this research ought to be carried out so that, I repeat, the findings currently available only to a small number of oil companies can be shared by a wider international community. This would certainly improve research on and use of hydrocarbons throughout the sector.

A number of amendments have been tabled by members of the Socialist Group, amendments which could more usefully have been put forward at the committee stage rather than at this late stage before the Chamber. These amendments are aimed essentially at destroying the programme, and I am thus obliged to reject them *en bloc*. If there are political groups which do not wish to approve the programme, they can vote against the resolution — full stop — without trying to render it meaningless by all these amendments which waste voting time and do not help to clarify the matter.

Having said this, Mr President, I have nothing more to add. I shall, however, be happy to answer any queries anyone may wish to put to me on the matter.

Mrs Viehoff (S). — *(NL)* Mr President, in recent years the European Community has made considera-

¹ *Deadline for tabling amendments — Speaking time: see Minutes.*

Viehoff

ble progress in the field of research and development. We have managed to bring about true European programmes.

Two years ago we devoted much energy to implementing the pluriannual action programme. This was very necessary because up to that time nothing but *ad hoc* decisions had constantly been taken. This pluriannual programme specifically included criteria for the evaluation of programmes at European level. This action programme and the criteria contained in it came into being at the initiative of the Socialists and was already approved by Parliament in 1983. It will certainly make for a greater diversification of energy sources so that dependence on one specific energy provider can be reduced and, in addition, energy savings and more rational use of energy can be encouraged.

The criteria for the proposed programme are, essentially, that it must cover new topics which are large in scope, can only be covered on a Community basis and which have a European dimension. This Commission proposal is, however, the very antithesis of these criteria as set out in the pluriannual programme. The European Parliament and the Council are of one mind as regards these criteria, and the Commission is having the greatest difficulty in justifying the proposal.

Why then add this programme? One may wonder whether a research programme totalling 35 million ECU, since cut by the Council on 19 December last to 15 million ECU, can do anything useful. Especially as the research programme is superfluous in that the big companies are perfectly able to finance and carry out such programmes themselves. There is no reason at all for the Community to finance one.

If I measure the Commission's proposals against the criteria in the action programme, I have to say that they do not meet them. The research programme offers nothing new; it covers no topic which is large in scope and it has no European dimension. I must also point out that such programmes are also already being carried out at national level, and we should investigate whether it is not better for these programmes to be financed by the industry itself. The bigger companies are certainly in a position to. In the Netherlands Shell and Esso make extra profits totalling thousands of millions simply because the gas price is linked to the oil price, and I should think those companies are laughing themselves silly at a programme valued at 15 million. The Community should be able to play a purely coordinating role here, for national programmes need to be coordinated, as Mr Ippolito himself has said.

I should like to remind the House, furthermore, that this programme is to be part of the non-nuclear research programme. As I have just said, the European Parliament approved this programme in 1983. In the meantime the funds for this non-nuclear research programme have been slashed by half as a result of the

current passion for thrift. This programme concentrates on research to develop energy from biomasses, sun and wind, energy saving and new methods for the use of coal. We want to be consistent and not support research which is superfluous and already being done, at the expense of the important non-nuclear research programme which has suffered too many cutbacks.

You will find these arguments reflected in our amendments, and if you read Mr Ippolito's report you will find, in the resolution and in the explanatory statement, the same reasoning that I have just outlined. Nevertheless, we come to a different conclusion. And it is no secret that a number of Member States share the views of my Group. Whilst paragraph 5 of the motion for a resolution feels that the Commission proposal may be approved, we reject it in its present form because the whole approach is wrong. And I can say that my Group will be voting against the report unless our amendments are adopted.

Another word in reply to Mr Ippolito, who said that the Socialist Group should have tabled its amendments earlier, at the committee meeting. I find that an unfair reproach. Mr Ippolito also knows that last month it was requested that this Commission proposal should be treated as a matter of urgency, so that as a result the matter went through the committee very fast without any opportunity for amendments at the committee stage.

I trust that my arguments will also convince the other Members of the House.

Mr Sälzer (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. Mr Ippolito, the rapporteur, has already made clear, and Mrs Viehoff has further made clear, that this Commission proposal is one which certainly raises a variety of critical questions. I should like emphatically to endorse Mr Ippolito's position in viewing this project initially extremely critically, to the point of rejecting it, but then deciding to approve it after weighing the various pros and cons of such a programme. I would like to assure him that my Group has weighed the pros and cons with him and will vote in favour of his report.

No one would contend that the sums made available here by the Commission are in any way comparable to the considerable funds which the oil companies themselves have to spend on exploration and exploitation. I also believe — and there I disagree slightly with Mrs Viehoff — that this programme never aspired or intended to compete with them in this way. This programme can only be meaningful if it is seen as an honest broker, available to the individual national and sometimes state-owned oil companies at Community level for the purpose of better coordination. This is all that a programme of this kind can do and all this programme seeks to do.

Sälzer

I believe that an attempt of this kind to provide a little more coordination between the various companies should at all events be made, especially as the funds to be made available are in no way generous enough to threaten other projects to be funded out of our research budget. To this extent Mrs Viehoff's reservations are doubtless correct in principle, but not necessarily justified as regards the scope of this programme.

I should like to comment on two more points in Mr Ippolito's report. Firstly, we agree with him that it is a good idea to draw on the expertise of as many independent research organizations as possible. But we do not agree that it would be desirable to form a further committee at Community level.

I would remind Parliament that last year in a very wide-ranging report we managed to prune this proliferation of research and technology committees and that the Commission is now — I trust — gradually cutting them back. It will be reporting to us on its progress.

So if we now call for an additional committee, this would be counter-productive in terms of our own position of principle, because we started from the premise that the number of committees should be kept as small as possible if they were to be effective.

To sum up, I would repeat that we agree with and shall vote in support of Mr Ippolito's appraisal of the pros and cons of a programme of this kind and that we shall endorse his position by rejecting all the amendments, with the exception of Mr Turner's amendment and Amendment No 10 by Mr Adam and Mrs Viehoff on which we have no opinion. But for the reasons I have just given — of wishing to avoid the creation of further administrative committees — we shall also vote against paragraph 2 of Mr Ippolito's motion for a resolution.

(Applause)

Mr Turner (ED). — Mr President, I very largely agree with both the last speakers in only being able to raise half a cheer for this programme. It is, of course, always important to bring in industry, as is done here, with a shared cost programme. It is most important, and we must always emphasize the need, to cooperate with the experts in industry rather than to rely upon management committees which are simply the tools of the 10 Member States. Therefore, I tend to agree with what Mr Sälzer said about paragraph 2 of the resolution — I had read it slightly differently. I think he is probably right in saying that it is giving approval to the present system of management committees, and I could not agree with that. When Mr Sälzer says he does not want another layer of committees, I entirely agree. Nonetheless, we do need to have a mechanism for selecting the actual projects which uses the expertise of industry and not simply of management com-

mittees. I do not say that would result in an extra layer, it can be done without it very successfully — in ESPRIT, for instance, where you bring in industry without setting up an enormous bureaucracy.

Now as to priority for this proposal, we all agree it is of low priority in view of the great shortage of money when one compares it with ESPRIT, for instance, or with BI-ESPRIT, which is not yet off the ground. This is of low priority and the reason for it is this: the oil industry is already well geared to its problems. It is not a European industry which is lagging behind that in America and Japan, and therefore we do not have the same incentive to bring European industry together.

I am very glad that Mr Sälzer will support my amendment concerning the work on engines and oil, because it is, I think, very important. It is the one area perhaps where industry will not rise to the occasion and do the necessary research. It is not the oil companies' side of the job, but the users' side. It is they who probably need bringing together by the EEC so that they can cooperate to find ways of using the heavier fractions and the vacuum bottoms. I look forward to seeing the producers' solution to that problem. But the people who will benefit from the solution to vacuum bottoms, heavy fractions and better engines are not already at this present time working together to find a solution — and I do not believe the oil companies are doing it for them. That is where we need guidance. I very much agree with what Mr Sälzer said: in certain respects the Commission can act as the guide for industry — and this is one of them. I must confess that when one talks about looking for catalysts and geological formations and about work on them and on the mechanics of fluids and that sort of thing, which are very much the concern of the oil companies themselves, there, I think, the need is much less great.

Mr Alavanos (COM). — *(GR)* Mr President, in our country too it is felt in certain quarters that the Community should support non-nuclear energy programmes for the reason that they give better results and give them more quickly, not to mention the fact that they can be of benefit to all the Community's Member States.

Nevertheless, we cannot help feeling serious misgivings with regard to the Commission's proposal concerning a research and development programme for the optimization of the production and utilization of hydrocarbons. We share the view expressed just now by Mrs Viehoff on behalf of the Socialist Group. Programmes of this kind only subsidize the large monopolistic oil companies. We also feel that the Commission's proposal is not sufficiently clear about the kind of programmes it has in mind or the conditions under which they will be carried out. It does not provide the necessary guarantees nor does it face up to the question — an important one to our way of thinking — of how the Member States are to reap the benefits of the

Alavanos

programmes. For these reasons the Greek Communist Party Members will not support this proposal, especially if the amendments tabled by Mrs Viehoff are not adopted.

Mr Fitzsimons (RDE). — Mr President, the increased production and utilization of hydrocarbons has proved to be a highly scientific and technical matter of great interest in itself, especially for the Community which suffers from a too heavy dependency on imports of hydrocarbons.

The Commission's programme has to be comprehensive and long-term. Its efficiency cannot be measured in the short term. That is why, in my opinion, the research and development programme on hydrocarbons must be kept as such because of the special nature of the programme itself.

The idea behind this research programmes lies in the fact that hardly 30 or 40% of the sources of oil and gas in the Community and in the world are exploited. Up to now it has not been possible to extract the major part of the existing quantities of hydrocarbons.

The example of Ireland is important here. Both parts of Ireland are heavily dependent on imported fuels and particularly on oil. The provision of Kinsale gas to Northern Ireland would have ensured a future for its 13 gas undertakings and avoided the public expenditure incurred in closing down the gas industry at a cost of some 100 million pounds sterling and the loss of some 100 000 jobs. A second source of natural gas would, if discovered, create a more secure supply situation for the country as a whole. The Community could assist the development of the lignite deposits at Lough Neagh in County Antrim where there is an exploitable reserve of 100 million tonnes or the equivalent of a medium-sized oil field.

Our particular concern is the development of offshore resources, the exploitation of many fields. The Community can greatly assist our efforts at a technical level in the area of oil and gas. This is essential if we are to have a commercial proposition. We will find small pockets of oil and gas, and it is in the interests of the Community to help us exploit these finds. We cannot afford the enormous capital needed for the use of multi-million pound rigs. The Community's research programme must help us to devise inexpensive methods of extracting oil and gas. The use of computer techniques and specially designed ships equipped to be stationed over small fields is one proposal. Another is the use of a template system. We must also have Irish people who are technically qualified; otherwise the multinationals will take us to the cleaners. They will try to convince us that the costs are enormous. We must be able to monitor the multinationals and be more than capable of working with them.

The EEC is the catalyst, but the funds for non-nuclear research are paltry. There will be no optimization of

production and utilization of hydrocarbons with an increase in available funds or a rearrangement of the shares. It is plain, therefore, that something must be done. We must improve our technologies and we have to know how best to use them. The large-scale research programme proposed by the Commission responds to this demand.

Of course, the oil companies and the refining industries are constantly dealing with these problems, but in the short term only to ensure a good return for their investment. Basically the research programme and the activities of the industries are complementary. The Community programme will give a scientific and long-term basis to the programme of the industries concerned. I would like to point out too that national research programmes are scarce, insufficient and piecemeal. Some Member States of the Community carry on such programmes, others do not. A Community programme will coordinate better all these separate programmes and strengthen the European scientific potential. If we achieve the objectives of the proposed programme, there is no doubt that the Community as a whole will profit from it, leading to a more efficient exploitation and better use of hydrocarbons which will enable the Community to reduce significantly its heavy dependency on imports. The EDA Group therefore approves of the Commission's programme and will vote for the Ippolito report.

Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz (ARC). — (DE) Programmes and the implementation of programmes to improve our knowledge of hydrocarbon deposits, as well as the refining of procedures for the better exploitation of deposits, must in principle be regarded as desirable, but only if enough money is available without taking any from the already meagre funds earmarked for the non-nuclear programme. This is a most important point.

The improvement and further development of secondary and tertiary processes for better exploitation of known hydrocarbon deposits may be particularly valuable in helping the European Community to cover more of its own needs. Research into the utilization of heavy oil fractions, which will be playing a more significant role in future, would only appear to be desirable if such work were to concentrate on the reduction of pollutant emissions.

Extreme caution should also be brought to bear on efforts to use tar sands and oil shale as sources of hydrocarbons. We have as yet no comprehensive view of the environmental damage caused by the mining and processing of these substances. We should therefore insist that any industrial mining of these formations is always preceded by an estimate of the technical implications. We must also insist — especially as our funds really are low — that a breakdown of costs is drawn up which shows clearly beforehand the proposed percentage involvement of the industrial companies.

Bloch von Blottnitz

But all these programmes will remain nothing more than improvised efforts cobbled together until such time as we agree on programmes of equal value, on measures to save energy, on the more rational use of energy, for this is still — heaven knows! — the cheapest way to provide energy. At the same time we must at last make the breakthrough to developing alternative, renewable sources of energy. This is the cheapest and most important measure, the one which is kindest to the environment and impinges on it least. I shall say this again and again and repeat my calls again and again, even though they are heeded here so little. Our Group will insist on it!

Mr Romualdi (DR). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I have asked to speak simply in order to say that I endorse most of the conclusions of Mr Ippolito's report and thus its favourable opinion, with all the reservations it contains, on the proposal by the Commission of the European Communities for the adoption of a research and development programme for the optimization of the production and utilization of hydrocarbons.

I do so on behalf of the European Right and particularly on behalf of Mr Petronio, who is again unable to be with us and who has on many occasions concerned himself with this fundamental problem of increasing research and making use of all our energy sources so that the countries of our Community can limit as far as possible our dependence on oil imports from areas which, for a variety of reasons, are always less than convenient — imports are always uncertain, unreliable and always very costly to our economy. We approve, then, an increase in research by the countries of the Community into non-nuclear sources of energy, and we agree with the call for participation by the major oil companies and the major industries which are directly concerned in research into and exploitation and utilization of hydrocarbons, principally for industrial purposes and for the development of new technologies.

The Commission's supplementary proposal is a move in this direction and aims, furthermore, to complete existing research on energy saving and alternative sources of energy. But all this must not, as has already been said, detract from the funds earmarked for the ESPRIT programme of research which must continue and which is vital to our further advancement. And for this reason it is better to limit the programme purely to research into and the exploitation of hydrocarbons in the Community, which is all that can in fact be done with the modest 35 million ECU available.

It is only too clear that all this must make use of technical assistance at the highest level, not necessarily from new committees or groups of experts; we need advisers who really are able to advise us well and who will serve the real interests of our Community.

Mr Tortora (NI). — *(IT)* Mr President, we Radicals cannot deny that we are happy to see this sudden return to an appreciation of hydrocarbons by our honourable friend, Mr Ippolito, whom we regard as a friend indeed and respect for his technical and scientific expertise. But too often in recent years we have been uncomfortably aware of Professor Ippolito as the immovable advocate of nuclear power in Italy. Our views on nuclear power are many and varied.

This 'conversion' of his on the road to Damascus, towards encouraging research methods and applications which are less hazardous to man, can only meet with our approval.

In addition to the exploitation of hydrocarbons, as our technical experts would have it, I should like to touch on the sector of mining research — which is also mentioned in the report. In our country, Italy, we have perhaps given in too quickly to the idea that certain mining areas are no longer competitive. Mines there have quite simply been closed down, and the underground workforce has either been made redundant altogether or has suffered hardship. I am thinking of Sardinia, Grossetano and other such areas in our country. Not to mention the true revitalization which this revival of research interest might entail for the mining regions of France, Belgium, Germany and the United Kingdom.

As regards new technological research, we read this morning that there may be significant uses to be made of maize, a cereal, to manufacture what has been termed 'green petrol', a substance free of lead, that ingredient which is so insidiously harmful to the health of the general public and workers and which so pollutes our cities.

Converting maize into motor fuel might be one way of putting our awesome cereal surpluses to good use, thus solving another of our world's serious energy problems.

We shall, then, vote most willingly in favour of the Ippolito report, but we shall particularly endorse and approve Amendment No 2 by Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz.

Just one plea before concluding. If a new discovery meant that it was really possible to use the rich countries' cereals surplus and transform it into fuel, we ought not then to forget those countries which still need cereals to feed their people more than they need fuel. In short, we shall want to have it both ways, to help Ethiopia and ourselves too, even if it means transforming cereals into fuel.

IN THE CHAIR: MR GRIFFITHS

Vice-President

Mr Narjes, Vice-President of the Commission. — *(DE)* Mr President, I should like first of all to thank

Narjes

the rapporteur for his careful, measured and fair reporting, the committee for its swift consideration and debate of this urgent proposal, and the speakers in today's debate for their interventions.

Even though the great efforts made in the last few decades to save energy and to replace oil, in particular, by new sources of energy have met with increasing success, thus ensuring that oil and gas can remain our principal energy sources well into the next century, albeit at increasing production costs, we nevertheless consider it vital, if only on account of the lengthy run-in times when new technologies are introduced, firstly to do everything possible to cut down even more on the use of fossil fuels and secondly to propose a programme to this end which will assist the rational exploitation and use of hydrocarbons by means of further research.

We are motivated in this by the recognition that oil will remain irreplaceable as a transport propulsion fuel for a long time yet, and that there will be a need for years to come for fossil fuels as raw materials in the chemicals industry. Finally, perhaps even more clearly in the past few months, we have seen that the current falls in the real price of oil worldwide have — sadly! — led or seduced governments and companies into cutting back their own research and development efforts, a move which is risky in the long term.

The European Community thus has an even greater duty and interest in safeguarding and assisting further the continuity of research and development work, specifically in this area of applications-oriented, precognitive research. In this way the European Community can prevent the development in the next few decades of circumstances which might trigger a third oil crisis.

Limiting our efforts to precognitive research, and I can add this on the basis of today's debate, means that we cannot make any commercial-scale or direct contributions to product development. I would also point out that we would be reducing the scale of the picture if we assumed that we are concerned only with large-scale companies here. Europe has a wealth of capable small- and medium-sized undertakings which can play a significant part in the research at issue here, without having the kind of money which the big companies perhaps have at the moment.

The proposed research work is not intended to compete with research which can be expected to be funded by high-performance industry itself. The aim is rather to plug a number of obvious gaps, to increase horizontal knowhow and expand the basis of scientific information, so that available hydrocarbon reserves can in the long term be used efficiently and to the fullest possible extent.

As a number of speakers have pointed out, with all the exploitation techniques available and actually used today, we still as a rule exploit less than half of the

world's geologically identifiable oil deposits. For this reason the proposed programme is complementary to other measures which are already under way.

In organizational terms it will form part of the research and development programme on non-nuclear energy already examined and approved by this House. We are grateful to the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology for conducting its deliberations speedily and for giving us a number of relevant recommendations regarding the priority to be accorded to the various research topics.

A word or two on the various amendments laid before us. Paragraph 1 of the committee's motion, which refers to cost-sharing by the oil companies, needs to be interpreted in line with our practice of providing a maximum of 50% in the case of shared-cost programmes like the one here. Where the companies' finances are healthy, we shall naturally do all we can to keep our contribution as small as possible. The 50% ceiling is as a rule designed for small- and medium-sized research-intensive undertakings. Paragraph 2, which has prompted a number of comments, should also be interpreted in the light of the fact that we have just one committee, the Advisory Committee for Administration and Coordination, which covers all non-nuclear energy research. Consequently there is no danger of there being a wealth of committees all working at cross purposes and impossible to monitor. We do, however, co-opt available experts to this committee to assist with individual projects.

As for paragraph 3, I would say that the boot is on the other foot. If this programme is not adopted, it is unlikely that there will be a majority in favour of the non-nuclear research programme as a whole.

As regards paragraph 4, which considers that priority should not be given to the adaptation of engines and problems concerning heavy oil fractions, we are aware that to the extent that these are problems facing the oil companies, it is these which primarily dictate the amount of money spent on research. But there is also an applications-oriented side, and in many cases there are undertakings which have applied for and ought to receive research funding in line with the overall objectives. To this extent we have no objections to Mr Turner's amendment.

In reply to Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz I would say that we would have no objections to subjecting the mining of tar sands and tar and oil shale to a very extensive system of environmental monitoring. But these kinds of deposits are hardly found in Europe, and outside Europe it is the sovereign right of the producer country to decide whether and to what extent it wishes to subject its mining operations to previous environmental tolerability testing of the kind envisaged.

As regards Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz's amendment to paragraph 1, the breakdown of costs cannot be drawn

Narjes

up *ex ante*, but is the product of how the projects are shared out and how much money we can agree to give for each individual project — as I said, a maximum of 50%. As I stated in my introductory remarks, we do not of course propose to make any contributions on a commercial scale. I can thus agree with the spirit of Mrs Bloch von Blotnitz's three amendments, though not necessarily with the letter of them.

The amendments by Mrs Viehoff of the Socialist Group are aimed at invalidating the entire programme. But if this programme were rejected, the Community's entire body of non-nuclear research would be in doubt. I believe our approach has taken account of the substance of the various amendments.

Mrs Viehoff (S). — (NL) I should like, if I may, to ask the Commissioner a question concerning his last remark that if Parliament does not approve this programme, then the entire non-nuclear programme will be at risk. I would point out that this Parliament has already approved it in 1983. I wonder if it is not an attack on Parliament's decision-making powers to say quite simply, if you don't do what we want, you won't get the rest either. That seems to me amazing. Parliament is asked to give its opinion on each subprogramme. It gave its opinion on the other programmes in 1983. This programme is an addition to these, and if Parliament does not accept it, then you can forget about the rest. I should be glad of clarification on this, because I have the feeling that it is not admissible.

Mr Narjes, Vice-President of the Commission. — (DE) Mr President, I would point out once again that the entire programme could be at risk, because there are a number of governments in the Council of Ministers which maintain that it is an integral requirement for any overall programme promoting non-nuclear energy to include a part-programme, a subprogramme of the kind we have here today. So if this part is removed from the overall package, the financing for it, which was obtained only with great difficulty, is put at risk.

Mrs Viehoff (S). — (NL) Mr President, this is not an answer to my question. I asked whether we were not seeing an attack on Parliament's decision-making

powers. Parliament is asked for its opinion, and it is well known that it cannot give that opinion freely but that its pronouncements are tied to other matters. I repeat that I find this an amazing state of affairs.

President. — If I could intervene here, Vice-President Narjes. You have given your reply. Mrs Viehoff has given her opinion. I think the best thing we can do is to take the vote and then just let us see what happens afterwards.

The debate is closed.

Explanation of vote

Mr Kuijpers (ARC), in writing. — (NL) The programme is part of an action programme for research on non-nuclear energy, and that is a good sign. I fully endorse the objectives of the programme. New technologies must indeed be developed, for Europe cannot afford to rely on one energy source alone.

The rational use of energy is also part of this option, for energy sources are not inexhaustible and energy must be used rationally. Proper attention must also be given to environmental protection and pollution questions.

Nevertheless, it pains me greatly that the infinite sources of power, such as wind, sun and water, are treated as marginal when it comes to money.

A programme on hydrocarbons should also take account of the risks entailed in these substances.

These risks are the carcinogenicity of hydrocarbons (cf. International Agency for Research on Cancer) and the catastrophic effects of dumping hydrocarbons at sea.

I find no mention of all this in the report, and shall consequently abstain.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)¹

(The sitting was closed at 6.25 p.m.)²

¹ The rapporteur was:
— IN FAVOUR OF Amendment No 1
— AGAINST Amendments Nos 2 to 8, 10, 11.

² Agenda for the next sitting: see Minutes.

SITTING OF TUESDAY, 12 FEBRUARY 1985

Contents

1. <i>Decision on urgent procedure:</i> <i>Mr Christodoulou; Mr Seal</i>	12	<i>Meana; Mr Hume; Mr Ripa di Meana; Mr Chanterie; Mr Ripa di Meana</i>	46
2. <i>Social Fund — Report by Mr Raggio (Doc. 2-1333/84):</i> <i>Mr Raggio, Mr Avgerinos; Mrs Dury; Mr Ciancaglini; Mr Tuckman; Mrs Squarcialupi; Mrs Larive-Groenendaal; Mr Flanagan; Mr Ulburghs; Mr Megaby; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mr Alavanos; Mr Chanterie; Mr Filinis; Mr Sutherland (Commission)</i>	12	• <i>Question No 4, by Mr Ford: Safety of Members of the European Parliament:</i> <i>Mr Ripa di Meana; Mr Ford; Mr Ripa di Meana; Mr Ulburghs; Mr Ripa di Meana; Mr Smith; Mr Ripa di Meana; Mr Staes; Mr Ripa di Meana; Mr Dal- sass; Mr Ripa di Meana; Mrs Boserup; Mr Ripa di Meana; Mr McMillan-Scott; Mr Ripa di Meana; Mr Trivelli; Mr Ripa di Meana; Mr Aigner; Mr Ripa di Meana; Lord O'Hagan</i>	47
3. <i>Agricultural prices 1985-86 — Statement by the Commission and oral question, with debate, by Mr Woltjer and others (Doc. 2- 1455/84):</i> <i>Mr Andriessen (Commission); Mr Woltjer; Mr Thareau; Mr Bocklet; Mr Provan; Mr Pranchère; Mr Ducarme; Mr Mouchel; Mr Roelants du Vivier; Mr Paisley; Mr Romeos; Mr Dalsass; Mrs Jepsen; Mr Adamou; Mr Christensen; Mr Früh; Mr Welsh; Mr Gatti; Mr Debatisse; Mr Tolman; Mr Marck; Mr Raftery</i>	23	• <i>Question No 5, by Mr Newman: The location of the storage of chemicals and their proximity to residential dwellings:</i> <i>Mr Clinton Davis (Commission); Mr Newman; Mr Clinton Davis; Mr Seal; Mr Clinton Davis</i>	49
4. <i>Formal sitting</i> <i>Mr Herzog, President of Israel; Mr Dalsass</i>	38	• <i>Question No 6, by Mrs Ewing: Com- munity forestry policy:</i> <i>Mr Clinton Davis; Mrs Ewing; Mr Clinton Davis; Mr Raftery; Mr Clinton Davis; Mr Dalsass; Mr Clinton Davis; Mr Hutton; Mr Clinton Davis; Mr Maher; Mr Clinton Davis; Miss Quin; Mr Clinton Davis</i>	50
5. <i>Welcome</i>	43	• <i>Questions No 7, by Mr von Wogau: Identity checks at Brussels Airport; No 14, by Mr Rogalla: Abolition of personal checks between Member States; No 49, by Mr Pearce: Frontier formalities; No 53, by Mr Cornelissen: Red tape for rail passengers at internal frontiers; and No 60, by Mr Coste-Floret: Checks at the Community's internal frontiers:</i> <i>Lord Cockfield (Commission); Mr von Wogau; Lord Cockfield; Mr Rogalla; Lord Cockfield; Mr Pearce; Lord Cock- field; Mr Cornelissen; Lord Cockfield; Mr Coste-Floret; Lord Cockfield; Mr Gerontopoulos; Lord Cockfield; Mr Cot- trell; Lord Cockfield; Mr Cryer; Lord Cockfield; Mr Van Miert; Lord Cock- field; Mr Flanagan</i>	52
6. <i>Question Time (Doc. 2-1593/84) — Ques- tions to the Commission:</i>			
• <i>Question No 1, by Miss Tongue: Imple- mentation of EC Council Directive 79/ 7/EEC on equal treatment for men and women in matters of social security</i> <i>Mr Pfeiffer (Commission); Miss Tongue; Mr Pfeiffer; Mrs Larive-Groenendaal; Mr Pfeiffer; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mr Pfeiffer; Mr Elliot; Mr Pfeiffer; Mr Her- man; Mr Pfeiffer</i>	44		
• <i>Question No 2, by Mr Marshall: Scheme for reduced-price butter for the confe- ctionery trade:</i> <i>Mr Andriessen (Commission); Mr Mar- shall; Mr Andriessen</i>	45		
• <i>Question No 3, by Mr Van Miert: Cul- ture in Europe:</i> <i>Mr Ripa di Meana (Commission); Mr Van Miert; Mr Vandemeulebroucke; Mr Ripa di Meana; Mrs Ewing; Mr Ripa di Meana; Mrs Banotti; Mr Ripa di</i>			
7. <i>Agricultural prices 1985-86 (contd)</i> <i>Mr Andriessen (Commission)</i>	56		
8. <i>Actual expenditure under the supplementary budget for 1984 and in the agricultural sector</i>			

in 1985 — Oral questions, with debate, to the Commission by Mr Langes and others (Doc. 2-1304/84) and by Mr Le Pen (Doc. 2-1611/84):		10. Actual expenditure under the supplementary budget for 1984 and in the agricultural sector in 1985 (contd):	
Mr Langes; Mr d'Ormesson; Mr Christopher- sen (Commission)	60	Mr Dankert; Mr Cornelissen; Mr Curry; Mrs Barbarella; Mrs Scrivener; Mr Curry; Mr Pasty	66
9. Votes			
Mr Welsh; Mr Hindley; Mrs Lizin; Mr Prout	65	Annex	

IN THE CHAIR: MR ALBER

Vice-President

(The sitting opened at 9 a.m.)¹

1. Decision on urgency

Second report by Mr Gatti, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, on four Commission proposals to the Council on the common organization of the market in wine (Doc. 2-1575/84)

(Parliament agreed to urgent procedure)

President. — I propose that this item be placed on the agenda for Thursday, 3 p.m. The time-limit for tabling amendments has been fixed at 12 noon today.

*
* *

Commission proposal to the Council for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 682/81 concerning the Community loan mechanism designed to support the balances of payments of Community Member States (Doc. 2-345/84 — COM(84) 309 final).

Mr Christodoulou (PPE). — (GR) Mr President, this subject is still being discussed by the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy. No decision has been taken, and I request that the vote on urgent procedure be deferred.

Mr Seal (S), chairman of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy. — I wanted

¹ For approval of the Minutes, see the Minutes of Proceedings of this sitting.

to give the House some information. As far as the committee is concerned we have not yet had a chance to discuss this matter. In fact, at our next committee meeting we shall be meeting the President-in-Office of the Council to discuss the situation. It really would not be correct for the Parliament to vote on this as a matter of urgency when the committee has not had time to discuss it or discuss it with the Commission.

(Parliament did not agree to urgent procedure)¹

2. Social Fund

President. — The next item is the report by Mr Raggio, on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment (Doc. 2-1333/84), on

the Communication from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 2-946/84 — COM(84) 344 final) on the statistical machinery to establish the order of priority to be applied when granting European Social Fund assistance to regions.²

Mr Raggio (COM), rapporteur. — (IT) Mr President, the Communication from the Commission to the Council on the statistical machinery for managing the Social Fund springs from the adoption by the Council of the new rules governing the Fund itself.

I would recall that, on that occasion, the Council was not able to accept the criterion of geographical selection that was proposed, and called on the Commission to continue its studies with a view to achieving reliable statistical machinery.

The statistical machinery — which, as we know, does not concern the absolute priority regions — will form

¹ For the announcement of motions tabled for the topical and urgent debate, see Mintues.

² The oral question, with debate, by Mrs Maij-Weggen and others, on behalf of the EPP Group, to the Commission, on the delay in the payment of advances from the Social Fund (Doc. 2-1453/84) was included in the debate.

Raggio

an integral part of the management guidelines, and will therefore help to ensure that the Fund is used fairly and transparently, in accordance with the principles on which the Fund was founded, the lines of the new rules, and the principle of concentrating the use of the Fund's resources. It is, therefore, an important instrument. It is not, however, conceivable that it could, in itself, resolve all the problems of managing the Fund, starting with the problem of its financial resources; they are problems, furthermore, that serious and growing unemployment has made increasingly acute and complex.

We do not have available all the information necessary in order to form a considered opinion on the use of the Fund in 1984, the first year after the reform. Such information as we have, however, gives grounds for concern: it appears clear that there are difficulties in translating the new features introduced by the new rules into action, and it also appears clear that there is a growing tendency, encouraged by the difficulties of the social situation, to turn the Fund into a cash dispenser pure and simple, a supplier of resources that are not always clearly destined to benefit employment, nor always fairly shared out. We must therefore step up our efforts to protect and reinforce the structural characteristics of the Fund, and to guarantee its efficiency, so that it may make an efficient contribution to the fight against unemployment.

I should like to emphasize that it is indispensable, in the first place, for the two instruments of management of the Fund — the guidelines and the statistical machinery — to be really complementary and based on the same logic, so that, operating jointly, they may ensure that, both qualitatively and territorially, the aid is effectively concentrated.

The guidelines at present in force cover a very vast range of types of operation, all of which are classified at the same single level of priority. They do not, therefore, provide that 'sieve' of selective criteria that is essential to enable the Fund to operate on qualitative lines. Under these conditions, the adoption of statistical machinery, however reliable, will not produce satisfactory results, since it will not be sufficient to enable the Fund to operate satisfactorily from the qualitative standpoint.

Is the machinery proposed by the Commission reliable? On this point the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment has shown doubts and reservations, and has even made severe criticisms. I will try very briefly to explain them.

First of all, statistical machinery can be considered reliable when it is based on incontrovertible, comparable, up-to-date data. This condition is not satisfied. The Commission itself recognizes that the statistical data at the Level in question — that is to say, Level III, the sub-regional level — is in some cases inadequate, hardly reliable and not comparable; in some cases it is

unavailable, and it is not up to date. — So much so that the Commission, when giving details of the machinery, was not able to provide a list of zones in descending order of priority.

Reliable, comparable up-to-date data ought to have been available in the autumn of 1984. To date these data are still not available, nor — I presume — will they be in the near future. This difficulty is partly bound up with the choice of Level III, a choice which, moreover, also raises other snags owing to the fact that the size of sub-regions varies appreciably from one Member State to another.

Secondly, for the very reason that it is intended to facilitate the correct and accurate use of the Social Fund, the statistical machinery must be able to represent the true situation as faithfully as possible — a situation that is made up of circumstances that are not static but are continually — and very often rapidly — changing. Above all, it must be able to capture the phenomenon of unemployment in all its scope and complexity. The Commission's proposal, on the other hand, tends to represent it reductively and incompletely. Why, for example, exclude the indicators relating to long-term unemployment and unemployment in areas undergoing industrial and sectoral restructuring? The argument used — that the available data are not reliable — is weak. The Commission considered these data reliable, at least as far as long-term unemployment is concerned, when including them in the geographical selection proposal attached to the decision on the new rules governing the Fund.

And then again: why not take into account 'temporary' unemployment, precarious job situations, and 'hidden' unemployment, which affects wide sectors of the population — especially women — which are considered inactive but are in reality discouraged and pushed into passivity by structural causes, special conditions and sexual discrimination? I realize that, at present, there are insufficient data regarding these situations. That ought to spur us on to up-date our instruments and harmonize our methods of statistical measurement.

It is surprising that the Commission does not limit itself to recording a contingent difficulty, but takes a decision that is not without political significance, accepting and defending, in its Communication, the method of estimation at present used for calculating unemployment; that is to say, to avoid any misunderstanding, the method based on the definition of the so-called 'active' unemployed, which is a restrictive method that does not allow the real situation to be faithfully represented.

Finally, machinery is reliable when it can bring about the concentration of aid in areas where social problems are most acute, and where the difficulties in tackling unemployment are greatest. This is so not only because of the need for fairness and solidarity,

Raggio

but also because the existence of pockets of high unemployment acts as a brake — partly because of the cost entailed in terms of social welfare and the assisted economy — on the further development of the 'strong' areas.

Naturally, the criterion of territorial concentration must be adapted to the need to take into account the needs of various Member States, in a balanced view of the management of the Fund. It is important, for purposes of concentration, that the machinery should not tend to minimize territorial dissimilarities in statistical terms, as would be the case if gross domestic product were calculated not on the basis of the rate of exchange but on a purchasing power parity basis.

Dissimilarities are, on the other hand, accurately reflected, partly because, together with traditional differences — the disadvantaged areas — new divergences are appearing within those strong areas as the result of increasingly unequal development, which causes a decline in areas that were previously strong; as the result also of the crisis of important strategic sectors, and, finally, as the result of the growth of youth unemployment, especially in the big cities and metropolitan areas.

The proposal to exclude the absolute priority regions when calculating the gross domestic product is totally unacceptable. The effect of this is to penalize, unfairly, the other regions in the individual countries concerned.

On the basis of these considerations — which I have tried to summarize faithfully, I hope — the Committee on Social Affairs, without pretending to get involved in what are strictly technical appraisals and solutions, has put forward a number of proposals and requirements for adapting the machinery to make it more reliable.

In conclusion, I think I must make it clear that the Commission, whilst emphasizing that its proposal contains the principles that would make it possible to classify priority regions, appears to show a readiness to reconsider the statistical machinery outlined in its Communication.

(Applause)

Mr Avgerinos (S), *draftsman of an opinion for the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning*. — (GR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the object of introducing the statistical mechanism is to provide an overall definition of the mission of the Social Fund in order to ensure the institution's effectiveness. The mechanism proposed by the Commission classifies the Level III regions in descending order of priority in accordance with the method of calculation known as the 'synthetic index'. The aim is to preserve the principle of grouping interventions on the basis of objective socio-economic criteria.

To define the socio-economic situation in each region different criteria may be used such as per capita gross domestic product and the rate of unemployment where a distinction needs to be made between general unemployment, structural unemployment, long-term unemployment and youth unemployment.

The Commission proposes a statistical method with an indicator in which per capita GDP is 30% and unemployment 70%. The latter rate, however, only takes account of youth unemployment and adult unemployment with a weighting of 80% and 20% respectively. This method leaves totally out of account long-term and structural unemployment, that is to say unemployment that affects areas undergoing industrial and sectoral restructuring, as well as underemployment. It has no regard to the European Parliament's resolution of 17 May 1983 calling for the following weightings to be assigned: index of per capita gross domestic product: 50%, index of youth unemployment: 25% and index of adult unemployment: 25%. It leaves out of account the fact that, in calculating the priority indicator, the 70% unemployment weighting represents an under-valuation of the requirements of the remoter regions. We also know that the data used in calculating an indicator, that is to say unemployment and per capita gross domestic product, are not homogeneous and therefore not too reliable, that they are sometimes non-existent, no rare occurrence, as in Belgium for instance where there is no gross domestic product indicator for Level III. Consequently, if in Belgium we use Level II indicators, these will not be very far off the gross domestic product. On the basis of information available on GDP and unemployment, both long-term and structural, the Commission cannot draw up objective and genuine tables of priorities.

We know there is a rivalry between the remoter areas of the Community, where the gross domestic product is small, and the industrial regions, where unemployment is tending to increase. Since none of these areas may be specially favoured, the indicators should be so weighted that the two elements, gross domestic product and unemployment, receive the same specific weighting i.e. should be given equal value, namely 50% in each case.

In its first and second periodic reports on the socio-economic development of Community regions, the Commission introduced the 'synthetic index' measuring the relative gravity of regional problems in the Community in respect of 131 Level II regions. This classification is based on an equal treatment of the two elements and thus meets the request made by the European Parliament. The Regional Policy Committee considers that there is little to be gained from each Fund evaluating the socio-economic situation in the Community regions on the basis of differing methods of assessment. Such a practice implies a lack of coordination between the two Funds.

We consider therefore that it is absolutely necessary to draw up priority tables for an objective utilization of

Avgerinos

appropriations. We reject the statistical method proposed since it takes insufficient account of the interests of more remote regions, and we propose a statistical method that assigns equal value to the two elements, gross domestic product and unemployment. We also feel that the synthetic index measuring the relative severity of regional problems could be improved and represents a sound basis for intervention decisions of the Social and Regional Funds.

Mrs Dury (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, maybe today we shall be doing something useful. I have heard — and the Commissioner will perhaps confirm this — that COREPER itself has asked the Commission to reviews its proposals on the statistical machinery.

My speech for the Socialist Group will of course be unreserved support for the report by Mr Raggio, who has already said why we are somewhat sceptical about the efficiency of the statistical machinery we have been offered. But I still think the Commission is right to propose a system to lay down the criteria for allocation of the Social Fund — and it is particularly necessary in that the management and activities of the Social Fund have to get results again and recover the effectiveness and the credibility it is so sadly lacking.

The question Parliament has to answer is whether the proposed statistical machinery is suitable. We know what the pitfalls of the present system are — the guidelines are badly defined, they are vague and even ambiguous and there are too many applications. We get the impression that choices are made in a more or less arbitrary manner and it is a question of the States fighting over aid from the Fund, which can be a little unhealthy and falsify the aim of the Social Fund itself.

The European Parliament's reply, it has been said, is reserved. I shall remind you of the two criticisms Mr Raggio made — first that, in fact, the statistics are drawn up differently in the different Member States and the survey of the labour force of course has results that are not always reliable. Take the example of the Belgian provinces. For a start, the breakdown of unemployment by sex is not reliable if it has been produced from a survey of the work force.

As to the criteria — if you add those for gross domestic product to those for unemployment, then a certain number of regions will be automatically excluded, although they contain groups of young people without jobs, women seeking qualifications and special groups such as migrant workers and workers wanting further training, particularly in new technology. These regions of course include the big cities. I shall plead for my region, the Brussels area. Look at the GDP and you can see that this is indeed a region that is less affected than the others, but there are still pockets of poverty and pockets of unemployment.

I shall now move on to another problem, long-term unemployment. People have already insisted on this.

The Socialist Group does too. Our statistical machinery should take account of long-term unemployment, which affects young people (who have sometimes been out of work for a long time) and older people alike.

Mr President, of course it is necessary to make choices in the allocation of the Social Fund. We know it is and we ask for the Social Fund to be increased, as it is a useful way of fighting unemployment. It is not the only way, as was said often enough when we discussed the Community budget, but it is still an important incentive for a certain number of schemes and many of the Member States would have been unable to act usefully without it.

I personally think that statistical machinery should not be exclusive or give some regions the impression that they will now be cut right out of the Social Fund system. Besides our statistical machinery — which is of course necessary — we need guidelines and guidelines that are a little more precise and in line with the targets we define. The report we shall soon be looking at on the policy of the Social Fund seems to me to complement the statistical machinery here. I hope the Commission will reassure us by telling us it intends to review this plan for statistical machinery and that it will take the European Parliament's comments into account.

Mr Ciancaglini (PPE). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, Mr Commissioner, the Group of the European People's Party supports with interest and conviction the proposal for a new form of statistical machinery to establish the order of priority to be applied when granting European Social Fund assistance to regions, which this Assembly has called for on various occasions.

The Commission's proposal is that much more remarkable if we consider that the Social Fund, which the 1983 reform made into one of the main instruments for promoting employment, has so far functioned with a great deal of uncertainty, on the basis of sometimes vague and not very reliable criteria. The aim of the proposed machinery is in fact to concentrate aid provided by the Social Fund where it appears to be most necessary, on the basis of objective data provided by the interaction of two essential factors — the level of unemployment and gross domestic product.

We support the proposed system of weighting, just as we approve the fact that greater importance is being attached to youth unemployment. For the purposes of the machinery, however, we consider it essential that the GDP should be assessed in its entirety — without, that is, disregarding the data relating to the more disadvantaged regions, which would falsify the purpose of the machinery — and that it should be calculated at current exchange rates. It is also desirable that the machinery should take account of unemployment

Ciancaglini

in regions undergoing industrial and sectoral restructuring. With regard to the geographical units chosen — Level III regions and provinces — the proposed level is acceptable because we cannot, for the time being, agree to the idea of considering, for the purposes of the proposed machinery, even smaller geographical regions, for which we have no very reliable data available.

Many of these points are put forward very clearly in the Raggio report, which thus fills in some of the gaps or omissions contained in the Commission's proposal. On the other hand, I criticize the opinion of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning, which takes the view that the proposed weighting — 70% level of unemployment and 30% GDP — does not adequately reflect the situation in peripheral areas and the more disadvantaged regions. If any shortcoming in this sense can be detected in the Commission's proposal, it has been completely eliminated by the report adopted by the Committee on Social Affairs, whose aim is to take account in depth of the complex aspects of the true situation — both economic and as regards employment — making an overall appraisal as well as a specific one.

In this connection, I consider it essential to re-affirm the need for greater coordination of the work of the various structural funds, avoiding sporadic and isolated action, which would prove unproductive. All of this should also lead us to reflect seriously on the rôle of the European Social Fund in the '90s, faced with a level of unemployment that shows no sign of decreasing, even despite a certain degree of economic recovery, and the challenge of new technology. No one, undoubtedly, deludes himself that unemployment can be fought by means of the European Social Fund alone. This Parliament has already on many occasions emphasized the need for a global strategy centered on a new stimulus to productive investment, as well as on competition. But it also called for new restructuring where work is concerned, in relation also to the growth of new technology.

If we want to prevent the Social Fund from remaining a sterile instrument of aid, it must finance training programmes that are appropriate to the new needs of the labour market; pilot schemes for the introduction of new technology, for the implementation of formulae for the reorganization of working time. The Social Fund must give priority in its operations to the more disadvantaged categories, particularly the long-term unemployed — structural unemployment, as we call it — which is today becoming permanent unemployment.

Victory in the fight against unemployment will depend on the extent to which we succeed in linking the process of technological innovation with the creation of new jobs for the young and the long-term unemployed, whilst at the same time also reducing working time. This delicate process cannot take place without

the commitment and fruitful collaboration of both sides of industry. Committing the Social Fund responsibly in this field also means improving its management, perfecting and speeding up its procedures, and preventing the already scarce resources of the Fund from being used to make good the deficits of undertakings in the Member States.

In this connection, the question by Mrs Maij-Weggen, on the serious delay in making advance payments from the Social Fund, is most appropriate. This is a problem that concerns the speed and promptness of action of the Fund, and it is one that we must solve if we want this instrument to meet the needs of the labour market.

In conclusion, Mr President, the European Parliament has long since made itself responsible where the European Social Fund is concerned. We now call upon the Commission and the Council to act in conformity with this decision, and to adopt, without delay, the new statistical machinery, on the lines put forward by this Assembly.

Mr Tuckman (ED). — Mr President, on behalf of my group I also want to welcome this report. It addresses itself correctly to the problems and Mr Raggio has done a great deal of hard work on what is an extremely complicated and not all that interesting a problem.

In this very House I once had the doubtful pleasure of having a gentleman come to see me in a committee I was chairing. He said two things. He said he was being asked to fill in too many forms and that he did not get enough information. The poor man was quite unaware that these two statements were connected and that you cannot have the one without the other. That is what we are really troubled with here.

The rapporteur is quite right to complain about the absence of information, but what is not there cannot be used. For instance, he said he would like to see included part-time workers who are unemployed. That is difficult to grasp. His next statement was that he regretted that one could not capture hidden unemployment in the statistics. I would have thought that the very word makes it almost impossible to capture.

That brings me to the real subject of this debate, namely, how can we deal with long-term unemployment? In the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment we had explanations and advice from the Commission. They made it amply clear that this year, 1985, these figures do not exist and cannot be produced. I, therefore, think that this House ought not to ask for long-term unemployment figures to be included now. If they do not exist you cannot use them. What I think might be possible is to sit down with the Commission and decide that by the time of the next review perhaps some mechanism can be created which would capture this long-term unem-

Tuckman

ployment, which of course ought to be captured. Until we know how much is involved in terms of time, of imposition on citizens, both in companies and privately, how much money would be involved, and how many officials it would require. I really do not think we are in a position to talk about it meaningfully, because it is just a very vague statement.

What my group is really saying is that there is no use making the best the enemy of the good. We have a certain amount of statistical information which guides us to a very large extent. To go and distort these figures now by bringing in imperfect methods of measuring long-term unemployment would be a disservice. In consequence, while we approve of the report, we have tabled a number of amendments designed to get rid of that aspect, namely, trying to make the Commission give us long-term unemployment figures which they do not have and on which they could not give us adequate and reliable statistics.

Mrs Squarcialupi (COM). — (IT) Mr President, our group approves the Raggio report.

In the two minutes that I have available, I should like to make some observations on the need for further development of the methods of statistical survey, so that we can really have an instrument available that is capable of providing a true picture of the situation. We need, in fact, up-to-date statistical methods that will help us to tackle the problem of unemployment in a concrete manner, avoiding making the Social Fund into a 'parking area' where our crisis-embattled economy can take a breather. We need methods that are readily adaptable to the continuous changes in the labour market, not least where the weaker sections are concerned, such as women, immigrants and the whole range of legal or illegal jobs done by many of these sections of the Community.

But in our discussion today we must also urge the Commission — as other Members have already done — to make the operation of the Social Fund more effective through greater coordination with other Community funds and with the structural policies, especially the newest of these, such as those relating to the environment, which have immense job prospects.

In addition, what is called for is an increasingly close link between the Social Fund and a Community employment monitoring centre, without which we are in danger of simply going blindly on. Unfortunately, we have heard on very many occasions that the Commission still does not agree to turn its present statistical and research resources into a monitoring centre proper.

Only on these conditions can we make the Social Fund into an effective instrument for fighting unemployment, instead of just a windshield behind which to hide the regrettable inability of the European Com-

munity to tackle genuine economic recovery and occupy a very different position on the world economic and political scene.

Mrs Larive-Groenendaal (L). — (NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, for several years now the Dutch Ministry of Social Affairs has published a voluminous set of instructions on how to apply for European Social Fund assistance. This is a laudable effort and essential, because, as Mr Tuckman has said, you lose heart if you try to understand all the complicated procedures and obscure criteria. But one thing becomes clear if you read the literature. After the deduction of 38% for the absolute priority regions and 5% for what are known as specific actions, only 57% of the resources remain. But what, ladies and gentlemen, are the criteria that govern the distribution of this 57% among the regions? If anyone knows, let him speak up. The manual I have just referred to says: on an *ad hoc* basis.

Let me give you a few examples from my own country. How is it that Antwerp and Copenhagen, for example, appear on this list but not the large Dutch conurbations, where there are enormous concentrations of unemployed people? Second example: how is it that the Netherlands, which, with 17% unemployment, has the doubtful honour of accounting for 6% of the total unemployment in the Community, was allocated only 2.79% of Fund resources in 1984? In my opinion, it is too easy to say that lax civil servants are to blame for this, as is suggested in this Parliament, since applications easily exceed allocations every year. No, is it not in fact a case of the Commission playing a questionable game, making rough calculations, since there is a lack of clear employment criteria and some of the data used are known only to the Commission?

My group therefore welcomes this proposal for objective statistical machinery, which will at least apply to Level III. In view of the teething troubles and deficiencies to which previous speakers have alluded and the Raggio report rightly refers, such as the absence of indicators of long-term unemployment, the failure to take account of the specific features of urban areas and the lack of satisfactory data on the gross domestic product of three Member States, we can only regard the proposed instrument as a transitional instrument, to which objective statistical data must be added as soon as possible. Once it has been perfected, however, this instrument may become an essential element in our strategy for turning the European Social Fund into a genuine Community instrument for European labour market policy, a structural, cohesive and efficient policy, not just a means of achieving redistribution at national level.

As time is short, Mr President, I shall comment only very briefly on the oral question with debate on the delay in the payment of advances, a subject that is also covered by this debate. As I understand it, most of the

Larive-Groenendaal

advances were paid in 1984, and the 1984 financial year will not therefore give rise to any further problems.

But I have a question to ask the Commissioner about the applications for 1985. Article 4 of the implementing regulation requires the Commission to pronounce on these applications within 30 days of the adoption of the budget. Let us say that the 1985 budget is approved in June. The Commission will not therefore be taking its decision until July at the earliest. Will not everyone then be in very serious difficulty where the payment of advances is concerned, because they cannot, of course, be paid until it is known which projects have been approved, and that will not be until July? How does the Commissioner intend to solve this problem?

Mr Flanagan (RDE). — Mr President, on behalf of my group I also wish to thank the rapporteur. I consider that the inclusion of Mrs Maij-Weggen's oral question was timely in view of the delays experienced by Member States in receiving advance payments during 1984.

At the September part-session of Parliament, we said that the greatest challenge facing the Community was unemployment, and we called on all the institutions of the Community to take positive steps to tackle it. During the intervening months, the position has worsened. In my country one in six is now unemployed, so we know to our cost how much the situation has worsened and continues to worsen. It is all the more important since the main instrument for dealing with unemployment at EEC level is the Social Fund. Where there are delays in advance payments, projects are put at risk or, if it comes to the worst, are cancelled.

I am sure that the Commissioner will look after the interests of the already designated priority areas. I do appreciate that 1984 was the first year of the operation of the new Fund and also the fact that at the moment we are operating under the provisional twelfths system. Nevertheless, the Commission can be positive even within this, in having a decision on applications for assistance taken by the spring so that a first batch of payments can be made to meet the needs of at least the priority regions where unemployment is at critical levels, especially among the young.

I fully support the view that some form of comparable statistical method is necessary to establish geographically the order of priority to be applied when granting European Social Fund assistance in areas other than those already having priority status, especially when taking into account the selection of Level III areas in their 700 regions.

The Commission is considering new guidelines for the Social Fund and is rumoured to be intent upon tight-

ening up the guidelines, so it is imperative that nothing be done to worsen the situation of special areas like Ireland.

Finally, Mr President, I look for support for our amendment, which I believe goes to the heart of this problem. The existing resources of the Community are inadequate and have failed to tackle the unemployment crisis in the six absolute priority regions. Unless the resources of the Fund are substantially increased, neither these regions nor the Level III regions of high and long-term unemployment and our industrial and sectoral restructuring will benefit from the desired concentration of aid.

Mr Ulburghs (NI). — (NL) Mr President, of all the Belgian provinces, Limburg has been hardest hit by unemployment. It has the highest rate of population growth in Belgium, and its youth unemployment is consequently among the highest in Europe. I wonder about the criteria governing the granting of Social Fund assistance.

Firstly, what statistics are used to calculate the level of unemployment? Is concealed unemployment included in the calculation? Is account taken of such provisional employment arrangements as the limited temporary scheme (BTK) and the third labour market (DAC) in my country?

Secondly, are the causes of unemployment being investigated, and in particular the structural causes that stem from the economic policy towards backward areas like Limburg? A certain kind of economic development has been encouraged in this area, through the rampant growth of multinational companies, which has been designed to stimulate Limburg's economy in recent decades. This economic policy has made us extremely vulnerable. Local economic initiatives have been destroyed by competition, and the multinational companies move out when they think it necessary and beneficial, as they are doing today.

Thirdly, is allocation governed by really objective criteria or by political criteria? I will give an example. There is an acute housing shortage in my country. This pressing social problem has prompted neighbourhood and tenants' associations to do important work in central Limburg, the mining area. This followed ten years of growing awareness and social organization, in which I was also involved. To our astonishment, we find that the European Social Fund is granting substantial assistance to a powerful socio-political organization which is setting up a rival but ineffectual association for the same tenants and the same area, with the result that this association is making no progress despite the major subsidies it receives.

Finally, what evaluations are made of the results achieved with Social Fund assistance? Can these results be checked both by the European Parliament

Ulburghs

and the committee responsible and by the people directly concerned?

To conclude, Mr President, I should very much like to ask a question about the social education of the areas affected.

Mr Megahy (S). — Mr President, I support the main thrust of the Raggio report, which I think is an excellent report on an extremely important and complicated subject. I think the need for the report represents the dissatisfaction over finding a method to determine the priority to be applied in granting Social Fund aid to the regions and the need to identify priority areas, because, after all, the formula that is chosen will in fact determine the allocation of roughly half the Social Fund's budget. Present priorities would cover something like 64% of the Community, so we need to be more discriminating.

I am not one of those who completely agree with the rather cynical view of statistics as expressed in the phrase that politicians use statistics as a drunken man uses a lamp-post — for support rather than for illumination. Nevertheless, I think that you cannot consider statistical machinery in complete isolation from its effects. The Commission document, in this instance, gives no clear indication as to where the cut-off point would be, and I think it is extremely vague on that point. Mr Raggio has quite rightly pointed to that deficiency.

There are other difficulties as well. There is the question of getting equivalent statistics for Level III regions, and there is, of course, a great deal of dissimilarity between many Level III regions. I think account ought to be taken of that point. For example, in some of the larger Level III regions, it is possible to find black spots which are not reflected in the regional statistics as a whole. Something needs to be done to take account of this when looking at the statistics.

Then, of course, I agree completely with what Mr Raggio says about the major omission — that is, the statistics of long-term unemployment. I realize there are difficulties in getting statistics here, but I would think that was true of the statistics for anything you wanted to measure. There have been various suggestions — for example, that one could look at the unemployed recipients of various types of statutory allowance in an attempt to arrive at comparable statistics.

We have recently had a communication on long-term unemployment, and I wonder what kind of statistics the Member States were using in trying to deal with that problem. We need to define this more closely, as, indeed, we need to consider how we define the unemployed. I think Mr Raggio was right in pointing to this, because, after all, some of the categories we seek to assist under the Social Fund are categories which are not to be found in the definitions given in the

Commission's document. They are what are called 'concealed unemployment', which Mr Raggio quite rightly looked at. These are the kind of people that we seek to give aid to, and I think we need to perfect our statistics in that kind of way.

Finally, I would like to echo the point that has been made about those areas in need of industrial and sectoral restructuring. I welcome the mention that has been made of certain of these areas, but I think it needs to be enlarged in the light of changing conditions.

Mrs Maij-Weggen (PPE). — (NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, today's debate on the statistical machinery has been joined by an oral question on the delay in the payment of advances for approved projects being implemented in 1984. While our first spokesman, Mr Ciancaglini, focused primarily on the statistical machinery in his statement, I shall largely confine myself to explaining my oral question.

This oral question has been put because we Members of Parliament have received many letters and telephone calls expressing concern over the belated approval of projects and payment of funds for these projects. Mrs Larive-Groenendaal's reassuring words, I am sorry to say, are out of place here. I must say that Mr Flanagan was far more successful in putting his finger on the spot. That payments have been made does not in itself mean that everything is in order. These are the facts.

The Fund was reformed in October 1983. The guidelines and statistical machinery of the reformed Fund were adopted in December 1983, and interested parties, in the Member States then had until March 1984 to submit projects for approval. These projects — and this is where the first problem emerges — had to be implemented in the 1984 financial year. Interested parties were thus asked to submit applications in the period mid-February to March for projects which ought really to have begun on 1 January 1984.

The situation was further complicated by the fact that projects were not to be approved until mid-June. This was quite understandable, since the Commission needed the time from March to June, of course, to screen and select projects. But this made things difficult for applicants, because, while they were expected to start projects in January, they could not submit their applications until February or March and could not be certain until June that they would be receiving money from Brussels. Then in June the Commission's services in Brussels encountered difficulties which prevented the final decisions from being taken until the end of July. The applicants did not therefore know until the end of July whether or not their projects would qualify for subsidies. As the decisions were then forwarded through the national governments, most applicants were not sure until August whether or not they would be receiving any money.

Maij-Weggen

What effect has this situation had? Applicants with enough money in reserve to risk the rejection of their applications began their projects in the early spring. They also forwarded their accounts without delay, in mid-August. But other applicants — small municipalities, private organizations for the handicapped, migrants and women, for example — naturally waited until their projects had been approved. They could not be certain of this until August. They did not therefore begin their projects until August or September, with the result that they could not be completed by 1 January 1985. It is impossible, of course, to compress one-year projects into two or three months. The advances were paid, but only in November and December. This has become a major problem, particularly for applicants who did not begin their projects until very late in the year. I also wonder whether the Commission has acted legally, since the decision states that the money must be disbursed immediately after the decision has been taken. Taking 23 July as the date on which the decisions were taken and November as the month in which payment was made, there was in fact a delay of four to five months.

My first questions have, of course, been answered, since the advances have now been paid, but how many projects started too late or were cancelled altogether because of this situation? At all events, it will not be possible to complete these projects within the set period. Hence my urgent question to the Commissioner, whom I in no way blame since this situation arose before he took office: how are these problems to be solved? How can applicants who began their projects late be certain that they can complete them at the beginning of the next year — that is to say, the beginning of 1985?

It is very important for a solution to be found to this problem. I have heard that various projects have already been cancelled and that people responsible for overseeing projects have been dismissed. This is very poor, because the Social Fund can in fact give the European Community a very good name, and this situation is having the opposite effect. I therefore look forward to hearing the answers to my questions.

Mr Alavanos (COM). — (GR) Mr President, I should like to make the following points.

Firstly, we support the criticisms directed by Mr Ragio and particularly by Mr Avgerinos, who spoke on behalf of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning, at the fact that the Commission proposals to reduce the GDP weighting of 50%, as proposed by Parliament, to a figure of 30% and at the fact that no account was taken of underemployment, concealed unemployment, etc., which, we argue, cause most hardship in the Community's peripheral regions.

Secondly, we should like to avail ourselves of this opportunity to raise the whole general problem of the

reliability of statistics. Mrs Dury raised the matter in the Belgian context, but in my country also there is a great lack of confidence in statistics, which considerably understate unemployment levels.

Thirdly, we feel that, apart altogether from the problem of the statistical apparatus and other related problems such as, for example, the question of percentages, there is also the larger question of how far programmes financed by the Social Fund should meet the needs of all our countries and not only of the more industrialized countries. According to the figures set out in the Eighteenth General Report of the Commission, Greece, which belongs to the group of regions enjoying absolute priority, receives only 5% of Social Fund aid, while France receives 11%, Ireland 12%, Italy 22% and the United Kingdom 32%. This is an intolerable state of affairs and must be brought to an end.

Mr Chanteric (PPE). — (NL) Mr President, the debate we are having today in fact forms an integral part of a debate that was sparked off some time ago by the communication from the Commission concerning efforts to increase the efficiency of the structural funds.

To ensure that the Social Fund functions fairly and effectively, we have, on the one hand, the guidelines and, on the other, the designation of areas on which Social Fund activities must be concentrated.

It is now proposed that a list should be compiled of the regions, or sub-regions, which are defined as belonging to Level III, although no information is available on many of them. However, what the Commission says in its proposals about data on Belgium being unavailable is not entirely correct. The Commission's proposals wrongly state that data on unemployment in Belgium broken down by sub-region or *arrondissement* are not available. That is not true, and it must be corrected.

Most speakers have called for a fairer and juster approach. But in this European Community that is something that is difficult to define and difficult to achieve. On the one hand, there are the backward areas of the European Community, on the other, the more prosperous regions, many of which are undergoing industrial and sectoral restructuring. Both these categories need help in their present difficult situation.

In the European Community we have in fact two Funds for this purpose: the Regional Fund and the Social Fund. Both have recently been reformed. But we still have the impression that there is a lack of coordination and that it is still not really understood precisely what these two Funds are meant to do. Each has its own aims, but they must also be coordinated in such a way that they can be used to assist the same activities.

Chanteric

The Commission proposals we are discussing today are therefore inadequate in most respects. They must be amended, and above all they must be made specific so that we can make correct assessments with the help of the new statistics.

Just one more comment to conclude. I have the impression that some Members are inclined to blame the Community for everything that local authorities have omitted to do in the past. When we, for example, hear references to the difficult situation in Brussels, we cannot help thinking that the local authorities have been completely indifferent for some considerable time and that they now want to pass the buck to the Community. We must see the Social Fund as a Community instrument, not as a safety net for situations that have got out of hand at national level.

IN THE CHAIR: MR MØLLER

Vice-President

Mr Filinis (COM). — (*GR*) Mr President, on behalf of the Greek Communist Party I should like to make the following points.

The determination of objective statistical criteria for allocating aid from the Social and Regional Funds is an important step towards a fairer and more efficient distribution of the available resources. Such a step must, however, be taken with great prudence and must meet with the general agreement of all concerned. The Commission's proposals for establishing a statistical mechanism do not seem to fill the bill in this regard. It is clear from the report and from the opinions that the statistical method proposed by the Commission for drawing up a list of priority regions does not take account of certain vital factors or gives them unequal weight. The chief defects of the Commission proposals are the fact that no account is taken of long-term unemployment and that different weightings are given to GDP per capita and unemployment. The proposed mechanism would also exclude urban regions. We in Greece are particularly affected by this omission. The cities of Athens, Piraeus and Saloniki are being ravaged by unemployment, particularly of the young, and poverty and should not simply be ignored in this way. We feel therefore that the decision to exclude these regions must be reconsidered.

We endorse the conclusions and the recommendations outlined in the report and the two opinions and would venture to say that the case of Greece is a clear illustration of the malfunctioning of the Fund's mechanisms.

As the report points out, the amount allocated to our country for dealing with structural problems bears no

relation whatsoever to the gravity of the problems. Furthermore, the fact that the amount was reduced in 1984 as against 1983 is nothing short of ridiculous.

Finally, we are wholeheartedly in agreement with the demand that guidelines be more precisely defined. We also feel that the Commission should work more closely with the national statistical offices and should coordinate the compilation of data in such a way that we can soon hope to have a clearer picture of the regional imbalances and structural problems.

Mr Sutherland, Member of the Commission. — Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to commence by expressing my gratitude for the contributions, both oral and written, which have been made to this debate, which have been helpful and which, I think, have increased an awareness and understanding of the problem which is being faced.

By way of preface to what I want to say, I should like to point out that the statistical mechanism which we are discussing today is part — though only part — of a process of improving the distribution of the available Fund. The revision of the guidelines in relation to the Social Fund is another important part of the process of improvement to which I refer.

Whilst I must agree with Mr Tuckman's comment that the subject itself is not a particularly enjoyable one, because of its complexity and difficulty, it has to be said that it is a very important subject and, as successive speakers have noted, the purpose of the statistical machinery is to try to create a sense of objectivity in the distribution of the Fund which in itself is desirable. So we are looking for a system which is coherent, equitable, which addresses the problem of unemployment and which concentrates on areas of real need. We are looking for a system which offers the greatest prospect of objectivity where administration is concerned.

When it adopted the texts on the tasks of the European Social Fund, the Council asked the Commission to continue its studies with a view to achieving reliable statistical machinery, taking into account *inter alia* the criterion of GDP per capita. The difficulty, of course, is establishing reliable statistical machinery. Successive speakers have spoken about the desirability of encompassing within the statistical mechanism other factors which cannot and have not been taken into account, but it would indeed have been quite improper and wrong to include those matters if reliable statistical mechanisms were not available to establish objectively the matters in question. The Commission continued its studies, and in close cooperation with the statistical experts of Member States has worked out a method for assessing statistical indicators which provide *reasonably good* — and I do not suggest more than *reasonably good* — comparability between the countries and regions of the Community and an updating of the

Sutherland

statistical data. There are, of course, anomalies. With any statistical mechanism or in the consideration of any statistical basis in political terms there will be anomalies and difficulties, but it does at least provide an objective basis, which in itself must be considered desirable. The statistical machinery, therefore, should fix the geographical order of priority for the granting of 60% of Fund appropriations, and under Article 7 of the decision on the tasks of the Fund, these appropriations shall be concentrated on operations in respect of employment in other areas of high and long-term unemployment and/or industrial and sectoral restructuring.

The problems which the Commission has had to deal with have been identified in this debate. Its main concern was, of course, to concentrate Fund assistance on the regions most affected by the crisis, outside the super-priority regions. At present 64% — more precisely, 63.6% — of the Community's work force meet the conditions for priority Fund assistance. Eleven percent of the 63.6% are in the higher rate of intervention regions. This figure is clearly too high to allow for adequate concentration on the real pockets which require assistance. The Commission currently is obliged to operate the weighted reduction to the assistance agreed, which is a device which sets a scale for the distribution of funds to each Member State. This situation is clearly undesirable both for the operators, whose applications for assistance are prejudiced, and for the Community, whose funds are scattered over a wide area — too wide an area, having regard to the deserving cases within the Community. The main task of the statistical machinery is, therefore, to concentrate the funds within areas which need and deserve assistance.

In order to define the regions with the severest social and economic problems, it was necessary to define reliable criteria at regional level. One might have preferred a more specific definition of area than the phase 3 or the Level III that has been referred to in this debate; but it is the best available. The best compromise, therefore, between regionalization and reliability for the purposes of the Social Fund was found at regional Level III. Four criteria were established by the Council decision on the tasks of the Fund: high unemployment, long-term unemployment, areas of industrial and sectoral restructuring and gross domestic product per capita. The Commission adopted two criteria: unemployment and GDP per capita.

A number of speakers today have commented on the fact that long-term unemployment should be taken into account and that the areas of industrial and sectoral restructuring should be included in some way in the statistical machinery. The Commission accepts the importance of both of these factors. The difficulty is that integration of these data into the system is not presently possible, simply because the statistics are not available. The work, therefore, of establishing these statistics will take some time and is continuing.

Three of the criteria requested by the Council are in a sense, however, contained in the temporarily adjusted machinery. Long-term unemployment is implicitly present in the sense that the areas of high unemployment, restructuring and low GDP per capita are also the areas showing the highest intensity of endemic unemployment. In addition, long-term unemployment affects a large number of young people, and by making provision on a massive scale for youth unemployment, which, as successive speakers have pointed out, is part of the present machinery, the Commission feels that it is doing its utmost by means of the Social Fund to ease the situation which must cause the greatest concern. One out of every four young persons in the Community is unemployed, and in some Member States the percentage reaches or exceeds 40%.

These considerations lead me to the last problem the Commission had to solve, which was the weighting to be applied to the data within the machinery. The weight placed on youth unemployment is a product of justice and reason — justice because the young, who have asked nothing better than to work, must be given that opportunity, and reason because it is a question of the Community's future that we are talking about, which must at all costs be safeguarded. The young are the hope of the future, in new technologies in particular. They are the ones capable of restructuring European industry in a way to make it more competitive. I know that during the consultation procedure your Parliament requested a 50% weighting of GDP per capita in the machinery, but the Commission considers that youth unemployment must have priority, and the rules of the Social Fund state that 75% of Fund appropriations must concern operations to promote youth employment. This was taken into account by the Commission in working out the machinery by which priority is given to regions with high youth unemployment.

The Commission has thus done its best to comply with the mandate given to it by the Council after consultations with Parliament. It acknowledges that the machinery to be applied is not perfect, that there are problems with it, that matters can be improved. The Commission intends to supplement the list of priority regions, which are defined by the machinery on the basis solely of unemployment and GDP per capita, with a list of the non-quota regions of the European Regional Development Fund and the ECSC list of areas of reconversion. This supplementing will have the effect of taking into account two of the matters which have been referred to by successive speakers.

The Commission would contend, therefore, that it has done as best it can in the light of the reliable statistics available the job of providing an objective criterion for the disbursement of the Social Fund. This statistical mechanism will be married into the operation of guidelines which are currently under review and which can, we hope, supply an objective and clear demon-

Sutherland

stration of the proper and best way to apply the funds available.

I should like to refer now to Mrs Maij-Weggen's question which forms part of this debate. The Commission is aware that delays in the payments of advances can create problems for certain bodies and that there have been delays. The delays in the payment of advances in 1984 can be attributed mainly to the budgetary situation. This was the main reason why, although the Commission had adopted its approval decision on 23 July 1984, commitments in respect of these approvals could not be entered into the accounts until three months later. When it became possible to enter these sums in the accounts, which was at the end of October 1984, the supplementary budget having been adopted on 25 October 1984, other changes had arisen in the meantime with respect to the amounts initially requested and approved. It became necessary to amend the approval decision of 23 July 1984, mainly in order to distribute the new resources released as a result of numerous refunds and changes recorded by the Social Fund services. Further, any measures designed to increase Social Fund assistance in respect of certain applications, as a result of an amended approval decision, cannot be carried out until the Member States have been consulted. Because of the demands of one Member State, consultation could not be completed until the end of November 1984. This did create problems, which have been properly adverted to by Mrs Maij-Weggen. However, bearing these difficulties in mind and the last-minute changes to which I have referred, the advances were finally paid in batches and entered into the accounts of the Social Fund between 20 November 1984 and 27 December 1984, which gave rise to the problem which has been referred to by both Mr Flanagan and Mrs Maij-Weggen.

In all, the amounts released following refunds and other changes since the original decision of 23 July 1984 represented 60 million ECU. Of this amount, which was divided amongst the applications for assistance, under budget items where there was a shortage of commitment of appropriations, some 55 million ECU were the product of refunds on commitments entered into in the same year. On the basis of these figures it would be foolhardy to deduce that the volume of operations postponed or cancelled as a result of the delay in the payment of advances corresponds to about 55 million ECU. This is because nearly all these refunds were attributable to a single Member State and also because no similar data are available from previous years to enable a proper comparison and analysis to be made. All that can be said with any certainty is that refunds by the Member States against commitments entered into in the same financial year have been a constant factor in the administration of the Social Fund.

Further, the relatively high level of these refunds in 1984 can be attributed partly to the consequences of

changes in the Social Fund operating rules following the revision of the rules in force in 1984. In practice the appropriations refunded were fully re-utilized, being used to increase Social Fund assistance for certain operations which had been subjected to the application of linear or weighted reductions because of a shortage of commitment appropriations.

The problem which was identified is a real one, and under the rules it has to be said that it is not possible to give assistance to projects which were not carried out in 1984. This is a regrettable consequence of the delay in the budgetary approval, and that is the essential problem which caused the difficulties adverted to in the course of this debate.

I was asked also whether advances on the Social Fund would be paid in 1985 on time. Given that we have a problem with the 1985 budget of the Community, we shall, I am afraid, be unable to avoid some difficulties with Social Fund payments. However, within the constraints of the situation, the Commission will endeavour to make the disbursements as rapidly as possible. Once the Commission has approved some of the applications for 1985 Fund assistance, probably in March, the Commission will take a partial decision to make advance payments insofar as the system of one-twelfths permits. On the assumption that the Community will have an agreed 1985 budget in June, it should be possible to arrange for further advance payments by July. Otherwise a second decision will have to be taken in July pending final resolution of the budgetary situation.

In conclusion, I would like to thank those who have contributed to this debate, which I think has been helpful. I would ask the Parliament to bear in mind that notwithstanding the fact that the system proposed has imperfections and does not provide a perfect solution to the problems of distribution in an objective, clear and reasonable way, it is the best available means having regard to imperfections in statistical machinery in respect of the areas with which we are concerned and the concentration with which one can associate disbursements with the areas in real difficulties within the Community.

President. — The debate is closed. The vote will be taken at the next voting-time.

3. *Agricultural prices 1985-86*

President. — The next item is a joint debate on

- a statement by Mr Andriessen, Vice-President of the Commission, on agricultural prices; and
- the oral question, with debate, by Mr Woltjer and others, on behalf of the Socialist Group, to the Commission (2-1455/84):

President

Subject: Statement by the Ministers for Agriculture of Belgium, Germany, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom on the date for payment of the superlevy

1. Can the Commission state whether the Ministers for Agriculture of the Member States are entitled to take autonomous decisions on the date for payment of the superlevy?
2. If the Ministers are not entitled to do this, can the Commission state what means, other than bringing a case before the Court of Justice, it will employ to compel the Member States concerned to comply at an early date with the implementing provisions to be upheld by the Commission?
3. Does the Commission share the concern that this open rebellion against the powers granted to the Commission could have serious repercussions in the future for the administration of the entire European agricultural policy?

Mr Andriessen, Vice-President of the Commission. — (NL) Mr President, the Commission two weeks ago adopted its proposals for agricultural prices for the coming season.

This is one of the most important dossiers which a new Commission has to handle. We laid ourselves out to put our proposals forward before the end of January — in record time, I might say — in order to enable Parliament to give its opinion in good time and the Council to reach a decision by 1 April in accordance with its obligations.

As soon as the Commission had taken its decisions, I informed first President Pflimlin, then the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food. That was about a fortnight ago. Since, naturally, many details concerning the Commission's decisions have already reached you through the usual channels, I will confine myself today to a few general and political aspects of the problem. Let me first summarize them.

For most products, we propose price-changes of between 0 and +2%; but for certain products where the guarantee threshold has been exceeded or where the market situation is very difficult, we propose price reductions.

Of course I am aware that these proposals are difficult, particularly for those affected; but I am convinced that they are realistic. And I believe that those who have condemned them — sometimes, I must say, in somewhat exaggerated terms — are making a profound and dangerous error. They are making an error because they confuse what is desirable with what is possible, and that seems to me, in politics — and that is what we are concerned with here — an easy but dangerous course. It is easy to say that agricultural

prices should keep pace with inflation or even rise faster, but how can price increases be justified for so many products that are in surplus, products which it is extraordinarily difficult to sell on the market? How can we handle the consequences of a further deterioration in the market balance?

It is easy to say that the Commission should have invented new solutions which would have obviated the need for a restrictive price policy; but what *are* the magic solutions facing Europe's agricultural policy, not only now but in the near future? During the few weeks that I have so far borne this new responsibility, I have had talks with those concerned, and I must tell you that they have not provided any magic solutions, nor has my first meeting — perhaps I should say, confrontation — with the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food of this Parliament. That is not to say, of course, that a serious effort need not be made to find and open up new approaches: I am prepared to do so and have already taken the first preparatory measures that are required for their organization, but one cannot expect to find a solution to these extraordinarily complicated problems in a matter of three weeks.

Mr President, I take the liberty of urging Parliament, when dealing with this difficult and delicate question of prices, to take as its point of departure policy lines which have been used in the past and have already found wide support among its Members. Last year, the Council adopted new guidelines for the common agricultural policy, including the application of guarantee thresholds, and a prudent price policy. Those guidelines were based on proposals of the Commission, which, as I say, Parliament itself supported. This Commission has kept to this line consistently. Perhaps, after the reactions that have been forthcoming, I should say that we have had the courage to act in accordance with these guidelines, and I hope that those responsible for policy in the Community — Parliament as well as the Council of Ministers — will not depart from the policy that they themselves have laid down.

I offer a specific example of what I mean. The market regulation for cereals says that, if the guarantee threshold is exceeded, the price must be abated in the following season. Well now, we had a record harvest in 1984-85; a record harvest can only result in the necessity of lowering prices in a subsequent season; and that is what the Commission now proposes. It therefore cannot be maintained that such a proposal on the Commission's part comes as an error. Indeed, let me remind you that we propose a net reduction of 3.6% instead of the 5% which the regulation permits of the full 8% which, strictly, should have been applied if there had been no limit laid down in the regulation and if we had taken the actual harvest levels of last year into consideration. In this situation, Mr President, who would seriously suggest that the prices of cereals should be increased?

Andriessen

I should like, if I may, to present four points which the Commission has borne in mind when drawing up its proposals.

First, the market situation. Parliament knows how difficult this is for many products. We are more than self-sufficient in practically all sectors. In many sectors, stocks are very high. But for sectors where the Community is still deficient, we have proposed, albeit moderate, price increases. I will name a few instances: cotton, soya, some vegetables, sheepmeat and even olive-oil.

Second, agricultural incomes. Last year, according to the best information at present available to the Commission, agricultural incomes in the Community increased by about 4% in real terms, after taking account of inflation. That is not a bad result, compared with many sectors of the Community's economy. It goes without saying that that one figure conceals differences, considerable differences, ranging from a negative result in certain sectors such as milk to an extremely good result for others such as cereals. That is why we consider a price reduction for cereals to be justified while proposing a price increase of 1.5% for milk. Together with a reduction of one point in the co-responsibility levy, that means a net increase in returns of 2.5% — and this for a sector where the level of production quotas still greatly exceeds what the market can absorb at full prices.

Third, the unity of the market. We propose to eliminate the negative MCAs for France and Greece and to reduce — albeit to a very small extent — the positive MCAs for Germany and the Netherlands. The position to be taken up by the Commission with regard to the currently existing negative MCAs in the United Kingdom will be determined in the light of circumstances obtaining at the time.

Fourth, the budget — and I take the budget last because the Commission's proposals are not primarily determined by current budgetary limits. Even if there were *no* budgetary problems, the Commission would have to take the line that it is taking. That is a matter of common sense as regards, for example, those types of vegetables and fruit of which large quantities have to be taken out of the market — we discussed this earlier this year — or varieties of tobacco which can hardly find a market at any price. Here, prices must be reduced.

As regards the 1985 budget itself, I have informed the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food that we now reckon that the total needs of the Guarantee Section will come very close to 20 000 million ECU. I understand that under an item to come later on the agenda we shall be dealing further with these budgetary problems, so I will not go into the matter any deeper for the moment.

One thing is certain, and that is that the amount we now estimate for 1985 is substantially more than the

19 300 million ECU figuring in the Commission's preliminary draft budget and very much more than the 18 000 million ECU to which the Council has so far agreed. In the light of this, I think no one can well maintain that our price proposals are primarily dictated by budgetary limits.

So much, Mr President, for the presentation of agricultural prices.

This debate includes an oral question by Mr Woltjer on the implementation of the milk quotas system. Parliament is, of course, aware that we have already, on two occasions, had an exchange of views on the problems raised in Mr Woltjer's question, the first occasion being the statement I made on behalf of the Commission during the December part-session and the other the last part-session, when I made a statement which gave rise to an unusually lively debate on this subject.

For the moment, I have little to add to what I said then. The Commission's proposals to the Council designed to introduce some administrative flexibility into the implementation of the system are now being studied in the Council, but I must say that the progress I should have liked to see has not yet been achieved. I wish to take this opportunity, however, of saying that in the Commission's view this interim operation is not the proper occasion for meddling with the system and that I am therefore not prepared to take into consideration any far-reaching suggestions from Member States in connection with these proposals.

Secondly, proceedings for incorrect implementation or even complete failure to implement the system are continuing in accordance with the normal procedures. This means that the Commission is proceeding with the steps required to draw the legal consequences from the fact that a number of Member States have failed to introduce the system correctly. Now that a number of amending proposals have been submitted, it is the Commission's intention to postpone somewhat the payments due on 15 February next in order, in connection with these payments, to take account of the amendments which, we hope, will have been adopted in the meantime, and of the implications that they are designed to have for these payments. This the Commission considers a logical result of the strategy it has adopted on these problems.

That, Mr President, is how things stand. After the Council meeting of Ministers of Agriculture which is to be held towards the end of February — that is to say, though I am quoting from memory, on 24 or 25 February — it should be possible to give further information on this subject either to the next meeting of the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food or to the European Parliament at its March part-session.

(Applause)

Mr Woltjer (S). — (NL) Mr President, I will begin by saying that it seems strange to link my question on the collection of the superlevy and the price proposals presented by Commissioner Andriessen, since we discussed this subject at length last month, even if we were only considering a statement and not having a real debate. We were only allowed to ask questions, which caused something of a problem at the time. My questions were raised as long ago as December and specifically concerned the credibility which the common agricultural policy still enjoys. This was also why I felt bound to respect the Bureau's decision to have a debate on the subject after all, since I believe this question is highly important in the context of these price proposals. On behalf of my group, I, too, should like to consider the political aspects of the price proposals and refrain from expressing our views on the practical aspects at this stage. We shall have a chance to do that in March.

In our assessment of the price proposals we apply three criteria, which we regard as essential and which we shall also use to evaluate the price proposals. The first criterion is this: how far do these price proposals help to restore balance in the market and make for the more efficient use of resources? In the last five years, my group has always placed the emphasis in its discussions on the restoration of balance in the market, even when considering price proposals. In the early 1980s, we explicitly stated that the restoration of balance in the market and the price proposals were inseparable, that these two subjects must be discussed together because what we have here is a Community instrument. Prices are used both to restore balance in the market and to ensure reasonable incomes. These two goals are always linked. That is a fact, and it has come in for some criticism. We have also done our best to delink the two aspects in the milk sector for example, to introduce another instrument, the quota and after a great deal of discussion we succeeded. But, Mr President, in other sectors there has been no delinking whatsoever, and a single instrument is therefore clearly being used both to restore balance in the market and to ensure reasonable incomes, and that is consequently the subject we must consider.

If we now consider the restoration of balance in the market — and I said this in the Committee on Agriculture — I believe it is true to say that the Commission has been consistent in this respect, since it has not tried to make a mere formality of the line indicated by the Council of Ministers last year but has abided rigidly by it in the proposals now before us. In this respect the Commission has indeed had the courage to do what it had to do. It has my support in this, as it had in the Committee on Agriculture. If the intention is to use prices to restore balance in the market, then so be it.

But I must say to the Commissioner that certain doubts have arisen in my mind since the interview that was reported in yesterday's issue of the Dutch newspaper the *Volkskrant*. He is reported as saying all of a

sudden that in the longer term he may well consider using another instrument, the co-responsibility levy. All I can say is that we shall then be making the old mistake again. Take a look at the debates we have had on this in Parliament in the past. The Council said such and such, the Commission held its ground for a while, and then came an alternative, a glimmer of light. Finally the Council decided not to discuss the matter any more that year and to make use of the new ray of hope the next. I am afraid, Mr Commissioner, that, if you now start talking about the possibility of introducing a co-responsibility levy in the cereals sector, you will achieve precisely what you did not want to achieve, gathering from what you have said: the Council will this year defer the reduction in the price of cereals and decide to introduce a co-responsibility levy next year. This is what happened with the superlevy when it came to fixing prices — as you will find if you look at the records — when Commissioner Gundelach came forward with his proposals for the superlevy. In this area in particular we adopted the wrong course of action, and we are in danger of doing the same again. I say this as a warning, not as some kind of prediction. But I issue this warning nonetheless, because you in fact did the same in the interview you gave.

Mr President, I should like to refer to another factor in this connection. We have already said that what is needed is both a consistent policy and the more efficient use of resources. By this I mean not only that fraud must be prevented but also that we must stop resources being used inappropriately and in fact wrongly according to the regulations where they can be used far more efficiently. I will give an example to illustrate what I mean. In the milk sector we have proposals for special marketing campaigns, which are extremely expensive. It is said that enormous amounts of money should be spent on marketing, whereas this money could be used far more efficiently and, for the farmers, far more attractively by introducing a Community arrangement to help them to reduce quotas and so give them some support. This money will then have a direct effect, which will increase its efficiency.

The second criterion we apply — and this brings me back to my question — is the credibility of the policy and our fight against renationalization, an important aspect and one I wish to emphasize here. When Ministers openly state that they do not intend to observe rules laid down by the Commission, in areas where it has the requisite authority, there is something really wrong and the policy loses all credibility. All I can say on this point is what I see happening in practice: the debate on the credibility of the common agricultural policy is spreading. I can only urge the Commission to do precisely what is needed to bring the common agricultural policy back under control, to be tough. If the Commission says that it is not going to collect the superlevy on 15 February and so in fact takes advantage of the proposed relaxation, which, as you know, the Council is considering very carefully, I think it will

Woltjer

be calling the credibility of the agricultural policy into question more than it has done in the past.

Another factor I want to underline is the tendency towards renationalization now much in evidence. Mr President, we know — we have discussed it at length here in Parliament — what has happened in Germany, but I could equally point the finger at other Member States that are taking the same line. If you follow the debates in the national parliaments of various Member States, you will detect a growing tendency towards renationalization. If, it is said, there is no more money in Europe, we will spend our own. This means that the agricultural policy is no longer determined here but in the Member States. This tendency means that, while you nominally have an important portfolio as a Commissioner, you will very soon be prevented from giving it any substance because the Member States will themselves assume responsibility for social policy, incomes policy and structural policy and want to implement them again at national level, and it is a tendency that must be stopped. In this respect, I feel your proposals lack something.

Our last criterion is this: if a price policy is used to achieve balance in the market, it should be joined by a social policy. You may talk about a magic policy — a rather picturesque word, Mr Commissioner — but I say you would do far better to come forward with very down-to-earth proposals. We have often discussed this in Parliament in the past. My group can be proud of the fact that it has taken the lead in any action in this direction, that it has not been tempted to seek higher prices on every occasion but asked itself precisely where the common agricultural policy's problems lie. They are in fact the problems facing the south and the confrontation between north and south, they are the problems facing smaller farms, they are the problems raised by higher inflation in some areas than in others, they are the problems with which the mountain regions and backward areas have to contend. If these problems can be defined, why not formulate a policy specifically designed to tackle them, not on a global basis with price increases but with stringent and direct measures, aimed specifically at these problems?

Let me give just one example of this. As the Commission has again referred to 120m ECU for the milk sector and has again acknowledged that something must be done for small dairy farmers, I simply wonder in a very down-to-earth way — there is nothing magic about this — why this proposal, this package now before us, cannot be extended to include other sectors, why the amount cannot be increased so that the problems that have emerged in those sectors can be alleviated with direct measures. This would make your policy credible, which is what you now want, to the benefit of the farmers and areas we are discussing.

Mr President, if this is not tackled at European level, it will be done at national level, and I have already referred to the serious matter for renationalization. If

you do not manage to prevent this, Mr Commissioner, there will come a time when you no longer have a common agricultural policy because it will have been transferred to the Member States, which will again do as they please. We must prevent this, and we of the Socialist Group intend to do what we can in this respect.

(Applause)

President. — I have received from Mr de la Malène and others, on behalf of the EDA Group, with request for an early vote pursuant to Rule 42(5), a motion for a resolution to wind up the debate on the oral question.

The vote on the request for an early vote will be taken at the end of the debate.

Mr Thareau (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, Mr Commissioner, the Americans denounced the GATT milk products agreement on 13 December 1984 and over the past weeks they have been reducing aid to their farmers, bringing about bankruptcies in America and forcing down prices on the world markets. All external markets are going to go through an extremely difficult period. So if we are going to have difficulties in the year that is about to begin, what sort of agriculture should we have in Europe to cope with them? That is the real question.

The first-class report that the Commission produces on agriculture in the Community every year, and particularly pages 123 to 138, gives us the results of Community agriculture — the average incomes dropped between 1976 and 1981 and, although they have improved since, they still have not caught up. But most importantly, the disparity between the farmers has increased constantly and the gaps have widened from 1 to 20!

The average income for 1984, which in fact improved, includes decapitalization. Take the example of my country, France, where more than 18% more cows were slaughtered in the second half of 1984 as compared with the second half of 1983. And you call that an agricultural income in your European accounts, when the cows are no longer there to produce anything.

During the January part-session, Jacques Delors stressed the need for an agricultural policy in the EEC and, only this morning, Mr Andriessen came and talked to us about prices without any reference to the Commission report I have just mentioned or the Treaty of Rome or what the President of the Commission said. He proposes prices regardless of the inequalities that exist and without any specific scheme for products in difficulty. He takes no account of farm incomes or the jobs lost as a result and offers us no change in structural or social aspects.

Thareau

A common agricultural policy should take account of the Community preference — derogations from which cost the EAGGF an average of a third of its budget every year — and we want to make the European farmers alone shoulder the burden of the problems of the world market! The common agricultural policy should control the volume of production and see that prices, assessed on a product-by-product basis, keep pace with inflation. It should pay greater attention to allied measures, to the machinery and the levels of intervention and the time taken to make payments. And it should, as of course someone has to pay, take account of the differences between the payers.

The CAP should also mean striking a fresh balance between the regions in the north and south of Europe. It should mean promoting the underprivileged regions and changing the rules to help Mediterranean productions and regions with the guidance section of the EAGGF. We are told about the need for fresh balance and the fundamental social role played by the farmers in the life of the regions, but the proposals do not follow.

The European Parliament has given its opinion on guidelines for a new structural policy on a number of occasions. Everyone seems to realize what is at stake, but as soon as the financial side of things comes up, national interests get the upper hand and block the dynamic policy we are waiting for. The gap between northern and southern Europe, between the favoured and the unfavoured regions, is getting wider all the time. The price proposals do not contain any socio-structural rules that can cope with the needs. They will worsen a situation which could well become irreversible.

The Commission proposals, through the regulation on the effectiveness of the structures, are ambitious. They include aid for small and medium-sized concerns and they introduce a ceiling rather than a threshold, thereby allowing us to hope that a disastrous policy, the exacerbated productivism of the development plans, will be abandoned. They aim to help young people set up in agriculture, thereby showing that the Community has at last recognized the need for young people to go into farming and stresses their importance. We also note that there are many other interesting measures, such as assistance for replacement services and management services.

But these agricultural programmes need more coherence. We still believe in the integrated Mediterranean programmes. All the structural programmes that we want must include price fixing, as part of an overall scheme, and we shall not be able to discuss the CAP if we are now agreeing to backtrack on the spirit of the Treaty of Rome.

Mr Bocklet (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. First of all I should like to thank Commis-

sioner Andriessen for coming here today and outlining his farm price proposals to the House, although I cannot altogether thank him for their content, since on a number of matters we disagree with him. We shall talk about the details in March, so for the moment I should like to concentrate on Mr Andriessen's principal remarks.

At present three things are required of Community agricultural policy: firstly the problem of surpluses must be solved, secondly farmers' incomes must be guaranteed and thirdly the cost of the agricultural policy must be drastically curtailed. Anyone who considers these three things together knows how hard it will be to find a solution. I would add that it is the failure hitherto of those with political responsibility to take any action which has brought us to this state. Consequently we are glad now to see anything at all being done. Nevertheless, in my view and in that of my Group, in many areas the wrong thing is being done. If I may be allowed a preliminary observation: those who call today for budgetary discipline must accept that the mistakes of the past must be paid for but must not be made good at the expense of the farmers.

In reply to a number of comments I would say that the most important aim of the common agricultural policy for the moment — in the interest both of farmers and consumers — is to reduce surpluses. We agree with the Commission on this and we can also say how the quantities to be secured can be defined. They are dictated by four requirements: firstly, adequate supplies for our own population; secondly, a safety reserve; thirdly, the amount we can sell on world markets and fourthly, the amount we need for food aid. But — and here we disagree with the Commission — the cutting back of surpluses must not penalize the farmers. We thus oppose any policy of putting pressure on prices, trying to reduce production by cutting prices, because this would endanger the livelihood of hundreds of thousands of farmers and would even spell the end for many of them.

We want to limit surplus production by limiting price guarantees — as in the case of milk or sugar — in all cases where we are able, because of the situation of the production process, to introduce a quota system. Where we cannot introduce a quota system we should seek a solution by switching intervention to other quality criteria or by creating incentives to switch production to other sectors. This is the case with cereals, for example.

For us Christian Democrats, prices policy remains the basis which guarantees a fair income for farmers. This means that we also say yes to an active policy on prices, albeit within the limits of the market conditions. This too I must add.

We are also quite aware that, in view of the differing structures existing within this Community, we shall

Bocklet

not make progress by prices policy alone. We are thus in favour of income supplements, like those we already have in the programme for hill farmers in disadvantaged regions. We favour income supplements for ecological reasons also and to maintain a certain management and rural structure, so that the smaller farms and holdings can survive. I say this for very specific reasons: with twelve million unemployed in this Community, every farmer we force to leave the land is one man more on the dole! This is something we cannot accept.

Two brief observations in conclusion. We want to see the Community's agricultural policy applied at European level with greater attention being paid to the protection of the environment. We want a reconciliation between environmental protection and agricultural policy and we want the system of Community preferences, to which the Commissioner has amazingly made no reference at all even though it is one of the three pillars of the CAP, to be taken more seriously. We believe that the Commission's proposals are too technocratic and too indifferent to the fate of hundreds of thousands of families. We thus reject this attempt at a solution and ask the Commission to give positive signals for the Community's agricultural policy.

IN THE CHAIR: MR PLASKOVITIS

Vice-President

Mr Provan (ED). — Mr President, I should like to thank the Commissioner for the statement he has made to the House this morning. We as a group welcome the proposals he is bringing forward in the price package for the agricultural sector this year. We believe he is being courageous in flying a flag and trying to show the industry that change has to come.

We realize, however, that the proposals he has come forward with will probably increase production for this year, and that is not really in the Community's interests. It will mean the supply of greater surpluses, and we realize, too, as he has pointed out himself, that it will have some severe budgetary consequences for the Community.

I have to say to Parliament this morning that if we as a parliament are sincere in wanting to increase our budgetary influence in the Community, we must behave responsibly, and we must behave responsibly on budgetary discipline. I hope that the Commission will use these price proposals as a flag-waving exercise and that they will go out and emphasize to the farming industry what is likely to come in the future. I believe the agricultural sector is looking for leadership and will respond to leadership, and I say to you this morn-

ing, Mr Commissioner, that we as a group believe that you have the courage to do it and we will give you the support that we believe is necessary.

As far as the Council is concerned, we believe that they are really the body that must take the ultimate decisions and that they must bite the bullet. For too long the Ministers of Agriculture have met inflated agricultural prices and brought this crisis upon the European Community. It is up to them to take the responsibility as well, and they must face reality and make certain that they carry the can. It will be difficult for them to go back and say that they have to re-trench. But that is the story they have to get across.

We see these proposals for this year, therefore, as a holding operation. It is no more than that. It is a holding operation to allow the agricultural sector to adjust itself to the changed circumstances that we now face. We know the budgetary consequences, and I believe the farmers know the budgetary consequences. Let no one say in future, therefore, that there is going to be a sudden arrival of change in the agricultural policy of the Community — as they said about the application of quotas. We know in this House that Mr Gundelach, when he was Commissioner in 1979, said there would have to be great restriction on the output of milk in the Community. Yet the industry chose to ignore it. Let us hope that the agricultural industry is big enough to realize the messages that are now conveyed in your price proposals for this year, Commissioner. Let us hope they realize that they must adjust, and let us hope they realize that you will be coming forward with other proposals in the future. It would be wrong to encourage destabilization in the agricultural industry and the rural areas, and we welcome, therefore, the proposals that you have come forward with, as I say, as a holding operation.

As far as cereals are concerned, we believe that the 3.6% cut is not great enough. We believe as a group that we shall be facing severe problems with the United States as far as cereal marketing is concerned, and that the proposals you have come forward with should, in fact, have been slightly greater. But we realize, as I say, the consequences that could have been inflicted on the sector if they had been greater. We hope that the indications you have given us this morning in your remarks about a possible 8% cut will go out and be recognized by the cereal producers. They must also recognize that with the record harvest we have had this year and with the three-year average for the threshold, that record harvest will be around for another two years as a result of these price proposals and that the likely threshold cut in future may be greater than what you have brought forward this year.

As far as milk is concerned, production still exceeds consumption by 14%, and a price-freeze, we believe, would have been more appropriate. Something should have been done regarding the removal of the co-responsibility levy, because it appears that those who have

Provan

cooperated in the application of the quota system are in fact still being inflicted with the co-responsibility levy, and that is not fair and just. Having said that, we welcome the greater flexibility that you are proposing, and here, too, we will support you.

However, there is a problem, as far as my country in particular is concerned, with the beef premium scheme, which you propose to abolish. It should be seen as a consumer subsidy, and anything you do to increase the price of beef will cut consumption and put more beef into intervention and storage. That cannot be right. We want to consume what we produce, and we should be encouraging consumption. There are figures available which show quite clearly that in the European Community the meat diet has been reduced by 6½% in the last five years. The UK story is slightly different. We have maintained consumption, and I think it is reasonable to suggest that it is the variable premium that has allowed this to happen.

There are many other aspects that we could talk about this morning, but let us not encourage destabilization of the rural areas. Let us have a smooth transition to the changed circumstances that face the industry. Let us be courageous and let the industry respond to your lead!

Mr Pranchère (COM). — (FR) On 14 January, Mr Delors, with his hand on his heart, told this House how much the farmers needed to believe in Europe. These fine words vanished when the Commission's price proposals were announced.

After the bad decisions of the European Councils of Fontainebleau and Dublin, these proposals constitute veritable provocation as far as the farmers are concerned. If they were sanctified as they stand by the Ministers, they would mean a 4-6% drop in farm incomes in all the countries of the EEC. That is quite intolerable!

All the producers are affected to varying degrees. The Commission's sights are on cereals and it wants to bring down prices once again to leave the ground clear for the USA on the world market. The milk producers, who are already heavily penalized by the quotas, are going to have another screw turned with a further authoritarian reduction of their output. Animal farmers, who saw a serious drop in their income in 1984, get no facts and no feelings from the Commission — beef and veal, sheepmeat and pigmeat all get nothing. And let us not forget the wine growers, who are in the same boat.

It is not these products that should get nothing, Mr Commissioner, it is you! Your proposals are such an insult to the farmers that you ought to get a vote of censure from this House! The drop in the prices of fruit and vegetables and citrus fruit, which may be as much as 6%, is indicative of the way Brussels is pre-

paring for enlargement — at the lowest possible price, making vast cuts in the already inadequate projections for the Mediterranean productions. A funny way of balancing north and south. The Commission makes no secret of its intentions either, as I note this justification for the 6% cut in citrus fruit prices — this will certainly encourage the producers to use the reconversion measures provided, it says. What reconversion? To oil-seeds or protein foods, while, in spite of a major shortfall in the EEC, they are penalized with a guarantee threshold and a price reduction? I shall not go into the problem any further today. When Unicef says that one child in the world dies of hunger every two seconds, is it tolerable for the Commission to work at reducing our agricultural potential? This is the kingdom of Ubu and Kafka combined.

Mr Commissioner, your statements before the Committee on Agriculture recently created a real 'bronca', as we say in southern France, an expression of the farmers' discontent, which can only get greater. In an attempt to tone down the effect and the shock of your proposals, you announce a serious discussion on the future of the CAP. If you really wanted to, you could have started certain things now. But you didn't. And worse, some of your old proposals, such as the tax on oils and fats — worth 600 million ECU, I would remind you — and the restrictions on substitute products, have been dropped.

As European Parliament *rapporteur* on agricultural prices, I cannot accept your proposals and I shall fight them in the report I shall be submitting to the Committee on Agriculture this afternoon with the dual aim of ensuring a fair income to family smallholdings and proper utilization of our agricultural potential. It is possible, when you realize that 50% of the Community's imports are products the Community itself can produce!

I am coming to an end, Mr President. Developing productions which are in short supply, getting greater respect for the CAP principles that are flouted — failure to respect the Community preference costs 2 000 — 4 000 million ECU, the Court of Auditors suggests — and setting up a proper commercial policy are the stakes for the future. It is in these conditions and in the light of this series of problems that I shall be proposing an average price increase of 5%, varied according to product, this afternoon.

In conclusion, I should say that the farmers do not need swingeing measures at the present time. They have had enough of those. What they need is a decent income and fresh prospects for the future. The farmers will certainly take action along these lines and I shall be with them.

Mr Ducarme (L). — (FR) This morning, we heard a Minister responsible for the budget, not one responsible for agriculture. You defined your policy in terms

Ducarme

of an amount, fair enough, but where are your proposals on the structural aspects, on the commercial policy, the development of agricultural research, the world agricultural problem, food and hunger in the world, the maintenance of family holdings, the penalization of factory farms, co-responsibility levies on substitute products and the restoration of the Community preference? The Commission document only contains one or two empty phrases.

Mr Commissioner, my Group wants you to present an additional document, as soon as the parliamentary committees meet again, to enable us to understand your food and agriculture strategy. If you do not, Mr Delors lied to us and, unless we are given explanations, how do you expect us Belgians to explain an agricultural price freeze or a price cut when your own information suggests that incomes in Belgium are going down by 7%? We expect concrete proposals which explain your strategy. We shall make our proposals in committee but for the time being, we shall stick to the objective method of calculation and we call, very legitimately, for the 7.8% increase.

Mr Mouchel (RDE). — (FR) Mr President, I listened to what Mr Andriessen had to say just now very attentively. But his proposals and arguments did not convince me any more than they did the first time I heard him in the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr Commissioner, you explained that it was normal for there to be a drop in cereal prices because there has been a record harvest and we have gone past the guarantee thresholds. We have had a record harvest, it is true. But, at the same time, I should also like to point out that we have had a very large drop in cereal prices — of as much as 10% in my region and my country it is all very well to talk about guidance prices not going up because of the size of the harvest — but how are we going to get the prices that have been fixed adhered to? For I personally do not accept the dissociation of guidance price and intervention price.

Although there may be a certain amount of justification for your position in the matter of cereals, how can there be for protein plants where we have an enormous deficit? For example, you suggest a more than 6% price cut for field beans. I really do not understand. How can you justify such proposals? Of course, you say that you are proposing price increases for cotton and soya. But when you propose an increase of 1% and the increase in costs is far more than that, I do not see how the proposals constitute encouragement to develop these productions that are in very short supply!

Agricultural incomes, you told us, have gone up by about 4% on average in the Community as a whole. This may well be so — although we do not have the final figures yet — but I also know that, even if this increase does turn out to be right, it will in any case

not apply to all the countries of the Community. The differences in the trends in farm incomes from one region to another are very considerable. I know, for example, that there will be a big drop in the milk producers' incomes in dairy farming regions. But the price increase you suggest is far below the cut in the volume of production attendant on the quotas. So we already know that, in constant terms and even discounting inflation, the farmers' earnings will be smaller than they were during the last agricultural year. At the same time, you are proposing to maintain the principle of the co-responsibility levy, which has long been entirely deflected from its aim. It is not possible to block the volume and the prices and to maintain the system of co-responsibility levies.

Furthermore, on the matter of the budget, you say that the 19 300 million ECU which the Commission originally provided has been exceeded by a considerable amount. That is fine, but we have to be told how and why. For why should the original estimates be wrong when we are seeing the dollar rise non-stop and refunds are declining in comparison with the predictions we made a few months ago?

I also agree with those who believe that, in these conditions, there is a risk of the common agricultural policy being renationalized. Look what happened in Germany. What you propose runs counter to what the President of the Commission told us in this very House a month ago. We are going towards the liquidation of a large number of farmers. But have we taken any account of the cost of unemployment, which is far higher than the cost of the common agricultural policy? In my region, for the first time — and I mean the first time — we are seeing a group of agricultural organizations seek ways of limiting the number of farmers who are going to be ruined and forced to stop all activity. In a word, these organizations are trying to see that those who have to die do so with the least amount of suffering . . .

Mr Commissioner, your budgetary approach to the issue is a partial approach because it fails to take account of the financial and human consequences of the farmers' ruin and the domino effect on the economy of whole regions. You are said, Mr Commissioner, to be a man of determination. Does this prevent you from listening to reasoned arguments from many members of this House who are asking you to go beyond the budgetary aspects of the matter and take account of things that have no effect on the budget? I should like to ask you the following question in particular. Why block any possibility of export when we have little or no need of refunds? That would call for two explanations. You are preventing us from realizing our legitimate hopes of winning markets, even where it costs us nothing. Why? You justify price cuts with surpluses. So why prevent the development of productions of which there is a deficit?

How, Mr Commissioner, can you reconcile your proposals with the declarations of the Commission to

Mouchel

which you belong? Can you tell us seriously what you want to do with the agricultural potential and the farmers? If you maintain your position, do not count on us to approve of an agricultural policy that our successors are bound to condemn.

(Applause)

Mr Roelants du Vivier (ARC). — (FR) Mr President, Mr Commissioner, every year, this House performs a rite that takes place in two stages. First, when the budget is discussed, a lot of voices are raised to say that too much of it goes on agriculture. Then when agricultural prices are discussed, a lot of voices (often the same ones) are raised to say that the agricultural prices granted are too small.

In connection with this rite, I think it is important to ask what is the logic of the price policy of the Commission and the Community in general. According to its own logic, of course, the common agricultural policy, and its price policy therefore, can be considered to be a great success, as agricultural productivity, Mr Commissioner, has increased by an average of 7% over the past 20 years and Europe has given itself relative security of supplies and prices as a result.

However, the miracle of the common agricultural policy has also brought social and environmental costs which are becoming considerable.

In the first place, do I need to remind you that in 25 years of common agricultural policy, the number of farmers has dropped from 20 million to eight million? The common agricultural policy goes hand in hand with a minute-by-minute disappearance of employment in agriculture. And alongside this, the *per capita* capital has increased fivefold and the debt of the majority of farmers risen constantly.

I shall not insist on the regional disparities which aggravate the social inequality either. This is all very well known.

What is perhaps more interesting, Mr Commissioner, is to see that, this year, more than in past years, I think, many of our colleagues and Commissioners and ministers have begun to see the structural policy as being more important and to think that, ultimately, the problem hinges on that structural policy. And in this structural policy, some people do not forget to point to the need for agriculture to be reconciled with the environment. I was pleased to hear Mr Bocklet talk about this. I hope that this will not stay at the level of good intentions.

In this structural policy, the funds available should be used more to help the most unfavoured regions improve the quality of products, to redirect and diversify production, to run integrated programmes and to provide direct assistance for the farmers who have an

important job to do when it comes to preserving natural sites.

And here, no new structural policy is envisaged in the declarations of the Commission, which is intending to react against some of the negative results of the past. It is highly inadequate as things stand. We must go a lot further to reconcile agriculture and the environment and consider that, before being an industrial activity, agriculture is perhaps above all a biological activity. This is something that should not be forgotten or overlooked at the present time.

Mr Paisley (NI). — Mr President, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Commissioner for the letter which I received from him recently concerning the situation in Northern Ireland, where dairy producers are encountering severe difficulties as a result of the sudden imposition of the milk quotas last year.

I am very pleased that he intends to pursue further the way in which the United Kingdom Government allocated the 65 000 tonnes of milk out of the Community reserve, which was intended for Northern Ireland but which was misappropriated by Whitehall. All those concerned with the dairy industry in the province of Ulster also welcome the fact that the Commission has formulated proposals on equalization between regions which, if approved, might well obviate the need for Ulster producers to pay any superlevy at all this year.

Northern Ireland is heavily dependent on agricultural production and especially on milk production. At the moment, it is the only region of the UK which stands to pay this levy. Such a situation would be totally unfair and absolutely unacceptable. I would ask the Commissioner when he expects these proposals to be approved, as it is essential that farmers know exactly where they stand as they approach the end of the current farming year.

I would also ask the Commissioner to reconsider his proposal to abolish the UK variable beef premium and the CAP premium. Is it not the case that the variable premium has many advantages over intervention buying as a means of market support in the beef sector? The premium benefits both producers and consumers alike by providing supplies of beef at reasonable prices. If it were removed, I have no doubt that greater intervention would mean greater costs for the EEC taxpayer.

On a more general point. I would like to know whether the Commissioner has taken into account the severe impact that his price proposals will have on farmers' incomes right across the Community, especially in the milk and beef sectors. Is it not high time that the co-responsibility levy on milk was finally abolished? It is intolerable that small producers, especially, should have in effect double taxation.

Paisley

I believe that this is the appropriate moment to consider doing away with this levy instead of, merely tinkering with it. Support prices must be increased in line with the rise in input costs. Anything less would mean consigning more and more small farmers to greater and greater hardship, pushing many of them off their farms completely and ruining them totally.

Mr Romeos (S). — (GR) Mr President, to the general remarks made by previous speakers, particularly Mr Woltjer and Mr Thareau, I should like to add the following.

The Commission's report on the situation of Community agriculture in 1984 states that the common agricultural policy, which is primarily concerned with the organization of the markets, has failed to remove the inequalities of income in the agricultural world and even seems to have accentuated them during this last year. It also says that the differences between the regions are as big as ever and that, inevitably, the positive results of the common agricultural policy on incomes vary from one region to another. The question is, therefore, whether the Commission's price proposals will remove, or at least reduce, these differences in incomes, which, as the Commission itself admits, have so far been due to the CAP.

It is to be feared, however, that these proposals will have the very opposite result — not that of reducing these inequalities, but of increasing them to the detriment of small-scale producers and the poorer regions. This price policy may aim at limiting the surpluses — although it is doubtful whether it will succeed — but it will most certainly result in that reduction already referred to in the incomes of farmers in the poorer regions. What is worse, this proposals package does not include those relating to the new structural policy, as had been promised to us in Berlin by the Italian Minister for Agriculture. If we say, therefore, that these new prices are designed to reduce surpluses, that means that something will have to be done for the products subject to such reduction. Something will have to be done for farmers who will be obliged to leave their farms as a result of this price policy — unless, of course, the Commission's object is to create further numbers of unemployed in the agricultural sector.

I should like to point out that an earlier proposal from the Commission to the Council stressed that while a common price policy remained the principal instrument of the agricultural policy, it presupposed the harmonious functioning of the European system and in particular an appreciable approximation of the proportion of agriculture to the gross national product in each country. Does the policy presented to us today by the Commissioner correspond to this requirement? Certainly not. This same proposal laid down that in certain cases a policy of direct aid to incomes for small-scale producers was to be followed, but this pro-

posal has obviously been abandoned. It was also stressed that the problems of the Mediterranean regions must be studied with especial care because of the importance agriculture has for the economy of these regions. I make these observations because it is clear that the Commission is failing, in its present proposals, to take account of the fact that in certain Community countries agriculture accounts for 2%, 3% or 4% of the gross national product while in others it accounts for more than 25%. It is therefore impossible for a common price policy to be equitable unless accompanied by parallel measures.

There remains the question of the organization of the market. If our imports of agricultural produce are now at the level of 50 000 million ECU and include, among other things, fruit and vegetables, how can we justify to our farmers any demand to reduce their output and their income in order to import similar produce from other regions into the Community? Mr Woltjer was right in what he said, that a price policy must be accompanied by a social policy. What we are practising today is not a price policy but a bookkeeping exercise, pure and simple, which will destroy the last trace of confidence that Europe's farmers have had in the Community.

Mr Dalsass (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, if we pursue a policy of this kind for several years, then there will truly be dark days ahead for agriculture! I should like to confine my remarks to just one area, agriculture in the problem regions — if I can call them that. I mean the mountain and hill regions and other disadvantaged regions.

When the milk quotas were introduced I repeatedly indicated that better provision should be made for the hill and mountain regions, because they are weak and cannot compete with the more favourably placed areas of agriculture. This was not done, and now the competition from these better placed areas is stiffer and stiffer.

It is in our interest that these mountain regions and hill farms should continue to be farmed. At the same time we know that fewer machines can be used there and that more manpower is required, so that everything is dearer, the yield per hectare is much lower and incomes are also lower. All these disadvantages have been ignored or barely acknowledged.

You will say, but there is an EEC directive on hill farmers. Yes, Mr Commissioner, but you do not cancel out the disadvantages by giving the farmers 100 ECU per hectare per year. It is also in our interest, ecologically speaking, to continue farming these regions. Repeated references to ecology have been made here. I would say that if in protecting the mountains you are protecting the valley, then landslides in the mountains spell danger for the valley. And so the hill farmer must continue to farm.

Dalsass

The mountains are also an area for leisure and recreation which must be preserved not only for the farmers but also for those seeking to get away from the centres of urban population. Consequently something more special should be done for these regions. Today the hill farmers have the advantage of being exempt from the co-responsibility levy, but this is soon to be taken from them.

In my view the mountain and hill regions are neglected too much, and so I make the perhaps rather heretical suggestion that the co-responsibility levy should be abolished, though only for small farmers and the mountain and hill regions. For the rest they should be kept in order to make the difference between problem agriculture and problem-free sectors of agriculture. One could also perhaps keep the calves premium for the hill and mountain regions.

Something has to be done, Mr Commissioner. If we do not wish to go down this road, we must do something else which will have an immediate effect. Today there is still some differentiation, tomorrow everything is to be reduced to the same level. But this would to some degree mean the *coup de grâce* for the mountain regions, and we should think hard before administering it. And those very people who are constantly talking of ecology and preservation of the rural environment ought really to be in favour of the solution proposed.

(Applause)

Mrs Jepsen (ED). — (DA) Mr President, to begin with I should like to express my great satisfaction with Commissioner Andriessen's statements last week in the Committee on Agriculture. The Commissioner said that he was against the introduction of quotas to limit surplus production in the agricultural sector. The Danish conservatives are also opposed to quotas and think that it is absolutely essential to bring in market forces and let supply and demand determine the level of agricultural production.

We are confident that these are the principles which will form the basis for future policy. The Commission's proposals for new farm prices can thus be adopted in general, provided the Commission's policy objective over the next four years will be to release the agricultural policy from the system of centralized control we have today.

As a newcomer to office, this Commission is ideally placed to frame and apply a coherent, long-range policy. But it will undeniably impose heavy demands on the Commission's — and of course the Council's — ability to reach decisions. The restrictive price proposal will put increased pressure on the national authorities to apply measures or support arrangements on a more national basis. The Commission has a duty here to prevent such a renationalization of agricultural

policy. This will of course also affect Danish farmers. But the reason why the Danish Conservatives nevertheless support this reorganization is that we recognize that, unless the Community is to be brought to its knees economically by its own policy, there must be action to tighten it up.

It is not just a European problem: the OECD has pointed out that supply and demand must be used as a regulator if agricultural production is to be brought back to reasonable levels — not only in the EEC and in Europe but in the USA and other countries too. There is a need for a joint strategy, which will be sufficiently flexible but will prevent the problems from being simply passed on from one sector to another. Protectionism and distortions to competition through subsidies and guaranteed prices tend to give rise to serious tensions, not just in our own economy but generally across the whole spectrum of international economic relations.

One observation is prompted, however, regarding the superlevy: the Commission must administer both the assessment basis and actual collection in accordance with the agreements and decisions originally adopted.

Once these production quotas have been introduced in milk production, the least we can expect is to be assured that the rules will be followed and not constantly changed. But, generally speaking, the milk quotas demonstrate the difficulties which will arise if we introduce similar quotas for other products.

The inescapable conclusion is that we must introduce a market economy in agricultural production too. We must ensure that the producers are interested in being able to sell the goods they produce. They have all too little motivation in this respect under the present system. Many farmers produce exclusively for intervention, while the Community's taxpayers foot the bill. That cannot continue. I therefore hope that the Commission will be able to take up the challenge which it has built in to its own price proposal.

Mr Adamou (COM). — (GR) Mr President, the Commission's proposals for agricultural prices are unacceptable to all small and medium-scale farmers and particularly for Greek farmers.

For the sake of budgetary discipline, the Commission has completely failed to take account of the peculiarities and problems of the Greek agricultural economy — production costs three times as high, inflation four times as high, an excessive increase in the prices of means of production, the splitting up of agricultural land into small plots, low productivity, etc., etc. These unacceptable prices are, moreover, accompanied by production quotas, guarantee thresholds, co-responsibility levies affecting dynamic Greek crops such as cotton, sugar beet, currants, tomatoes for processing, tobacco — that is to say, products where Community output is below consumption.

Adamou

Greek farmers are already up in arms, and their trade organizations Gesase and Paseges are openly denouncing this policy. For Greece, the Greek farmers, there is no course left but to fight for the cause advocated by the Greek Communist Party — the fight for a national agricultural policy and ultimately the country's departure from the EEC.

Mr Christensen (ARC). — (DA) Mr President, the price proposals the Commission has presented do not solve the problems of agricultural surplus production, the EEC's budget problems or the farmers' income problems. The intention is, by applying a restrictive price policy, to reduce the production of surpluses, but the result will be to force the farmers into producing more units. That is what happens when market forces are circumvented. Indeed the whole idea of the Community's agricultural policy is to circumvent market forces, and never has this been pursued more intensively than at present. I cannot of course share the views of my colleague, Marie Jepsen, that it is possible to make the market forces effective. It cannot be done by accepting a quota system or by accepting a system of guaranteed prices.

The intention of using quota arrangements and co-responsibility levies to limit production therefore is to avoid using market forces. But it is a repudiation of the Community's own principles, and it will result in the blocking of the structure. Nor is it possible to contemplate the extension of the quota system to areas other than the dairy sector. Unfortunately that is what I think will happen. As long as market forces are not applied, we have to resort to quota systems, and we thus end up with a full-blown centrally planned and bureaucratically regulated agricultural system, which is completely out of touch with other sectors that live to a greater degree, or exclusively, according to the principles of the market economy. That is, I am sorry to say, how things are in reality.

Despite the price proposals, which aim at zero prices, it cannot be said that the Community is a low-price area for food. That is, it is the consumers who pay. And they also pay as taxpayers, because the expenditure under the agricultural policy will burst the Community's budget. When production surpluses are dumped on the world market, the Community slides to the brink of a trade war with one country or another. All this happens without the individual farmers gaining any special advantages for, if that were the case, we would not have a situation in which hundreds of thousands of the Community's eight million farmers are having to leave their farms. We have a right to ask: what happens to the many, many billions of kroner in the farm support budget? Who gets them? It is certainly not the thousands, tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands of farmers who are going bankrupt.

For Danish farmers the critical turning point, when the so-called EEC advantages turn into their opposite,

will soon come, if it has not already arrived. The Danish People's Movement against Membership of the European Community will devote its efforts to securing the examination and promotion of alternatives to the hopeless agricultural policy of the European Community. Danish agriculture used to enjoy freedom of production. When we insisted on market economy conditions, Danish agriculture was the most competitive and efficient farming industry in the world. Now instead we have so-called price security, and Danish agriculture is being wound up. That is what has actually happened, and that is why we need to establish different systems, different rules, an entirely different policy. We do not believe that can happen within the framework of the European Community, and that is why we want to examine what other possibilities there are for Danish agriculture.

Mr Früh (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to address myself to one specific sector in this debate. Clearly, Mr Commissioner, we are entering into a topical discussion prompted by Mr Woltjer's question. As you know, we are experiencing major difficulties in the milk sector and in the European agricultural policy as a whole, which is supposed, as if by magic, to reconcile its high productivity with equilibrium on the internal and external markets and with the constantly bemoaned fact of its cash shortage. Our opinion on this and on your proposal has already been outlined by our first speaker, Mr Bocklet. I should like, not least in my capacity as chairman of the committee which Parliament set up to consider the question of milk quotas, to give my views on this special matter.

All the measures which have been taken have not helped this sector much. Finally, last year, the system of quota restrictions was adopted. That was what the Council of Ministers wanted, and after a year or so we see now where it has got us.

Let me say the following. Mr Commissioner, Parliament warned at the time against introducing the superlevy immediately after the second quarter. We thought it was not possible for the necessary arrangements to be made in all countries so quickly. Sadly our warning was brushed aside. Some countries have so far been unable even to declare their reference quantities to their producers and the dairies. Perhaps the time allowed really was too short. Others — and I am thinking here particularly of my own country — have already had this superlevy imposed on them. You can imagine that this has given rise to considerable bad feeling.

But since then something has happened which has, unfortunately, destroyed the credibility of the Community's agricultural policy: the Council stated that it was unable to enforce the Commission's implementing provisions in the individual countries and to collect the levy at the appropriate times. We would now earnestly

Früh

ask you, Mr Commissioner, to see to it that there is not one law for some and another law for others, and that your threat to go to the Court of Justice is immediately carried out. And when you say, we shall estimate milk production and recover any fines from the advance payments, then guard against the possibility that the countries may well receive less in advance payments but that the effect is not passed on to the producer so that he ceases to believe that you will ever collect this levy. I thus call on you to make matters clear here after the first year, so that the credibility of the Community's agricultural policy is not undermined. If this system of milk levies fails you can be sure that all further measures which prove necessary in other areas will also come to grief and that the common agricultural policy will find itself in deep trouble, if it does not fall apart completely.

(Applause)

Mr Welsh (ED). — Mr President, the small dairy farmers of Lancashire have had a traumatic experience this year because of the imposition of milk quotas. The blame lies squarely with the Council of Ministers because they for many years avoided the necessity to take tough decisions, and to some extent, I have to say, with parliamentarians such as my good friend, Mr Bocklet, who have led farmers everywhere to believe that by some special magic the Community could suspend the ordinary operation of the laws of supply and demand in their case, and we know that this is not true. If other farmers are to be spared the traumatic experience suffered by the milk producers, then action must be taken now and action must be taken in a planned and constructive way.

I should feel much better at the end of this debate if Mr Andriessen, particularly in view of some of the things that have been said, particularly by the German Minister of Agriculture, would state that the Commission will not under any circumstances accept or put forward any proposals that detract from the effect of the ones that are on the table now. In other words, that there will be no backsliding. I think that if Mr Andriessen were to give that assurance today, it would greatly strengthen his hand in the negotiations that are to come.

I also have two specific questions. In the first place, given that we still have a surplus of milk forecast in excess of 10 million tonnes, would it not make more sense to cut the quota by 2% instead of 1% and to compensate dairy producers by abolishing the co-responsibility levy altogether? Would that not be more sensible in both budgetary and management terms? Secondly, can Mr Andriessen tell us whether the Commission thinks that it will have the budgetary resources available to support the disposal of excess cereals given the likely passage of an American farm bill which will bring greatly increased amounts of American produce onto the market? Does he not think that under those

conditions a 3.6% cut is inadequate, that a 5% cut, which is justified by the excess over the threshold, would be much more to the point, and does he not also think that some sort of quota control needs to be introduced for cereals as well? If he can give us that sort of assurance and answer, then my milk producers will feel a lot happier.

Mr Gatti (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, we Italian Communists have never been, and we are not now, in favour of a policy of high prices, because we are against those who produce for storage purposes and to create surpluses.

For that reason, Mr Commissioner, we do not ask you for magical solutions, but we do ask for solutions that are different from what we have had in the past; we ask that account be taken of the fact that European agriculture — as the document says — differs very profoundly from one country to another, and you know very well that an increase of 3, 4 or 5% in one country may mean a reduction in other countries. We ask you to take the different economic situations in individual countries into account; it is not possible to take an average for inflation, because the situations differ very considerably.

Why, therefore, will not the Commission change its premises here and now? As you well know, price policy and structural policy must proceed in line with one another. For that reason a price policy designed to control expenditure must be modulated product by product, so as to ensure the balanced growth of the Community and punish surpluses. That is why your proposals for a price policy spread over many years do not protect incomes: it is only by means of modulation and real changes that we can really alter our common agricultural policy so as to give our farmers a prospect for the future.

Mr Debatisse (PPE). — *(FR)* Mr President, Mr Commissioner, here are one or two remarks to add to those made by my friends in the Christian Democrat Group.

You, Mr Commissioner, say that you have plenty of courage. I do not doubt it, but allow me to have a little doubt about the fact that these proposals are balanced because — is the effort to be made properly balanced? That is the real question I want to ask you. The farmers have the feeling that they are only ones shouldering the burden of the proposed measures.

If I look at what is happening in industry — when supply has to be adjusted to demand, for example — there is a reduction in the factories' volume of production and, fortunately, aid to the Community to enable it to cover the social costs. But the cost of 12 million unemployed would be far greater than the common agricultural policy and what it costs. So it is with this in mind

Debatisse

that I should like to tell you that it is not just a question of reducing quotas and prices, which are in fact going to be brought down by 0.3%.

You must remember that the objective method, which the agricultural organizations and the authorities established, provides for an increase of more than 7.8% to cover the lag in production costs. So we are far from being able to say that your proposals represent a balanced position. And it still has to be said that agricultural income includes both the individual earnings of the farmers — and they will have to tighten their belts yet again — and the means needed to fit out and modernize their farms and make them competitive. I should like all the non-farmers to remember that, without this effort with productivity, the prices themselves would have soared. Over the past 20 years, productivity has increased far more in agriculture than in industry. I should like this not to be forgotten in international competition.

And is it balanced as far as different countries are concerned? For if you look at the USA, the milk producer gets a price that is about 30% higher than the European producer's price. So we are a long way off. And it is not your proposals that will improve the situation!

Lastly, I should like us not to forget the mountain farmers either, as they cannot do anything else. This is where the balance is lacking. They cannot produce anything else and the proposed measures are clearly inadequate!

Mr Tolman (PPE), *chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food*. — (NL) Mr President, in view of the many comments that have been made, I shall be extremely brief.

I will begin by thanking the Commissioner: even though the new Commission has only just taken office, he has managed to keep to the time-limit, the end of January, for the submission of his proposals, thus enabling us in the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food and, very soon, Parliament as a whole to do our duty on time. As we well know from life, the cries of 'hosanna' are sometimes soon followed by cries of 'crucify him'. There is no denying that the cries of 'crucify him', the criticism, have been fairly dominant here.

We are now reaching a stage where the political groups must come to a decision on the right position to adopt, and in my opinion two points in particular have to be considered. Firstly, both the committee and the Commissioner have placed the emphasis very clearly on the present surpluses. I have the impression that not enough attention has really been paid to the incomes policy, the incomes aspects. I would point out once again, Mr President, that we must not yield to the temptation of thinking that mapping out a price

policy will enable us to pursue a satisfactory incomes policy. Circumstances in European agriculture vary too widely for that. There is in this respect an element of the unfinished about this, Andriessen's unfinished symphony: one aspect, the surpluses, attracted considerable attention, while rather too little attention has been paid to other aspects — quite understandably, I feel, because time was very short. Considerable emphasis on the surpluses also justifies considerable emphasis on products which are in short supply. And one piece of advice I should like to give Mr Andriessen is this: think of this above all else, think, for example, of products which are in short supply, high-protein products, and give special encouragement to their production. But do not limit this encouragement to just one year: follow a line that will ensure some continuity in the future and show that sufficient interest has been taken in these aspects as well. I hope the Commissioner will take these comments into account.

Mr Marck (PPE). — (NL) Mr President, I shall confine myself to one aspect of the matter, because the others have already been discussed. I want to talk about renationalization and the danger it poses for the common agricultural policy. A study of the Commission's farm price proposals and the degree of laxity that is to be found in administration clearly indicate that the common agricultural policy, which has been developed with so many sacrifices and so much patience, is in danger of being totally destroyed. The Member States will feel a growing need to take national compensatory measures to protect their farmers' incomes against the collapse of the Community. The Commission does not, for example, make any mention in its price proposals of the incomes guarantee farmers have under the Treaty of Rome. This will inevitably prompt some national governments to take compensatory action. And as the compensation will differ from one country to another, this will mean a reversion to national policies.

This also finds expression in specific cases. The introduction of a separate milk quota for each country, the differences in arrangements and application and the proposed reduction in the prices of cereals will bring substantial changes in production in each country. As the Commission has not proposed any means of preventing these changes, there is a danger that each country will by-pass the Commission and introduce its own measures. Here too, the differences of approach will give rise to serious distortions.

And what is the Commission doing to bring about a more European approach? Steps are indeed being taken, but for the most part too late and too slowly. How long was it before the first Christmas butter campaign was eventually launched? Why were the refunds on cereals blocked for so long at a time when we were under considerable pressure from the Americans? Why is the Commission not proposing a common buying-out arrangement now that this seems to be a realistic

Marck

proposition in the various Member States? What is the Commission doing to combat far-reaching national measures? I do not see a great deal happening here. The procedures are slow and in fact have the opposite effect. I apologize to the Commissioner for raising the question of Dutch natural gas prices again. We have been waiting for a statement from the Commission on this since October 1984, but so far we have heard nothing. Meanwhile Dutch market gardeners continue to enjoy a competitive advantage. The Commission must tackle this problem as a matter of urgency if it does not want to be the cause of the downfall of the common agricultural policy. If the Commission fails to offer the farmers and market gardeners any fresh prospects, the Member States will take the helm again and propose and take all manner of social measures that will lead to the destruction of this agricultural policy. This must be prevented at all costs, and I ask the Commission to give the matter very serious thought.

Mr Raftery (PPE). — Mr President, the Commissioner referred to the farmers' good fortune last year in having a rise of 4% in their income. But I would remind the Commissioner that that good fortune was due rather to the weather than to any actions on the Commission's part.

Secondly, I would remind the Commissioner that the vast majority of farmers in 1984 had a lower income than they had in 1978, and that in my own country incomes were about 25% lower than in 1978. He has advocated the price mechanism as a means of controlling surpluses. Frankly, I think that is not a good means. The price mechanism will simply result in smaller farmers being driven out of farming and bigger and more efficient farmers being encouraged to adopt more of the new technology which is the primary cause of surpluses. It will accelerate the application of new technology on the larger farms, thereby creating more surpluses, reducing the number of farmers and adding to the dole queues in Europe, increasing the cost to national governments and to the Community as a whole.

As to those who say that our prices should be brought more into line with world prices, let me remind them that food is an entirely different commodity from other commodities; that people will only eat one dinner, they will not eat two, and they will not do without one. Consequently, there is very little elasticity of supply and demand.

I think we have to look to other means. He has talked about the quota system. The quota system is preferable to the price mechanism, but the quota system is a very blunt mechanism and while it may be admirable for countries with a developed agriculture such as Denmark and Holland, it is entirely unsuitable for countries with an undeveloped agriculture such as Ireland, Italy and Greece.

I would prefer to think of a third system, and that is a reallocation of the soil resources to produce what is in deficit in the Community. It is nonsense, I believe, to continue producing milk or beef on the wetlands of the West of Ireland or in the highlands of the Alps when these commodities are in surplus, if at the same time such land is very suitable for the production of a commodity — timber — which is in deficit now and will be in deficit in our lifetime and in our children's lifetime. Equally, there are other commodities such as protein and fibres which could be produced on the land which is presently producing cereals, whether it be in East Anglia or in the Po Valley or in the Paris Basin. Surely it is not beyond the imagination of the Commission to produce proposals which will encourage the production of the many items which are in deficit in the Community at present.

Mr President, I submit that if the Commission is not able to come up with something better than prices, it is time for some of the staff to get early retirement.

President. — Before suspending the proceedings, I should like to put the request for an early vote on the motion for a resolution in Doc. 2-1639/84 to the vote.

(Parliament rejected the request)

The motion is accordingly referred to the appropriate committee.

The joint debate will be resumed at 4.30 p.m.

(The sitting was adjourned at 12.10 p.m.)

4. Formal sitting

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

President

(The formal sitting opened at 12.15 p.m.)

President. — Mr President of Israel, it is a great honour for my colleagues and myself to be able to welcome you today to this Chamber.

(Loud applause)

Through you, the European Parliament renders homage to the State of Israel, with which the European Community, since the agreement of 1975, has maintained legal and economic ties to which we attach great importance.

President

More than this, however, we are bound by deeper ties connected with geography and history. We do not forget that the very birth of the State of Israel resulted from the greatest tragedy that Europe has ever known. The upshot for us is a common destiny of which we are entirely aware.

We are also united by a common attachment to the ideal of liberty and to parliamentary democracy, to which the State of Israel, in the midst of so many trials, can claim the inestimable credit of remaining unshakably loyal.

Finally, it is a friend of Europe that we have today the great pleasure of welcoming and to whom, without further ado, I give the floor.

(Loud applause)

Mr Herzog, President of Israel. — Mr President, may I express to you my profound thanks for the honour accorded me and my country by inviting me to address this session of the European Parliament. I do so, conscious not only of the intrinsic importance of the Parliament but also because of the significance of this body. It has a profound significance for those of us who come from the Middle East because here, despite all the problems involved, great nations which were divided for centuries by war, attrition, conflict and hatred are joined together in what must represent a new and noble adventure in the history of mankind. Above all, it represents a landmark and a lesson for the nations of the world in general and for the strife-torn area from where I come in particular.

You here represent much for one from Israel. You represent what is perhaps the most important of all between nations — dialogue. You represent an attempt to stress the unifying and to resolve the divisive. With all the growing pains which a new community such as the European Community must endure, you represent a brave and noble example to the world. And as I stand here I cannot but offer a silent prayer that one day we shall be privileged to have such an institution in which the representatives of the countries in the Middle East will meet to discuss their problems in free and open debate . . .

(Loud applause)

. . . and not, as in so many instances now, in hostile and menacing diatribe.

In appearing before you here, I do so as the representative of what is, alas, the only parliamentary democracy, as you understand it, in our area. During my period as Ambassador to the United Nations, I always regretted the fact that the democracies of the world did not see fit to create their own bloc and to support each other. It was sad at times to observe how democracies on occasion saw fit to abandon a small fellow-

democracy fighting for its existence in an area where totalitarian rule predominates.

Mr President, ever since the establishment of the State of Israel all the heads of our government without exception have declared that our conflict with our Arab neighbours cannot be resolved on the battlefield but only at the negotiating table. All our governments emphasized our willingness to negotiate on all issues without prior conditions. For years we maintained that dialogue is the only road to peace and that negotiations, however protracted and difficult, must lead to positive results. For years we maintained that no advance could be made without negotiations and that no negotiations had ever taken place between us and our Arab neighbours without an advance being made. And then one day a great man arose in the Middle East and accepted our challenge. The late, lamented President Anwar Sadat of Egypt came to Jerusalem, addressed the Knesset, set forth his demands and entered into negotiations.

(Applause)

His challenge was taken up by the Government of Israel. The long and protracted negotiations which ensued, with the active help and historic involvement of the United States Government, and its President, led ultimately to the signing of the Israel-Egyptian peace treaty. They also led to the Camp David Agreement, setting out the guidelines for a solution to the Palestinian-Arab question. All the territory of Sinai was returned by Israel to Egypt.

Today the border with Egypt is open. Israeli tourists frequent Egyptian resorts in Sinai and in Egypt. A bus leaves Tel Aviv every morning for Cairo. Daily flights connect Israel and Egypt. True, there are problems. Not all developments have been as we would have wished them. However, the machinery of negotiation and dialogue exists in the Israel Embassy in Cairo and in the Egyptian Embassy in Israel. Indeed, Israeli and Egyptian negotiators met in Beersheba in recent days to discuss outstanding issues. It is sobering and sad indeed to reflect that the United Nations, dedicated as it is supposed to be to the peace of the world and to the achievement of peaceful relations between nations, condemned an agreement the most tangible result of which has been the fact that since President Sadat's historic visit to Jerusalem in November 1977 not one Israeli or Egyptian soldier has died in the Sinai or on the Israeli-Egyptian border. Because of the process of peace set in motion by President Sadat's visit, there is not one house of mourning in Egypt or in Israel as a result of hostilities on the Egyptian-Israeli border.

Indeed, Mr President, in May 1983 we signed an agreement with a second Arab country, with Lebanon. Again this was with the active participation and intervention of the United States Government, which has been a major force for peace in our area. This agreement was designed to lead to a Lebanon freed from all

Herzog

foreign forces, be they Syrian, Israeli or foreign terrorist groups. This in turn was to lead to a process of normalization along our border with Lebanon, which would guarantee that Southern Lebanon will never be used for terrorist attacks on Israeli towns and villages in Northern Galilee.

It is sad and tragic that the main purpose of Syria and its Lebanese surrogates was from the outset the abrogation of the Israel-Lebanon agreement. How tragic it is, against the background of the human misery which has been the lot of the Lebanese people since 1975, to observe that an agreement which would have advanced the cause of peace in Lebanon was the main target of the Syrian Government in pursuance of its policy of absorbing Lebanon and creating a Greater Syria. This, perhaps more than anything else, demonstrates the inhuman tragedy of the Lebanese situation and the cruel alternatives which face those who are involved. In the final analysis it is the Lebanese people which is suffering a tragedy, the scope of which it is difficult to comprehend.

Mr President, let me remind you that Israeli forces entered Lebanon because terrorists in the vicinity of its borders had been making life intolerable for approximately one-fifth of the population of my country. Children were growing up in shelters, frequently not seeing the light of day for days on end. Innocent travellers and passers-by were being killed on the roads and in the streets by Soviet-supplied Katyusha rockets. Industry was almost at a standstill. Farmers went into the fields at the risk of their lives. Life in the towns and villages was being paralysed. I challenge you to tell me how each of your governments would have reacted in similar circumstances.

(Applause from the right)

A month ago our National Unity Government decided on withdrawal from Lebanon in stages, back to the international border. This withdrawal is now taking place, and in less than a week from now our forces will have reached the first-phase line in the withdrawal. We gave adequate notice to the Lebanese Government and to the United Nations of our intentions. What has been so tragic and has perhaps moved me most of all has been the fact that most of the communal groups in Lebanon have been privately urging us not to withdraw, their public declarations notwithstanding.

We have left the opinion open all along for an agreed political-military solution between Israel and Lebanon. We have emphasized the important rôle that United Nations forces can play in preventing further communal strife, in protecting the weaker minority groups and in preventing the return of terrorists to usurp Lebanese sovereignty in Southern Lebanon. The blame of whatever might happen in Lebanon after the long period of notice that we gave, in which we agreed in principle to hand over the areas we leave in an orderly

fashion to the Lebanese army and to Unifil, the United Nations force, will rest squarely at the door of the Lebanese Government and of its masters in Damascus.

Israel's primary interest in embarking on the 'Peace for Galilee' campaign against the PLO was the security of our northern border. We are interested in a sovereign and independent Lebanon, free of foreign forces on its soil, capable of acting as necessary to ensure its security and to live in proper relations with its neighbours. We will continue to work for this, but we will insist on our northern towns and villages in the Galilee being free from the nightmare of Katyusha rocket attacks threatening life and property.

Obviously, one of the problems facing Israel in the field of our relations with the Arab world is that of the Palestinian Arabs, residents of the Judea and Samaria districts on the West Bank and in the Gaza district. It is clear to all in Israel that this is a major problem which must find a solution. We had gone a long way towards solving the problem when our government signed the Camp David Accord. To our regret, the Palestinian Arabs in Jordan did not take advantage of the opportunity which Camp David gave them, refused to join the negotiations and rejected Israel's outstretched hand.

We regret, too, that Egypt discontinued the autonomy talks, despite its undertaking on this subject. The situation today is an anomalous one: Egypt is unwilling to reopen the autonomy negotiations without the participation of Jordan and the Palestinians. Jordan has yet to indicate its agreement to enter into such negotiations. Thus we find ourselves in a vicious circle. The tragedy of the Palestinian people has been their leadership, which has invariably rejected compromise. Had they entered the autonomy negotiations which Israel proposed at the outset and which were set out in the Camp David Accord, the Palestinian Arabs would now be living in a régime of full autonomy, as laid down by the Camp David Accord, and we should by now have been in the concluding phase of negotiations on the final status of the territories. Here is another example of a missed opportunity which characterizes the Palestinian tragedy.

In the history of the Arab-Israeli conflict, Israel was invariably prepared for compromise. On no issue was the Palestinian Arab leadership ever prepared for any form of compromise. Only now that the bloody conflict in the PLO has weakened the reign of terror which the PLO exercised over the Palestinian Arab population are the Palestinian Arabs beginning to give expression to their feeling of betrayal at the hands of the Arab countries and of their leadership over the years. King Hussein has hesitated on the issue of negotiating with Israel. He wants Yassar Arafat's approval. Arafat, for his part, has been looking over his shoulder at the extreme elements in the PLO and has been incapable of reaching any clear-cut decision or policy. He cannot apparently escape from the lan-

Herzog

guage of equivocation and double-talk in favour of a clear, unequivocal enunciation of policy.

For years we maintained consistently that within the equation of the Arab-Israeli conflict the PLO is an irrelevant organization. An organization with the aims of the PLO as laid down in the Palestine Covenant, including the destruction of Israel, is doomed to failure unless it can do one of two things: either be strong enough to achieve its aims, or have a leadership strong enough to compromise. The PLO was capable of neither and accordingly doomed itself historically to oblivion. The Camp David Accord was a breakthrough of historic dimensions. It provided once again an opportunity for the Palestinian Arabs. It would be a tragedy for them to let this opportunity slip, as they have done in the case of all previous opportunities which were offered to them.

I make a point of meeting very frequently with the Arab leaders in the Judea and Samaria districts of the West Bank and the Gaza district. What is perhaps characteristic of the new winds blowing in the Palestinian camp is the fact that all are willing to admit today that their great tragedy has been an extreme and intransigent Arab leadership over the years, whether it was the Mufti of Jerusalem, or Shukeiry, or Nasser, or Arafat. For 19 years, from 1949 to 1967, Jordan controlled the West Bank and Egypt the Gaza Strip. There were no settlements in those areas then and there was nothing to stop the creation of a Palestinian state. The Arab governments did not create one because then, as today, despite their rhetoric — in the Middle East lip-service is the cheapest commodity available — the last thing they were interested in was a Palestinian state.

Ten days after the conclusion of the Six-Day War, on 19 June 1967, the Israeli National Coalition Government, which included at that time Mr Begin, agreed to return Sinai to Egypt and the Golan Heights to Syria in return for peace and demilitarization. Shortly thereafter it was prepared for negotiations with King Hussein.

King Hussein was prevented by President Nasser from coming to the negotiations pending the decision of the Khartoum Arab Summit Conference which enunciated the Arab policy of the Three Nos: no negotiations with Israel, no recognition of Israel, no peace with Israel.

In 1977, after President Sadat's historic visit to Jerusalem, the then Prime Minister, Mr Menachem Begin, proposed autonomy for the Palestinian Arabs. Israel, Egypt and the United States negotiated most of the autonomy agreement, but Jordan and the Palestinians refused at that time to join these negotiations. Here you have the sad story of the Palestinian tragedy, the tragedy of a people with an intransigent leadership backed up by the assassin's bullet.

A dramatic outcome of President Sadat's historic initiative in coming to Jerusalem in 1977 was a psychological revolution in the area. An historic watershed was crossed. As far as the central moderate elements in the Arab world are concerned, whether they give public expression to it or not, Israel is accepted in the area.

All of you who have followed our conflict closely will readily appreciate the significance of this development. The debate in certain Arab countries today is not whether or not to negotiate with Israel: the debate is a substantive one on what issues to negotiate, who can deliver the goods and what there is in it for each one of the parties.

Tens of thousands of Israelis frequent Egyptian hotels, thousands of Lebanese cross daily into Israel to work, Arabs from all over the Middle East come to benefit from the medical facilities in Israel. In the past summer alone, 180 000 Arabs from all over the Middle East crossed the river Jordan. Annually, thousands of Israeli Moslems make the hadj pilgrimage to Mecca.

Our Arab and Druze population maintains close links to the cultural currents and mainstreams of the Arab life. Not so long ago I opened the Israel-Arab Book Week with a display of books from all over the Arab world. Nightly Israelis watch Arab television broadcasts from all the neighbouring Arab countries; nightly Arabs in countries surrounding Israel tune in to Israel television in Arabic and, incidentally, get their first insight in many cases into the process of democracy and political debate in action.

I am not saying that there are no problems and that complete peace reigns. Far from it. But the impression as reflected outside Israel of a black-and-white confrontation between two peoples is utterly false. The shades of grey in the picture far outweigh the extremes of black and white.

Mr President, I am the head of a state 17% of whose citizens are Arabs and Druze. Given the problems which we have faced over the past 37 years and the fact that most of the Arab countries continue to maintain a state of war with Israel, the condition of our Arab population, which is a loyal and integral part of our society, is perhaps the greatest tribute to our free and democratic society.

Our Arab and Druze citizens are an important element in the political life of our country, participating as they do within their own ethnic frameworks or within the general party framework in the country. Many of you here have met their representatives in the Knesset. We can boast the only free Arab press in the Middle East, published both by the Arabs of Israel and by the Arabs residing in the territories administered by Israel. Ours is the only society in the whole Middle East in which an Arab who feels that he has been politically wronged may turn to the courts of the land and does so. The

Herzog

Jewish mayor of Jerusalem received more votes from the Arab population in East Jerusalem in the last municipal elections than any Arab mayor ever received in that city.

Mr President, as I look at the societies which are obsessed so much with decrying Israel, I do so with a feeling of intense pride in the people of Israel, which I represent here before you, Jewish, Arab and Druze. It is because we are so proud of the achievements of our own Arab minority enjoying all the privileges of a free and open society, despite the attitude of the Arab countries around us to Israel, that we can raise our voice once again in bodies such as this Parliament to ask for similar treatment of our minorities in other countries.

I know that you, a body representing peoples dedicated to the supreme value of the dignity of man, do not remain silent in the face of the imprisonment by the Soviet Union of our Jewish brothers and sisters whose sole crime is to want to rejoin their brothers and sisters in Israel. This 'crime' is compounded by an additional one, that of their insistence on the exercise of their religious rights and the preservation of their ancient culture.

I appeal once again from this rostrum to the Soviet Union to grant equality in the fields of education, religion and human rights to its Jewish citizens and to allow those who wish to join their brothers and sisters in Israel to do so.

(Applause)

Is it not a sad commentary on what has happened to our world that on the eve of 1984 a Soviet Jewish citizen, Joseph Bigun, was sentenced to seven years in prison and an additional period of five years of exile for the 'crime' of teaching Hebrew, the language of the Prophets, the language in which the immortal prophecy of the prophet Isaiah about peace among nations was spoken?

You and we dare not pass over in silence the deprivation of the basic freedoms as we know them, such as our people is experiencing in the Soviet Union, in Syria and in other countries.

We as a people know our failings. We know our shortcomings. We do not need to be lectured on them. We are a free and open society in which they are openly discussed. We have never compromised and will never compromise on certain issues. One of them is the struggle against the scourge of international terrorism, from which we and you have suffered so much. We are proud of the fact that our response to this danger to the world has been firm, unequivocal and courageous.

We believe that we have also set an example in our approach to our people's sufferings. We have never

compromised on this issue and no sacrifice has been too great a one for us. Only last month, in the midst of a most grave economic crisis which is affecting our country, was published the noble saga of the absorption of many of our brothers and sisters from Ethiopia.

The Arab-Israeli conflict gave rise to two refugee problems of equal dimensions. Some 800 000 Arabs and some 800 000 Jews from Arab and Islam countries became refugees. Despite the enormous difficulties involved, we absorbed our refugees, trained them, housed them, gave them a new life with dignity and honour. Compare this with the behaviour of certain Arab countries who let the Arab refugees rot in camps for over 40 years so as to use them as political pawns! All this when the revenue of one day's oil production in the Arab world could solve the entire Palestinian refugee problem.

(Applause)

We are proud of our cooperation programme with the developing countries. Thousands of their people, including those of nations with no diplomatic relations with us, have been and are being trained in Israel.

In 1948, when the State was established, we had little or no food and were living under the most extreme conditions of austerity. Today, thanks to some of the most advanced technologies in the world in the field of agriculture, we can feed our people. In addition, one of our important exports, as you are doubtless aware, is that of agricultural products, but this export is threatened. The European Community had in the past recognized its own traditional association with the countries of the Mediterranean basin, an association which historically was so important to the cultures of all our peoples. It gave expression to this community of interests in the association agreements which we had so laboriously reached. The negotiations of the Community with Spain and Portugal, as no remedial arrangements are reached with my country, are not only threatening our agricultural exports to the countries of Europe, but are virtually threatening the social and economic basis of Israel's all-important agricultural sector, which represents not only the livelihood but also the dreams of generations. I appeal from this rostrum to you, and through you to the countries of the EEC, not to close your eyes to a problem which, if not tackled, could turn into a tragedy.

Our trade deficit with the Community has been aggravated in recent years. According to your statistics, our exports to the Community in the course of 1983 were worth 2.048 billions of ECU, while we imported 3.424 billions' worth of ECU. More than one third of our exports is composed of agricultural products fresh and processed, the future of which may be prejudiced unless adequate solutions are negotiated in time. We have no alternative for these products but the EEC markets. Despite all our tremendous efforts to diver-

Herzog

sify, we still export today to your markets 80% of our flowers, 60% of our citrus, 85% of our citrus by-products and 90% of our strawberries. It is therefore my conviction that a traditional pattern of trade must be guaranteed as a matter of mutual interest for the EEC and Israel.

We are struggling to overcome a very serious economic problem brought about by the fact that we have to devote one-third of our national budget to defence, for we face some of the largest armies of the world today, whose governments have not renounced the aim of our destruction. The combined forces facing us on our eastern front are not much smaller than NATO's forces in Europe. But in trying to solve our economic problem we have never lost sight of the human being. The battle to overcome inflation and reach economic stability might be slower than in other countries because we are loath to condemn entire generations to the tragedy of unemployment. Many of you who are suffering from this social tragedy will understand our hesitation.

Standing before you, the exalted representatives of ten sovereign European states, united in the cause of the advancement of the lot of your citizens, I cannot but reflect in sorrow how far removed we in our area are from the fulfilment of the dream which the founders of the European Community had in mind when they finally set their feet on the road which has brought you so far. You might, as you are elected to do, look at what has not yet been achieved in Europe; but I, as an outsider who comes from a people whose heritage is so deeply and often so tragically interwoven with that of Europe, cannot but reflect with envy on your achievement. We in Israel, Jews and Arabs, dream of the day when peace will come; but you, during 40 long years, have achieved peace and the continent of Europe has not known war. We in Israel dream that our neighbours and ourselves will emulate you.

It is with your example in mind that from this rostrum I turn once again to our neighbours and to the representatives of the great Arab nation and the peoples of Islam in the name of our common heritage and the golden ages of cooperation between our peoples in the past and say, let us renew our days as in the past for our mutual benefit and for the benefit of the peoples of our region! I once again extend the hand of friendship and cooperation on behalf of my people to our neighbours. Let us begin to talk. Let us open a dialogue. Let us forget the bitterness of the past and move forward together on a basis of mutual respect and tolerance to a new era which will bring healing, recovery and advance to a region which has suffered so much!

Thank you, Mr President.

(Prolonged loud applause)

President. — Mr President, the European Parliament has listened to you with great attention and, as you

have certainly been aware, with a feeling of warm sympathy both for yourself and for the State you represent. After listening to you, I think I can speak for my colleagues in expressing the fervent wish that Israel and the other states of the Middle East may soon, thanks to the courage and the conciliatory spirit of your people, come to enjoy a state of peace in security and justice.

(Applause)

(The formal sitting closed at 12.45 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR: MRS PÉRY

Vice-President

(The sitting opened at 3.05 p.m.)¹

Mr Dalsass (PPE). — *(DE)* Madam President, we have had a debate today on Commissioner Andriessen's statement regarding his price proposals. I assume — since this is the custom — that the Commissioner will be making further comments after the debate. So I just wanted to ask you whether this is to be the case, and if not, why not.

President. — Mr Dalsass, I think your question could be raised at the end of Question Time.

5. Welcome

President. — I have the pleasure of offering a cordial welcome to a delegation from the Norwegian Parliament led by its President, Mr Knudsen.

(Applause)

The relations established between our two parliaments in November 1982, here in Strasbourg, have from the first been remarkably solid, friendly and promising. This is only natural, since Norway is a particularly near neighbour of the European Community; but above all it is encouraging inasmuch as there are many things we have to accomplish together. Today our delegations are at work for the third time.

It is my earnest wish, and that of this entire House, that the talks which began this morning and will be carried on until tomorrow evening will prove useful and testify to all we have in common and all that binds us together for the future.

¹ For the action taken by the Commission on the opinions of Parliament, see Annex.

President

I wish the Norwegian delegation a very pleasant stay in Strasbourg, where, in fact, the Norwegians have been present and active for many long years. I offer this delegation, and, through it, the Norwegian people, a friendly greeting on behalf of the peoples of the European Community that we represent here.

(Applause)

6. *Question Time*

President. — The next item is the first part of Question Time (Doc. 2-1593/84). We begin with the questions to the Commission.

Question No 1, by Miss Tongue (H-259/84):

Subject: Implementation of EC Council Directive 79/7/EEC¹ on equal treatment for men and women in matters of social security

What has the Commission done to monitor implementation of the EEC Directive 79/7/EEC, given that it should come into force in December 1984?

Is the Commission aware that the British Government has failed to revise the provisions of the UK Invalidity Care Allowance, which is the only benefit in the EEC which is denied to married women just because they are married, and thus contravenes the provisions of the directive?

Mr Pfeiffer, Member of the Commission. — *(DE)* The Directive in question covers an exceptionally involved and complicated subject, as evidenced by the unusually long period of six years allowed for its implementation. For this reason the Commission sent Member States an interim report, a whole year before expiry of the grace period, i.e. at the beginning of 1984, aimed at making it easier for Member States to implement the Directive by giving them appropriate explanations. In this report the Commission also examined the United Kingdom rules referred to by Ms Tongue. It agrees with her that they do indeed present a problem which needs to be solved, and the Commission is making efforts to do so. Before it can be solved, however, difficult legal questions have to be clarified, and the Commission departments are currently working on these. The Commission will also state its position on this point, at the latest, in the report on implementation of the directive which it is required to submit under Article 9 of the directive.

Miss Tongue (S). — I have taken note of the interim report that you have published, but with the six years

that you have had in which to take issue with governments on their failure to implement this directive, I should like to know why you have not done so, and I should like assurances from you that a letter will go forthwith to the United Kingdom Government drawing their attention to this contravention and that the Commission will continue to pursue all governments who continue to contravene this directive and all other directives designed to improve the situation of women in Europe. Could the Commission also clarify what action it intends to take against governments such as the United Kingdom Government who have actually equalized provisions under this directive on social security downwards and not upwards? By that I mean that they have in fact made the obtaining of disability allowances much more difficult than previously.

Mr Pfeiffer. — *(DE)* Madam, I can only repeat that the measures which the Commission is able and resolved to introduce depend initially on the outcome of the investigations I have described. We are in the middle of these, and it would perhaps be premature to draw final conclusions at this stage. I can only assure you once again that the Commission recognizes this problem and will do everything in its powers to get the directive implemented accordingly.

Mrs Larive-Groenendaal (L). — *(NL)* I have a brief supplementary question in four parts. Is the Commission aware that in the six transitional years the Dutch Government has not seen fit to adjust its legislation to take account of the third directive? Can the Commission confirm that, in the absence of implementing legislation, this directive has been directly applicable since 23 December 1984 and that European women may invoke the directive in the exercise of their rights? Can the Commission confirm that, if the Dutch Government introduces appropriate and specific implementing legislation in the next few months, as it has promised, this legislation must apply retroactively from 23 December 1984? Finally, does the Commission share our view that the Netherlands is slowly coming to deserve the title of 'backwoods of Europe', since this is the umpteenth time the Dutch Government has failed to implement a Community directive by the time and in the manner required?

Mr Pfeiffer. — *(DE)* I can only ask once again for your understanding of the fact that we cannot, at this stage when the legal investigations are under way, give any conclusive judgment on the government of a Member State. If your fears are proved right, I can assure you that the Commission will take appropriate action.

Mrs Maij-Weggen (PPE). — *(NL)* I have something to add. Is the Commission aware that the longer it waits to react to this whole situation, the longer it will be before women receive the benefits concerned? In

¹ OJ L 6, 1. 1. 1979, p. 24.

Maij-Weggen

my country the money not paid to women pending a statement on certain problems — and the Commission is also in default in this respect — amounts to tens, if not hundreds, of millions of guilders. And is the Commission prepared to expedite the drawing up of this report, and can it say when it will be published, so that women may know with some certainty when this situation will be clarified?

Mr Pfeiffer. — (DE) I can only give my assurances that we shall endeavour to get results as quickly as possible so that we can draw conclusions from them.

Mr Elliott (S). — Will the Commission undertake to look most seriously at any direct or indirect attempts to circumvent this or other directives relating to equality of treatment between men and women? I refer in particular to a very serious situation which has arisen in the United Kingdom recently whereby new regulations operated by the Department of Employment and the Manpower Services Commission on the admission of applicants to training schemes seem quite clearly, and clearly in the view of the Equal Opportunities Commission in Great Britain as well, to offend against not only the United Kingdom legislation on sex discrimination but against EEC directives on the same subject. I think we need to watch this very closely, and I would like an assurance from the Commission that they will exercise absolute stringency in ensuring that these directives are applied in the various member countries.

Mr Pfeiffer. — (DE) I can only assure you that the Commission will do everything it can to see that the directives are not circumvented. I would ask my honourable friend to notify us of any concrete instances of which we are unaware. We shall then investigate them.

Mr Herman (PPE). — Before getting sexual equality respected in the laws of the Member States, could the Commission not start by getting it respected among its staff? And, to give a very concrete example, inequality in the matter of surviving spouses is still flagrant.

Mr Pfeiffer. — (DE) Unless I am mistaken the Court of Justice has had this matter referred to it, and the Commission will endeavour to draw the appropriate consequences from its judgment.

President. — Question No 2, by Mr Marshall (H-266/84):

Subject: Scheme for reduced-price butter for the confectionery trade

Is the Commission aware that the scheme for reduced-price butter for the confectionery indus-

try discriminates against the UK, as it prevents the UK chocolate confectionery industry from having access to cheap butter and it severely restricts the availability of subsidized butter to the highly fragmented sugar confectionery industry? Can the Commission indicate when it will erase these anomalies?

Mr Andriessen, Vice-President of the Commission. — (NL) The Commission does not believe that the scheme, or perhaps it would be better to say the subsidization scheme, for butter used in the confectionery industry discriminates against the United Kingdom. Contrary to what the honourable Member suggests in his question, the chocolate confectionery industry does qualify for this specific assistance. Only chocolate as such and chocolate used to coat confectionery do not qualify. That is a rather technical point, but if questions concern technical points, the answers can hardly be other than technical.

There is no discrimination against the United Kingdom since exactly the same criteria are applied to all the Member States. This means that the technical information I have obtained on the chocolate confectionery industry or on chocolate as such applies to all the Member States of the Community.

I will add just one point, because I think it is important. In the past, the Commission has repeatedly been urged to reduce the quantity of unprocessed chocolate that may be sold under this subsidization scheme to less than the present 5 tonnes per month. This will make it extremely difficult to exercise control. In view of the pressure that has been brought to bear, the Commission is now examining ways of doing this, but I am not sure that it will be possible to produce a satisfactory scheme capable of effective control. Nonetheless, we have not yet drawn our final conclusions on this aspect. I would point out in this connection however, that firms unable to buy 5 tonnes per month have the opportunity of buying a butter concentrate under a subsidization scheme which is comparable to the scheme for unprocessed butter and applies to quantities smaller than 5 tonnes per month.

To summarize, there is no discrimination against the United Kingdom. The chocolate confectionery industry is not excluded. What is excluded is chocolate as such, and this is due to the fact that chocolate contains so many other dairy products that there is no reason to make this scheme applicable to chocolate as well.

Mr Marshall (ED). — I thank the Commissioner for that very full answer and ask him to accept one or two points. A large number of companies who could use more butter are not allowed to benefit from the scheme. Would he accept that those who take advantage of the butter concentrate scheme are in fact being given a product with a taste which, when put into

Marshall

products such as fudge, is much less satisfactory than when those products are made straight with butter?

If you are to sell a product such as fudge on taste, you have to use butter. Most manufacturers are not able to buy enough butter to take advantage of butter as such and have to buy butter concentrate with a poorer taste. Will he look at this matter again, because the confectionery trade is convinced that if he were to amend the scheme and remove this 5 tonne limit, he would find a large number of firms buying more butter under the scheme?

Mr Andriessen. — (NL) I have taken note of what you have said. My answer will therefore be very brief.

Firstly, the Commission is looking into the possibility of introducing a system of controls which would enable quantities of less than 5 tonnes per month to be made available for purchase along the lines the honourable Member has suggested. I hope to be able to revert to this question as soon as the study has been completed.

Secondly, there is a Latin saying that reads: *De gustibus non disputandum*, meaning that there is no arguing over taste. While I am assured that the opposition to butter concentrate on grounds of taste is exaggerated, I fully agree that there is no arguing over taste, and I do not therefore know who is right here. But it seems to me that the first question is the most important one. I shall do my best to provide some definite information on a possible reduction of the 5-tonne limit as soon as possible.

President. — Question No 3, by Mr Van Miert (H-270/84):

Subject: Culture in Europe

Is it true that just a handful of people at the Commission are responsible for preparing and implementing Community action in the cultural sector; if so, exactly how many people in the Commission work in this field? Does the Commission think that there are enough of them to work out a coherent cultural policy at European level; if so, can it justify this view, if not, what steps has the Commission taken to change this situation, and with what results?

Mr Ripa di Meana, Member of the Commission. — (IT) The Commission is aware of the importance of the problem raised by Mr Van Miert, and is working on an appropriate programme and — I emphasize this point — an adequate budget.

With regard to commitments already given, the division responsible for problems in the cultural sector, which is part of the General Secretariat of the Com-

mission, is responsible for drawing up and implementing Community action in the cultural sector. It consists of a head of division, together with four Grade A officials and their staff.

The Commission's aim, in addition to making the best use of the instruments provided by the Treaty for the cultural sector — the limitations of which are only too well known — is also to expand the new spaces that have opened up and are opening up in Europe, marking — I would say — a turning point that dates from the Solemn Declaration of Stuttgart of 19 June 1983.

In accordance with what I have said, the division responsible endeavours to coordinate the action of the other departments of the Commission responsible for managing the legal and financial instruments based on the treaties and rules of the Community.

With regard to the problem of administrative personnel, it is our firm intention to stimulate and expand initiatives in the cultural sector, and the Commission will provide adequate staff accordingly.

Mr Van Miert (S). — (NL) I am grateful to the Commissioner for this fairly detailed answer. I find it satisfactory in most respects, and I hope that the Commission will shortly be submitting a number of proposals to this Parliament concerned less with an increase in the number of officials than with other aspects. The issue is not the enlargement of the apparatus but knowing what genuine efforts the Commission intends to make to support certain worthwhile European cultural initiatives.

Mr Vandemeulebroucke (ARC). — (NL) In view of the answer it has given, which at last reveals that there are a total of five A-grade officials working in this field, does the Commission not feel that there are too few people in its administration, if only because we have been waiting so long for the recognition of the equality of diplomas and certificates in the European Community? Does the Commission not also feel that this aspect should be given priority? Does it believe this is impossible with the present staff complement? If so, when does it intend to come forward with a very practical proposal concerning the equality of university diplomas and other certificates?

Mr Ripa di Meana. — (IT) Although this point has not yet been dealt with in the Commission's discussions, my own personal opinion is the same as that of the questioner. I hope it is also the opinion of the entire Commission.

With regard to the timetable for examining this and other problems connected with the cultural sector, my expectation is that they will be dealt with by the Commission during the month of March.

Mrs Ewing (RDE). — I congratulate the Commissioner on his attendance at his first Question Time and, as chairman of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport, may I say I hope to be working in very close cooperation.

Will he join me in regretting the fact that this Parliament slashed their own culture budget by adopting a procedure by which, in secret session of the Committee on Budgets, unless that committee had a majority, the culture votes did not even see the light of day in this Parliament? Will the Commission join me in hoping that Parliament has the wit to show the interest in culture expressed by Mr Van Miert at next year's budget, when, perhaps, that will enable the Commissioner to justify a need for more staff?

Mr Ripa di Meana. — (IT) I thank the questioner, and greet the chairman of the committee that is my opposite number. I also share her hopes, and believe that the Commission will jointly take up this position.

It is a new Commission, and I think its programme, outlined by President Delors during the January sitting, is eloquent on this point.

Mrs Banotti (PPE). — I should also like to welcome the new Commissioner on his first appearance before the House. He mentioned in his own submission to the House an appropriate budget, but he did not tell us exactly what it was. I should be interested to hear what he feels is an appropriate budget, and also whether he could let us know some of the cultural priorities he intends to address when his department is suitably arranged to deal with these subjects.

Mr Ripa di Meana. — (IT) When I say 'an appropriate budget' I mean a different budget from the present one, which sets the sum of 2½ million ECU as the amount available for the cultural sector.

With regard to the question of what I consider to be an adequate figure, the questioner will realize that, out of regard for the Commission, which has not yet heard my proposals, I cannot be more explicit until later.

It is my firm intention to propose to the Commission an increase in line with the ambitions that seem to me now to be emerging in a very interesting way.

Mr Hume (S). — While I welcome the Commissioner's commitment to drawing up the programme for cultural development in the Community, would he recognize that one of the major cultural problems facing the Community is the problem of those who speak the less-spoken languages in the Community, that there are some 30 million people who speak less-spoken languages, and that this Parliament has already called for a charter of rights for such people, as has the

Council of Europe? Would he agree that such a charter should be a priority in the preparation of his cultural programme?

Mr Ripa di Meana. — (IT) I am familiar with the work done by this Parliament — I refer, for example, to the Arfé proposal, — and I am also aware, in broad outline, of the work of the Council of Europe on this question. I personally consider that this is one of the points of priority for future action in the cultural sphere.

Mr Chanteric (PPE). — (NL) I should just like to revert to Mr Vandemeulebroucke's question and more specifically to the recognition of diplomas. The Commissioner said in reply that he endorsed Mr Vandemeulebroucke's idea. Would the Commissioner be more precise? Does he not agree that the procedures that have hitherto applied in this important area, the recognition of diplomas, are in need of a complete overhaul, since we shall otherwise be discussing the same matter and be forced to put the same question for another ten years? Does the Commissioner agree that a new policy is needed in this area?

Mr Ripa di Meana. — (IT) I confirm what I said. I consider that, for example, the *ad hoc* committee appointed after the Fontainebleau Summit is working along lines which reflect its concern and the concern of the questioner. I consider that the Commission, when examining the proposals that are put to it, will take up a new, different position from what it has adopted in the past.

I must, however, be careful, because there has so far been no discussion of the subject in depth, nor has there been agreement between the various competent Commissioners, who are familiar with the subject. My own personal opinion is as I have expressed it today; and that is confirmed, as I have just said, by the work of that committee.

President. — Question No 4, by Mr Ford (H-288/84):

Subject: Safety of Members of the European Parliament

Could the Commission provide details of what steps it has taken to protect European Members of Parliament in the event of a nuclear attack?

Mr Ripa di Meana, Member of the Commission. — (IT) The question raised by Mr Ford is very much bound up with the expectations and hopes raised by the resumption of talks on nuclear weapons. Of course, that does not exempt all of the appropriate authorities from the duty to protect, so far as is possible, *all* citizens from danger of any kind.

Ripa di Meana

However, with regard to the question itself, I should point out that the safety of Members of the European Parliament is not a matter for which the Commission is responsible.

Mr Ford (S). — I find it interesting that the Commission has managed to wait three months before telling me that, thus preventing me from putting the question to the appropriate authorities. Nevertheless, I trust that the Commission's line would be — if it were responsible — that there is no defence against nuclear warfare and that civil defence is no defence. Would the Commissioner agree with the sentiments of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament on that issue? Would he agree that if the issue were to be discussed, Parliament should be consulted before any money was wasted in this way, when clearly the interest of the Community and of the world lies in getting rid of nuclear weapons in unilateral and multilateral nuclear disarmament rather than taking any steps in this direction?

Mr Ripa di Meana. — *(IT)* Mr Ford will have noted that I began by recalling the general hopes — for all mankind, not only the Members of the European Parliament — that have been raised, with regard to the threat of nuclear war, by the resumption of the relevant talks. With regard to the time taken to give this reply, the Commission was ready with its answer in the previous part-session of this Parliament, and only the working timetable prevented it from giving it.

Mr Ulburghs (NI). — *(NL)* In the event of an insane nuclear war, would it not be better for us representatives of the people not to have special privileges but to die with the people? While we are still alive, would it not be far better if we used our energies to combat all nuclear weapons? It is not too late for this in Belgium.

(Applause)

Mr Ripa di Meana. — *(IT)* I think that, as far as general guidelines are concerned, the hope should be that we shall all survive together.

Mr Smith (S). — If the Commissioner should be approached in the near future with the suggestion that this Parliament should involve itself in some form of civil defence against the possibility of nuclear war, would he remind those people that the only real defence can be nuclear disarmament? Would he also remind them of the words of the survivors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki when they asked the world some months ago to 'step back and learn from us'? It is only by stepping back that we can have any real defence against nuclear weapons on this earth of ours.

Mr Ripa di Meana. — *(IT)* I understand the questioner's concern. I think that I, too, can associate

myself with all of those who think that the best defence lies in talks, integrity, reciprocity and the insistence yet again on having talks.

Mr Staes (ARC). — *(NL)* It seems fairly obvious to me, of course, that there should be no special provisions, safety measures and so on for the Members of this Parliament. That would create an absurd situation. I am tempted to ask straight away whether similar protection can be provided for our homes, because we spend some time there too. But we might well wonder who does enjoy such privileges. It would be fascinating to find out which government leaders, while claiming that the nuclear threat is vastly exaggerated, have recourse to various safety measures in case a nuclear war breaks out after all, so that they at least will be safe. May I therefore ask the Commission if it has or can obtain any information on this?

Mr Ripa di Meana. — *(IT)* I have no information on this matter, and I do not know whether or not I shall be able to obtain any.

Mr Dalsass (PPE). — *(DE)* I agree with the Commissioner that we should negotiate and disarm, but until such time as agreement is reached, one cannot unilaterally give up certain attitudes and courses of action. I also consider that the Commission cannot speak for Parliament — that is really a matter for Parliament itself — but let me ask one question: has thought been given to any defence measures for Commission officials, employees and others working with the Commission? I believe that such measures should be taken!

Mr Ripa di Meana. — *(IT)* I am not able to answer the question put to me by Mr Dalsass. I think that if defensive or preventive measures were to be taken, they should obviously cover all citizens and hence, not only the Members of the European Parliament, but also the Commissioners and everyone.

Mrs Boserup (COM). — *(DA)* I should like to thank the Commissioner for the very clear and sympathetic answer he has given. As I understand it, the Commission does not intend to take any special measures to protect the precious lives and health of Commission Members and staff. I greatly appreciate that. May I ask the Commissioner to exert his influence on Parliament, should it conceive the absurd idea of requesting funds to install special, loathsome underground caverns for us to sit in? I want to die among my people, not in a place like this.

Mr Ripa di Meana. — *(IT)* Madam President, I do not think it is the responsibility of the Commission to give advice to Parliament.

Mr McMillan-Scott (ED). — I am sure that Mr Ford would join the Commissioner and myself in welcoming the discussion in Geneva leading, we hope, to multilateral disarmament. We hope also, I am sure, that the European dimension will be taken fully into account in those talks. However, I am surprised to hear Mr Ford say that there is no protection, because many of his colleagues in the United Kingdom have declared nuclear-free zones in their Socialist local authorities. Could the Commissioner tell us what protection is offered by these nuclear-free zones? This might apply also to Parliament.

Mr Ripa di Meana. — (IT) I have no information on this matter.

Mr Trivelli (COM). — (IT) For all that the discussion may be somewhat strange, I think it has provided the opportunity for some exchange of views as to what we can do and what Europe can do, not so much to save the lives of its own Members of Parliament, nor even of its citizens, but what it can do to avoid this danger materializing.

May I ask whether the Commission intends to call upon the parties to the Geneva talks to halt the installation of new missiles by both sides whilst negotiations are going on; and if the Commission cannot do this, which other European body can?

Mr Ripa di Meana. — (IT) To answer Mr Trivelli's question, I think that the position of the Commission regarding all of the talks that have been opened at Geneva can easily be deduced from the text read by President Delors in this Chamber in January, at almost the same time as those talks began. I do not think that the Commission can say anything regarding the substance of your question, that is to say, the installation, whilst talks are going on, of further missiles. I think that is possibly a matter for the Council.

Mr Aigner (PPE). — (DE) I would ask the Commissioner at least to make clear to my honourable friends, who have asked a large number of perceptive and very intelligent questions, that there is a difference between war, which is prevented by other means, and terrorist attacks, where the dangers are different. When this has been understood it should then be made clear — and it is the Commission's job to make it clear — that the prevention of war is not a matter for the Commission but for the senior members of our governments and our armed forces. I can hardly imagine that anyone would wish to make a distinction on the question of safety comparable to the distinction between Soviet Russia and Afghanistan.

The Commission should, however, at least say that it is aware of the danger of terrorism to employees and servants of the various parliaments, the Commission,

in other words to those working in the Community institutions, but that the security measures in operation cannot of course be discussed here in public.

Mr Ripa di Meana. — (IT) This exchange of ideas after the question put by Mr Ford has been used to some extent as a pretext for a discussion, for a broader sounding-out of views.

In view of the seriousness of the subject raised — whether it be the nuclear threat, or the threat of terrorism — I can obviously only agree with you that these are separate questions, problems that the Council of Ministers — as I have just indicated in my answer to Mr Trivelli — can, if it so wishes, take up as matters for political cooperation; they are subjects on which the Commission must obviously abide by the views of the Council, although where the current wave of terrorism is concerned the Commission must associate itself with the firm condemnation and mobilization against terrorism that is reported in the different countries of our Community.

Lord O'Hagan (ED). — Madam President, I would like to raise a point of order. I would like to make it quite clear that I did not raise this point of order before Mr Ford's question was put, because he might have considered that I was attempting to censor him and deny him his right as a Member to raise this issue in the Parliament. I am still putting the point of order, Madam President, because, his question having been put, it illustrated the total absurdity of this Parliament's asking the Commissioner questions about something for which he is not responsible.

Madam President, can you ensure in future, when drawing up the list of written questions, that we do not expose the Commissioner to foolish, irrelevant and trouble-making questions of this sort which make this Parliament look ridiculous and do not help either Parliament or the Commission in their work?

President. — Mr O'Hagan, I take note of your statement — not of its precise content but of its form.

Question No 5, by Mr Newman (H-441/84):¹

Subject: The location of the storage of chemicals and their proximity to residential dwellings

Does the Commission not consider it necessary to strengthen the 'Seveso Directive' on the handling and storage of chemical substances, so as to establish a minimum distance between residential dwellings and sites in which chemical substances can be handled and stored?

¹ Former oral question without debate (O-44/84), converted into a question for Question Time.

President

The dangers of the close proximity of chemical storage to peoples' homes has once again been highlighted by the major chemical fire on 24 September 1984 at Anchor Chemicals in Clayton, Manchester, and the consequential necessary temporary evacuation of some 300 people whose homes were immediately adjacent to the chemical storage facility.

Mr Clinton Davis, Member of the Commission. — The Commission views such incidents with extreme concern. This was a major chemical fire involving some 150 firemen and causing 300 people to leave their homes. As to the Seveso Directive, the Commission is in the process of revising Annexes 1,2 and 3. These relate to the storage and use of dangerous substances in industrial plants and contain a list of some 178 chemicals which are subject to systematic controls. In considering the necessary revision, the Commission will take into account new scientific information and experience gained from inquiries into recent incidents involving dangerous chemicals wherever they have occurred. In view of the widespread public anxiety about these hazards, I am writing to Member States in order to stress the Commission's view that the level of secrecy surrounding the location of dangerous chemicals should be kept to a minimum, that information on the most dangerous industrial activities should be shared at Community level and that there must be sufficient professional staff and resources available to enable the safety regulations to be properly implemented. Our people have the right to be informed and the right to be protected.

Mr Newman (S). — I would like to thank the Commissioner for that very useful and constructive reply and ask him whether he believes that one of the difficulties in circumstances such as occurred in Manchester is that the Seveso Directive, as it is being implemented, only affects extremely hazardous sites, that the principal difficulties are that the minimum notifiable quantities of chemicals or hazardous substances on any particular site are far too high, that sites are allowed to have stored less than the minimum notifiable quantities of many different and not compatible chemicals, that there is not sufficient local involvement at local authority, workers' safety representatives or local community level and, finally — and I think his reply is very useful here — that it is necessary to have enough officials at local level to be able to enforce directives, because it is a question not only of having the correct directive but also of having enough people on the ground to enforce it. What does he feel about the situation over the past few years in the United Kingdom, where, although the risks have increased and regulations such as the Seveso Directive, however, weak they are, have come into force, the British Conservative Government has reduced substantially the number of factory inspectors? I would be interested in the Commissioner's comments on this matter.

Mr Clinton Davis. — I am grateful to the honourable Member for raising this extremely important issue. The ramifications to which he has drawn attention underline the need for a revision of the directive along the lines that I have indicated, and I do not think I can go any further save to say that the honourable Member did write to me and I shall be responding in some detail to the points that he raised.

On the question of local authorities — the method of operation that they adopt — that is a matter for them. All I can express is the view of the Commission as to guidelines that ought to be adopted and, in particular, that it is highly undesirable in the interests of safety that professional staff and resources should be diminished. Safety is a matter of the highest priority for all the people whom we represent. If any Member State seeks to derogate from that duty, then I think that all of us would deplore it.

Mr Seal (S). — I am surprised that the Commissioner talked about minimum secrecy, because I am sure he is aware that the Seveso Directive requires that firms which store dangerous chemicals publish procedures which need to be adopted by the public in case of an emergency. In order for us as Members of this House to check that firms which are storing dangerous chemicals have, in fact, complied with the directive and have published these emergency procedures, we need to know which firms the Member State governments think have dangerous chemicals in store.

Is the Commissioner, therefore, aware that the United Kingdom Government does not even admit to having a list of firms storing dangerous chemicals, which I find absolutely amazing in the light of this directive? Because of this, will the Commissioner investigate and ensure that the United Kingdom Government, together with governments of other Member States, do, in fact, publish the list of firms which they regard as having dangerous chemicals in store?

Mr Clinton Davis. — I have already indicated to this House that any infractions of safety procedures are to be deplored, and if any honourable Member has any information about such infractions, I hope that he or she will provide me with that evidence so that the matter can be fully investigated.

If there is any Member State which derogates from this duty, then I repeat, it is a matter that we will act upon as and when evidence is forthcoming. I note what the honourable Members says and I will look further into what he has alleged.

President. — Question No 6, by Mrs Ewing (H-312/84):

Subject: Community forestry policy

President

What steps does the Commission propose to take to rekindle interest in a common forestry policy?

Mr Clinton Davis, Member of the Commission. — The Commission remains convinced of the need to promote policies aimed at developing the forestry industry in the Community. As the honourable Member is probably aware, the Community currently suffers a balance-of-trade deficit on wood products of 13 000 million ECU — the largest deficit after energy products. At the same time, our forests represent a vital environmental resource which has been severely damaged by the accumulated effects of industrial pollution. Forests also provide employment to many people within the Community, and accordingly this Commission, for the first time, has charged one of its Members, myself, with the special responsibility to oversee our forestry policy. I am giving urgent consideration as to how these many disparate aspects of forestry policy can be brought together in a more integrated framework, and I shall present my proposals to Parliament as soon as possible.

Mrs Ewing (RDE). — May I thank the Commissioner for that most encouraging answer: I am sure that many of us interested in this industry will welcome it. Does he have any idea of a time by which we could hope to cut the huge bill for timber imports, and would that include newsprint and pulp? Will he also be including long-term incentives to increase the area under forest? For instance, in my constituency alone there are millions of acres of land doing nothing which would be suitable for forests.

Mr Clinton Davis. — I think that by raising those specific points, the honourable Member is, in fact, asking me to prejudge the result of the investigation that I shall be making and my ultimate report to the House. I am very much aware of the crucial nature of the forestry industry in Scotland and I am aware of the honourable Member's particular interest in the issue. I and the Commission are delighted that this development has taken place. We look for a balanced expansion of this but, as I say, I think it would be premature for me to make a judgement about it at this particular moment.

Mr Raftery (PPE). — First of all, let me say how pleased I am to hear of the Commission's renewed interest in forestry. Would the Commissioner agree that the main reason why we have so little planting in the Community, and particularly in my own country, Ireland, is that because there is a delay between the time of planting and the time of harvesting of from 20 to 30 years, farmers have to wait a very long time before it yields an income? Does the Commission have any plans for giving farmers an annual income in the form of leasing and a payment for looking after the

planting of the land? Have they any ideas in that regard?

Mr Clinton Davis. — The honourable Member has raised two specific and interesting points. As I am just about to engage upon this very important task, I think it would be wrong for me to preempt the nature of the enquiry. All I can say to the honourable Member is that those interesting proposals will be considered and I will be in touch with him. I think that is the best way of dealing initially with those two matters. But I would wish to report to Parliament in full once the enquiry has been completed and I am in a position to do so.

Mr Dalsass (PPE). — (DE) Mr Commissioner, in my view forestry policy is extremely important. We know that forest and woodland is particularly suited for recreation and leisure pursuits. It also provides the raw material energy, and particularly in mountainous areas it is necessary to prevent erosion on the mountainsides and to stop landslides and similar damage. Does the Commissioner not think that, since the circumstances in the various countries are so diverse, it would be better to coordinate the various national forestry policies rather than having a common forestry policy?

Mr Clinton Davis. — That really begs the question, and until I have been able to consider the matter in the round, I really cannot say whether it would be better to proceed down the route of coordination rather than a Community policy. But I think that the honourable Member will understand — and I make no criticism of past Commissions in this respect — that after five weeks it would be ill-judged of me, to say the least, to enter upon a definitive direction of policy. I think one must consider the matter in its entirety. As I say, this Parliament will be kept informed as to the progress we make.

Mr Hutton (ED). — I congratulate the Commissioner on holding such a distinguished portfolio for the first time.

Will he ensure that forestry is central to any discussions within the Commission on the use of land, and is he in a position to agree that the cost of encouraging forestry could in many cases be much less than the cost of sustaining agricultural production which is in surplus?

Mr Clinton Davis. — That is a somewhat barbed question. As to the distinction of my undertaking this office, one man's distinction in another man's bed of nails! I hesitate to keep repeating the same answer, but the reality of the situation is this: if I were to take up each specific point and reply affirmatively or negatively at this stage, it would not enable me to carry out

Clinton Davis

a fair assessment of the entire job that I have to undertake. I hope the honourable Member will forgive me.

Mr Maher (L). — In the first directly-elected Parliament I have heard answers like the ones we have had today from Mr Clinton Davis. I am not blaming him for anything, but I have heard Commissioners in the past indicating that they supported the need for a common forestry policy, etc., etc. But nothing happened. Would the Commissioner not agree with me that the real problem is the Council? It is not Parliament.

Parliament is by and large supportive of a common approach to forestry, but the Council is refusing to provide the necessary resources in order to get such a policy off the ground. Has the Commissioner any ideas as to how he can convince the Council that it is essential to have a common approach to forestry policy, taking account of the problems presently confronting farmers about the use of land?

Mr Clinton Davis. — I have enough trouble looking after my present responsibilities without embarking upon a programme of allocating culpability as far as previous Commissioners are concerned.

Certainly, Parliament has declared itself strongly in relation to this matter. We have had the Gatto report, and the Council has come in for a good deal of opprobrium as a result. It is always popular in this Assembly to blame the Council. I do not want to jump onto bandwagons, but I think that the condemnation in this particular respect was not altogether misplaced.

All I can say is this: it is the determination of the present Commission to embark upon a very full review of the whole matter along the lines that I have already suggested. I am glad that the honourable Member should wish to give that further impulse.

Miss Quin (S). — Does the Commissioner accept that there are environmental considerations in any forestry policy and that not all forest projects are necessary beneficial to the countryside? For example, certain conifers can actually acidify the soil and cause acidification of streams and lakes. Will the Commissioner therefore, when examining this problem, wear his environmental as well as his forestry hat?

Mr Clinton Davis. — I can assure the honourable Member that I am getting used to wearing a large number of hats. That has its advantages and disadvantages, but in this particular instance there is a clear advantage in being able to look after environmental interests as well as forestry ones. I am well aware of the honourable Member's concern about the environmental damage that can result from excessive or indiscriminate afforestation, and I am well aware that that

is based to a considerable degree upon solid fact and information. Therefore, I will most certainly take those points into account when working out our forestry policy.

President. — Since they deal with the same subject, I call, together, Question No 7, by Mr von Wogau (H-324/84):

Subject: Identity checks at Brussels airport

Is the Commission aware that when arriving at or departing from Brussels airport every single Community citizen coming from a different Member State or travelling to such a state is checked by the computer system installed there, and does the Commission believe that this practice applied to people travelling between Member States is compatible with the rules of the European Community?

Question No 14, by Mr Rogalla (H-526/84):

Subject: Abolition of personal checks between Member States

Can the Commission say, having informed me that it has been notified of agreements in this area between France and the Federal Republic of Germany, in what way and to what extent its Members or staff have taken steps to draw up and conclude similar agreements between other Member States; what have been the Commission's findings in this area?

Question No 49, by Mr Pearce (H-618/84):

Subject: Frontier formalities

Will the Commission appoint an *ad hoc* enquiry into the obstructive operations of officials carrying out customs and passport facilities at Brussels National Airport and Dover Docks, as a beginning for a new campaign against frontier formalities which are a denial of proper free movement of citizens and which subject citizens to official controls which are unsuitable in free and democratic countries?

Question No 53, by Mr Cornelissen (H-625/84).

Subject: Red tape for rail passengers at internal frontiers

People travelling on Brussels-Luxembourg-Strasbourg-Basel inter-city trains are obliged to leave the restaurant car at the Luxembourg-France border. This means that many passengers have to leave their meal to get cold during passport controls, which was surely not the intention of the authors of the Treaty of Rome. Will the Commission therefore say what regulations or guidelines necessitate these controls, which are highly disagreeable and hardly reflect a European spirit?

President

Question No 60, by Mr Coste-Floret (H-639/84):

Subject: Checks at the Community's internal frontiers

Can the Commission give Parliament an account of the representations it has made to the authorities of Member States in order to reduce identity checks on European citizens at internal Community borders, and of the results obtained?

Lord Cockfield, Vice-President of the Commission. — I shall start with the questions by Mr von Wogau and Mr Pearce on identity checks at Brussels Airport. The Commission is aware of the situation that exists at Brussels Airport. It regrets that details of passengers who are nationals of Member States are systematically and extensively checked with the assistance of an electronic system on arrival at Zaventem Airport.

The Commission has taken up this matter with the Belgian authorities on a number of occasions. Whilst the authorities have designated a special quick-entry gate for Members of the European Parliament, no changes have been made for citizens of Member States generally.

The situation at Dover docks is raised in Mr Pearce's question. The Commission is aware of the situation that exists at Dover docks. The United Kingdom Government has been informed of the concern at the delays experienced by nationals of Member States at Dover. We do not believe that a special enquiry into these particular cases is appropriate. We would like to see the introduction of uniform systems to facilitate travel at all intra-Community borders.

Train passengers are the subject of Mr Cornelissen's question. The Commission is aware of the situation that exists on the train between Brussels and Strasbourg. Methods which oblige the passengers to interrupt their meals for such purposes are to be deplored.

The honourable Member asks what is the legal basis for these controls. Present Community law provides that border controls on nationals of Member States are restricted to presentation of a passport or identity card. This is Article 2, paragraph 1, and Article 3, paragraph 1, of Directive 68/360/EEC and Article 2, paragraph 1, and Article 3, paragraph 1, of Directive 73/148/EEC. There is, however, no Community law on the administration of these border controls.

As to the question of administrative practice, the Commission, in its reply of 6 July 1984 to Mr Rogalla's written question, pointed out that

The national authorities are responsible for the conditions in which these checks are performed. However, they should be carried out so as to inconvenience travellers as little as possible.

There has been no legal change since that reply was given.

Bilateral agreements between Member States are the subject of Mr Rogalla's question. It is *not* the responsibility of the Commission to negotiate bilateral agreements between individual Member States, nor is it in its power to do so.

Proposals to facilitate intra-Community travel is an issue that relates to all of the questions. These five questions highlight the concern felt by Members about obstacles to the free movement of Community nationals. The Commission shares this concern, and recent proposals detailed below should help to improve the situation.

First, the Council and the Member States themselves adopted a resolution on 7 June 1984 which invites Member States to introduce special checkpoints at airports for use by nationals of Member States to speed up the procedures. This resolution also provides that at such special gates only spot checks should be employed. That resolution, however, is not binding. Accordingly, the Commission has recently made a proposal for a directive on the facilitation of controls and formalities applicable to nationals of Member States when crossing intra-Community borders by transport of all kinds. This was agreed by the Commission on 4 January 1985 and has been submitted to the Council. We hope that the Council will open the consultation procedure quickly and that Parliament will also give its opinion as soon as possible.

The essence of the proposal is that persons crossing borders between Member States who identify themselves as citizens of Member States and who comply with provisions relating to goods they may be carrying should no longer be obliged to stop. Moreover, spot checks may be employed whatever kind of transportation is used. This presupposes that officials responsible for controls at crossing points must be able to ascertain that the persons presenting themselves are exempt from control. To facilitate spot checks on the road, a green sticker of kind specified in the Franco-German agreement could be used. At airports there would be special gates for citizens of Member States. Experience shows that this system speeds up the operation of controls significantly.

These proposals draw their inspiration from the system in force between France and Germany under the terms of a bilateral agreement signed on 13 July 1984. Benelux have proposed to France and Germany that a similar agreement should be made. The Commission places great weight on these proposals as an important step in realizing a citizen's Europe. I am sure they will receive the full support of Parliament. These issues were the subject of a preliminary discussion at the meeting of the internal market Council yesterday — that is, on 11 February. There is a great deal of goodwill but many practical problems. The Council will return to the mat-

Lord Cockfield

ter in May, by which time I hope that progress in resolving the problems will have been made.

Mr von Wogau (PPE). — (DE) I should like to ask the Commissioner if he shares my view that computerized checks at the Community's internal borders have been shown to make the controls slower rather than faster. I have found that computers have been installed at a number of border points, on the Dutch frontier among others, and that these have quickly led to lengthy queues.

Let me quote as an example the French border. When entering France the SOFIA computer system is used, but not when crossing from France into Germany. Crossing into France takes on average one hour and 20 minutes, but crossing into Germany takes only 20 minutes. So if we want to change something, let us change the rules for frontier clearance. In my view computers are inappropriate at the Community's internal borders, and are needed only at its external borders. Is the Commission prepared to act with a view to seeing that no further systems of this kind are introduced at the Community's internal borders and that, where they already have been installed, they are removed?

Lord Cockfield. — I entirely share the honourable Member's concern. The real problem is not the computer itself, but the system that the computer is giving effect to. The correct course is not to abolish the computer, but to change the system. What we want to do is to enable citizens of Member States freely to cross the borders subject only to minimal spot-checks.

If this is done, the use of computers is probably not necessary anyway, but the essential point is to get rid of the formalities rather than to get rid of the system which gives effect to unacceptable formalities.

Mr Rogalla (S). — (DE) As one of those who submitted a question I think I am entitled, under the Rules of Procedure, to ask a supplementary question. In listing the numerous efforts undertaken by the Commission has the Commissioner not somewhat neglected Article 3 c) of the EEC Treaty? This requires the Community to abolish all obstacles, which includes these border controls. Can he not, as a sign of our Community's goodwill, at last get rid of the meaningless 'customs/douane' signs? What specific measures will he take to raise to Community level the bilateral negotiations currently under way between France and the Federal Republic of Germany, and soon to be extended to negotiations between France and Germany on the one hand and the Benelux countries on the other hand, so that Community officials can take part in them and the prejudices of the individual negotiating partners can be diminished?

Lord Cockfield. — As the honourable Member well knows, I entirely share his views on this subject. We do, however, face a problem. What we want to do is to get a completely free internal market in which not only goods and services, but the citizens of Europe can move perfectly freely. But, as of now there are significant differences in the law, the level of taxation, immigration controls and all sorts of other provisions as between individual Member States. It is only by the process of gradually removing these differences that we shall get the complete freedom of movement that both he and I aspire to.

Of course we support these efforts between individual states to conclude bilateral agreements. My reply said that we have no official status to negotiate such agreements, which by their very name, of course, are agreements between two or possibly more individual Member States. We are only too happy to see such agreements reached, but we believe that the better solution is to have a Community-wide directive which will deal with these matters, and this is the course on which we are embarked — with, I know, the honourable Member's full support.

Mr Pearce (ED). — Would the Commissioner agree that, despite his expressions of goodwill on this matter, it is rather sick that after nearly 20 years of this Community this nonsense at borders still persists? Would he agree that, in fact, the situation at Brussels airport is getting considerably worse year by year rather than better and that a privilege for MEPs is hardly an answer to that situation?

Is he aware that at Dover docks the pantomime goes so far that people coming off ships have to get into a bus, travel some way along and then get out again and be herded like sheep first to passport controllers, then to customs officials; herded by police officers who, in my experience, are not always terribly polite or terribly efficient? All this is in what is supposed to be a common market and, indeed, a community. Will he undertake to keep this House informed month by month of the actual progress that he is making in addition to the expressions of goodwill, for which I thank him?

Lord Cockfield. — I entirely understand and respect the honourable Member's strength of feeling. I ought, however, to say that the Commission has made representations both to the authorities at Brussels and to the United Kingdom Government about these matters. We do, of course, all regret the fact that after 27 — now coming up to 28 — years Europe has not been integrated into a single Community in the way that the authors of the Treaty of Rome originally contemplated. This is why the present Commission is putting so much effort into making a reality of the internal market, and that does include facilitating the free movement of the citizens of Europe.

Lord Cockfield

As I have said, the Commission has taken a major initiative on this: we presented a proposal for a directive at the beginning of January, and I myself presented this to the Internal Market Council yesterday.

Mr Cornelissen (PPE). — (NL) I gather from the Commissioner's answer that he too regrets that passengers on trains from Brussels to Strasbourg have to leave the restaurant car during their meals for passport checks at the Luxembourg-French border. I should therefore like to ask whether the Commission is prepared to approach the governments concerned with a view to their permitting passport checks to be made in the restaurant car in future. As its answer to the many questions that have been put reveal that it is so well informed, may I also ask whether the Commission is aware of the recent substantial increase in the number of complaints about checks at various internal frontiers, that between the Netherlands and Belgium in West Brabant being a case in point? My question is this: is the Commission prepared to investigate this matter and to inform us of the results of its investigation?

Lord Cockfield. — We did make it clear in the reply to Mr Rogalla on 6 July 1984 that the administration of these controls is a matter for the individual governments concerned. I appreciate his concern about passengers being inconvenienced by these controls, and we shall make further representations to the governments concerned.

If the honourable Member can give me specific details of the other complaints that he has, with particular reference to the borders between Holland and Belgium, I will certainly have the matter looking into.

Mr Coste-Floret (RDE). — (FR) I asked a general question about the abolition of controls at frontiers within the Community. It was attached to a series of particular questions on particular controls at certain frontiers. I am forced, I regret to say, to the conclusion that the Commissioner answered the particular questions but not the general one.

In his reply to the particular questions, he mentioned speeding up the controls. The problem is not one of speeding up the controls. It is, if we are to achieve a people's Europe, to do away with them. So I shall ask, as a supplementary question, the general question to which no answer has been received. Certainly, Mr Commissioner, you told us that you had submitted a proposal for a directive. I should like to know whether this proposal really does away with controls in general and how soon you expect to be able to achieve this — which is the only thing that will lead to the kind of Europe we want, a people's Europe.

Lord Cockfield. — May I, with respect, ask the honourable Member to read my reply when it appears in

the official record, because I did very very specifically deal in detail with the general question. The Commission's proposals of January of this year have, of course, been published. I think it would be helpful if the honourable Member read them.

Mr Gerontopoulos (PPE). — (GR) Although Greece has now been a full member of the European Economic Community for more than four years, Greek travellers visiting London find to their surprise that on their arrival at the airport they are treated somewhat differently from other Community citizens. Where, for example, a special exit is reserved for citizens of Member States of the Community, this does not apply to the Greeks, who have to use the exit intended for citizens of other countries.

I should like to ask the Commissioner whether this discrimination accords with the principle of equal treatment for citizens of the Community and, if not, what steps are envisaged by the Commission to resolve this problem.

Lord Cockfield. — My information is that during the transitional period what the honourable Member says was true. But, in fact, now Greek nationals do use the channel specially provided for EEC citizens.

Mr Cottrell (ED). — When the Commission talked to the Belgian authorities about the position at Brussels Airport, what excuse did the Belgian authorities give for this charade? One could also ask, when the Commission talks to the British Government, what answer does the British Government give with regard to the difficulties which exist at Dover Port? And since Athens Airport has been mentioned by our Greek colleague, is the Commission also aware of the complete and utter chaos which reigns at that airport when any one tries to get in or, even more surprisingly, out of it again?

Lord Cockfield. — The reasons given by both governments are too numerous to repeat.

(Laughter)

Mr Cryer (S). — Would the Commissioner accept that it might be more useful if he pressed the authorities at Brussels Airport to provide facilities for the handicapped than interfere with what seems to be a legitimate attempt to control terrorism, which, presumably, the Commissioner is in favour of? And since he apparently shares the loonier notions of people who are member of the Kangaroo Club, could he tell us how he intends, for example, to control terrorism, the distribution of hard drugs, the spread of rabies or foot-and-mouth disease unless there are checks at customs barriers?

Lord Cockfield. — At the moment these arrangements are in the hands of the individual Member States, and until such time as a directive is adopted there is nothing the Commission can do other than try to exercise persuasion on the governments concerned. There are very legitimate concerns relating to matters such as terrorism and the smuggling of drugs, and these concerns are specifically reflected in the draft directive.

Mr Van Miert (S). — (NL) I should like to hear from the Commissioner precisely what criticism can be levelled at the Belgian government so that this matter can be publicized. After all, it was Belgium's present Foreign Minister who drew up the report on the European Union, and he has called for a citizen's Europe on several occasions in Parliament. I should therefore like to know who is to blame, the Minister or various civil servants, so that we can at last publicize the matter. May I therefore know precisely what criticism is being levelled at the Belgian authorities regarding their attitude at Zaventem?

Lord Cockfield. — The internal workings of the Belgian Government are not really a matter for the Commission to comment on.

Mr Flanagan (RDE). — Madam President, on a point of order. I have waited patiently for 70 minutes for Question No 8, which I took over on behalf of Mr Fitzgerald. In the admirable game of cricket it was found necessary to pass a law under which a certain number of overs must be bowled per hour. Therefore, could I ask you please to go to the Bureau and advise them that once again in 70 minutes we have taken seven questions? I think the time has come when it is necessary to review the system of question and answer with a view to having a minimum number of questions answered and not waste the time of the whole of the House by dealing with a mere seven questions in 70 minutes, i.e., 10 minutes per question. It is not good enough, Madam President. Thank you for giving me the opportunity of making that protest.

President. — Mr Flanagan, I take note of your remarks. We are limited to one speaker per nationality and political group, and in spite of this rule it is true that we have only dealt with a limited number of questions. I find it regrettable, but that is how it is.

The first part of Question Time is closed.¹

¹ See Annex of 13 February 1985.

IN THE CHAIR: MR NORD

Vice-President

7. *Agricultural prices 1985-86 (contd)*

Mr Andriessen, Vice-President of the Commission. — (NL) Mr President, if my information is correct, Parliament's Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food is meeting at this moment. I have not counted up the members of the committee and other Members of Parliament who have spoken.

(Interruption by Mr Dalsass)

(DE) Yes, that is what I am saying, that is precisely what I am saying.

(NL) I am, of course, prepared to answer: that is for Parliament to decide. But I can well imagine that the members of the committee would be rather unhappy if they discovered that I had answered their questions at a time when they were unable to attend the sitting. I therefore leave it to you, Mr President, to decide whether I speak on this subject now or at a time when those who are probably most interested are in a position to be present. But if you give me the floor, I shall try briefly to reply to what was said this morning.

Mr President, I should like to begin by saying something about the questions raised in connection with Mr Woltjer's oral question and specifically those concerning the milk problem. The fact that the Commission felt, after submitting proposals to the Council, with which Parliament is also familiar, that it should introduce some administrative flexibility into the system, including a 20-day deferment of the payment deadline, 15 February, must not be interpreted as a desire on the Commission's part to alter the basic system. It must simply be seen in the light of the fact that it is not very logical, on the one hand, to submit to the Council proposals for a change in the system which affect the payment obligation and, on the other, to insist on payments being made in a situation that is in need of change. That is why we have acted as we have. It seems to me to be a logical part of the strategy.

Mr Früh and others called for absolute clarity in the application of the milk quota system at the end of the first year and the beginning of the second, and I can say that his wish is my command. The Commission wants clarity in the application of the system in the first year and thus, *a fortiori*, from the first year onwards. I cannot exclude the possibility of certain procedures still being applied at the beginning of the second year. That is a situation which the Commission cannot prevent, but it will do its utmost to ensure the clarity and transparency to which Mr Früh referred.

To Mr Paisley, who referred to a typically Northern Irish problem raised by the imposition of the superlevy

on direct supplies by the producer or supplies to the dairy, I should like to say that this is entirely a national decision on which the Commission has no influence. The Commission simply applies the system after the national governments have chosen a given system.

Mr Welsh asked why the co-responsibility levy could not be reduced by 2% and the milk quota by 2 million tonnes rather than 1 million tonnes. I will certainly not deny that the idea underlying his question will warrant serious consideration in the very near future. But what the Commission wants to avoid at the moment is a change in the decisions taken by the Council in March 1984. For obvious reasons, the Commission wants to abide by these decisions now and in the next milk-price year. I am willing to admit in this connection that a Community buying-out arrangement may well be considered. Of course, the budgetary implications will also have to be taken into account.

To conclude my comments on milk, I should like to say a few words about the co-responsibility levy. Some Members have called for the abolition of the co-responsibility levy now that the quota system has been introduced. I regret to say that the Commission does not share this view. Why not? It has rightly been pointed out that, even with the present quotas, the Commission still has to cope with a level of milk production that far exceeds the Community's needs, which means that the excess must be sold in some way or other at considerable expense, either in the Community or elsewhere. This being the case, the Commission feels it is reasonable to expect those who share the responsibility for the production of the milk that has to be sold at considerable expense to pay their share of this expense. That is why the Commission believes there is no reason to abandon the 2% co-responsibility levy which will replace the 3% levy if the Commission's proposals are accepted. I might point out by the way that in budgetary terms each 1% of the co-responsibility levy represents 260m to 270m ECU and that the abolition of the levy would have budgetary implications for which some kind of solution, possibly in the form of compensation, would have to be found.

As regards prices, I will begin by saying that, after the rather harsh tone adopted during the discussions in the European Parliament's Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food — and that is perhaps something of an understatement — I have not been disappointed by the tone of today's debate. This is not to say that what has been said here differs substantially from what was said in committee. But perhaps we should begin by deciding on what tone to adopt in the debate if we are then to have an exchange of ideas. Hence my gratitude in this respect.

I should now like to say a few words that I consider important at this stage of the debate. Firstly, I am, of course, responsible for what the Commission has proposed, and I do not therefore intend to abdicate this responsibility in any way. But it must be realized that

what we have before us is not an Andriessen proposal: it is a proposal from the Commission, it was discussed by the Commission at two levels of authority, it was adopted by the Commission, and the Commission therefore bears collective responsibility. I must therefore completely and utterly reject any suggestion in today's debate of a difference between the position adopted by the President of the Commission in the statement he made during January's debate and the price proposals now being considered. There is no question of the Commission not having accepted responsibility as a collective body and in its entirety for the proposal now under consideration.

Secondly, as the Thorn Commission has set out its views on the future of the agricultural policy in COM 500 — you know the jargon — and as decisions have been taken with the European Parliament's support, I do not think Parliament would appreciate it if another completely new plan for the reform of the common agricultural policy were now presented. I do not believe that would be in the interests of the agricultural policy or, if I may be rather more specific, of our farming community. What does this mean? It means that the proposals we are now considering must be seen in the light of this policy, as originally expounded and adopted, but that other aspects of this policy, also covered by COM 500, have not been forgotten. This means that the structural policy or the prospect to which I referred in my statement this morning and to which I have referred on previous occasions remains, in my opinion, an essential element of the agricultural policy as it should be pursued in the future. It also means that I cannot promise Mr Ducarme that in March I shall produce a further document to solve all the problems that have been mentioned here today. I am quite convinced that is impossible. And I therefore refuse to commit myself in this respect. I want to make that clear.

What I will undertake to do — and I want to make this equally clear — is the following. Firstly, I shall do my utmost in the Council of Ministers — of Finance, Agriculture or whatever — to obtain sufficient financial resources for the Community to pursue a structural policy that meets today's requirements.

I will be quite frank about this, as I was yesterday. Yesterday there was a meeting of the Council of Ministers for Economic and Financial Affairs, and I discussed with the Finance Ministers the funds needed if an acceptable structural policy is to be pursued. We have not yet reached agreement. But I should like to make one thing very clear in this Parliament and in public. As you know, there is a debate on what should be done with the Mediterranean programmes, and efforts are being made to combine Integrated Mediterranean Programmes and agricultural structural policy. I made it very clear that, if the Council believes that the agricultural part of the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes should be fully integrated into the structural policy for the Community's agricultural sector,

the Commission will not be able to get by with the amounts that have so far been requested. The Commission will have to have more than the 6 000 m or so which it has now requested for the structural policy. I want to make that quite clear. I feel Parliament has a right to know that in this respect the Commission does not intend, as it were, to take away with one hand what it gives with the other.

I say this because many honourable Members referred both to the structural aspects of the agricultural policy and to North-South relations during the debate this morning. Both elements are under discussion, and I can assure the European Parliament and the farming community that, although the Commission's powers are limited, as you know, it will do everything it can to see that a stringent market and price policy, which is what the present situation requires, is accompanied by a structural policy and a Mediterranean policy that takes due account of the problems to which various Members rightly referred during the debate this morning.

I have thus indirectly replied to the penetrating remarks Mr Dalsass made this morning about mountain areas. The price policy cannot be used — as I believe Mr Tolman rightly pointed out this morning — to solve every incomes problem that arises. A package of measures is needed for that. The Commission is aware of this need and more specifically of the problems facing mountain areas, to which Mr Dalsass referred this morning.

As regards incomes, I have been accused in the European press and by numerous agricultural organizations and others of not appreciating the incomes problems in the Community. Let me say the following on this subject.

Firstly, the incomes problem cannot be solved solely with prices. It is also a question of costs and the pressure they exert, it is a question of quality, it is a question of reorienting production and so on.

Secondly, some Members referred to the situation in their own countries. I do not think that we should be looking at incomes on an annual basis. The trend in incomes should be considered over a longer period. I should like to say to the Greek Members that in the last few days I have read a brochure published by the Greek Government, which says things about the trend in farm incomes in Greece that I would have liked to hear a Greek Member say this morning. It says that there has been a clear upward trend in Greece. I did not hear this said this morning, but that is what the Greek Government is saying.

May I point out to the Danish Member that real incomes in Danish agriculture rose by about 20% in 1984 and that from 1984 incomes are expected to rise by 33% in real terms.

And may I say to the Belgian Members that there have also been formidable increases in incomes in Belgium in the last few years. Admittedly, they fell last year. But, Mr President, we cannot consider the incomes situation from year to year. That is my complaint about the objective method that some Members have introduced here.

In an economy like the Community, where we have the worst possible problems and incomes are declining in many, if not all, sectors, it cannot be argued that rescue operations that were acceptable at the time of an economic growth-rate of 4%-6% are still possible in a given sector. That is not so. I am not saying that the incomes side of the policy must not be considered very carefully, but what I do say is that it must be considered over a fairly long period and in the light of the trend that has emerged. I think a great deal of the criticism that has been expressed is in substance — and I am now being very polite — unjustified, not to speak of the tone in which it has been voiced. I therefore completely reject the criticism that the Commission is not honouring its commitment under the Treaty regarding the development of incomes in agriculture. You will find this is not true if you consider the trend in incomes over a number of years.

The next point is renationalization. Like many of the honourable Members, the Commission is aware of the serious threat in this respect. We had an impressive example of this last year. But I have one basic question to ask here, and it is a question which, if I may say so, Parliament should also be asking itself. Should the threat of the renationalization of the agricultural policy be allowed to prevent the Commission, or the Community, from pursuing the policy which it believes is the only right answer to the present challenge? I say no, Mr President. What we must do, and what the Commission will make every effort to do, is prevent a policy that is right — and I am assuming that we decide on the right policy — from resulting in these measures being taken. We must do everything we can to prevent it coming to this.

I will say at this juncture that, if specific income-support measures become necessary as a result of the policy that we must pursue, I believe, first, that they should be taken at Community level and not at national level and, second, that they should be of a temporary nature and be taken within the framework of the systems we have introduced. You will find, Mr President, that this is what the document I have already referred to, COM 500, says: it provides for the Commission to take such action if specific circumstances require.

A third remark in this connection, Mr President. The third subparagraph of Article 93(2) of the Treaty of Rome permits the Council, acting unanimously, to take support measures which are incompatible with the principles of the Treaty. We know that the Council, made use of this right last year when the positive Ger-

man MCAs were abolished, with a possible extension to the Netherlands. The Treaty makes provision for this, and no one will expect the Commission, the guardian of the Treaty, to deny that this possibility exists. But I would add — and I wish to emphasize this in this Parliament — that this is not a power that can be exercised or is suitable every day. It is a power that should definitely be exercised only in exceptional circumstances. I hope the Council will not make use of it in other than exceptional circumstances — very exceptional circumstances, I am inclined to say.

My fourth point concerns the surpluses. At the moment I do not have a general remedy, and I agree with those who have said that a stringent price policy on its own will not result in lower production and may even lead to higher production and so disturb the balance further. Nevertheless, the fact remains that there is some kind of relationship in the economy between production and prices, between supply and demand, and I believe the common agricultural policy must also be given the chance to let the relationship between supply and demand have its effect. That is my first comment on this subject.

Secondly, from time to time more will have to be done. We have had to introduce quotas for sugar and milk. The fact that this is the third time we have discussed the milk quota in Parliament since the system was introduced shows what problems the introduction of such systems raises. I will admit that I am not a strong advocate of quotas. I am more in favour of allowing the market to operate freely. I do not think — and I want to make this very clear here today — that quotas would be right for the cereals sector, for example. That is why, Mr Woltjer, when speaking of cereals and realizing that we have a situation that may make it difficult to expect prices alone to alleviate the problem of overproduction, I mentioned the possibility of a co-responsibility levy, because I do not believe a quota system, which you obviously prefer — apparently not, I am pleased to see: then we are in agreement — can be regarded as the solution for the cereals sector.

A comparison has been made between the problem of surpluses in the agricultural sector and in industry, particularly by Mr Debatisse, who mentioned various aspects. I cannot mention all the aspects, but I will say this: as far as I know, industry, the steel industry, for instance, but other sectors of industry too, the textile industry being another example, had to decide at a given moment to reduce production because of the market situation. As you know, under our steel policy we are now in the process of reducing capacities, and therefore production, by roughly 20%. This, of course, causes employment problems. There are other instruments to cope with this, such as the conversion of undertakings to create new employment. In a stagnating economy, which is what we have today, this is extremely difficult, I will admit. But — and this is what I wanted to say — it has been accepted in these

sectors that production must be reduced in real terms and that the price mechanism must play its part in this process. One system cannot, of course, simply be declared applicable to another. We do not do that in agriculture either. But I would say that there are certain parallels to be considered in this connection.

If the price mechanism we are now trying to apply to the surpluses proves inadequate, other proposals for ways of achieving our goal will have to be considered.

My fifth point concerns exports and the Community preference. Mr President, with your permission, I shall now try to eliminate a misunderstanding. It is said that the Community does not pursue an active export policy. Nothing is further from the truth. I will give you an example. In the two years from 1982 to 1984, exports of beef and veal doubled from about 450 000 to 900 000 tonnes. At present the Community is the world's largest exporter of beef and veal, and I can assure you that that is causing our competitors in the world market quite a few problems. The Community has succeeded in selling in the world market very large quantities of surpluses produced by other sectors. Do you think this would have been possible without an active, not to say aggressive, export policy? In the last ten years, we have doubled our exports to world markets compared with our imports. I feel these are figures that should count in this debate. This is not to say that we should not perhaps consider other, new export instruments.

I know some people are thinking of multiyear contracts. I know others are thinking of credit systems that are used in other countries. I will not express an opinion on this today. All I will say is that I am prepared to consider other systems, but I am not prepared to accept the criticism that the Community does not pursue an active export policy and that consequently what the President of the Commission said in his policy statement in January is not being followed up in the agricultural sector.

I realize that the international situation in which we are having to operate at present is extremely difficult. Mr Welsh mentioned the US farm bill this morning. If you look at the reflection of this farm bill in the United States budget that has been published in the last few days, the American agricultural policy, if amended in this way, may well be a serious threat to the Community, causing it problems and difficulties in the world market. That is something we should bear in mind.

You should also consider our price proposals in this connection. I appreciate that Mr Welsh feels we might have done rather more with cereal prices than we have done. I am also glad that he understands how we set about our task. I recognize his problem. We shall have to negotiate on this with our international partners. We must also wait and see what becomes of the American Administration's proposals. But in these circum-

Andriessen

stances I cannot exclude the possibility of further reflection becoming necessary on our export policy towards the United States and on the instruments we should use.

One of the aspects to be covered by the longer-term study to which I have committed myself is precisely this question of our exports and the form our Community preference must take. But let there be no mistake. I have said this at previous part-session of this Parliament, and I will say it again. I am not afraid of our foreign competitors and I am quite willing to discuss the matter, but let us not forget that the Community, too, is heavily dependent on exports to the world market and therefore on a healthy export and trade climate throughout the world.

A brief word about specific products. I have already mentioned the question of cereals. I should like to say to this year's rapporteur, Mr Pranchère, that lowering our cereals prices would certainly not help to strengthen the United States' competitive position, as he suggested in his statement. On the contrary.

Various comments have been made about beef and veal, by Mr Welsh and Mr Paisley, for example, and about the variable beef and veal premium. I do not know if this is the right time to discuss this in depth, but I should like to explain why the Commission feels it must persist with what the previous Commission started. Firstly, the present variable premium signifies complete segmentation of the common market. Being responsible for the development of the Community, the Commission is not, of course, overly fond of this premium. Quite the contrary. Secondly, we believe it costs more money. And thirdly, we are not convinced it helps to increase consumption. We therefore feel we should persist with what we have done in the past.

There was mention this morning — by Mr Provan, I believe — of a kind of holding operation. To some extent that may be true. The Commission does indeed feel that various adjustments need to be made to the common agricultural policy. Decisions have been taken in this regard, and others may have to follow. To this extent, I sympathize with the description given by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food this morning when he referred to Andriessen's unfinished symphony. These price proposals are not the end of the matter. At best, they are a first important step. Other steps should follow, as I have said in the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food and as I will say again here as I come to the end of my statement. What must follow is an attractive and inspiring structural policy — and I promise this Parliament that I will try to get this settled in the Council — and a longer-term perspective, which I hope will lead to serious discussions with the two sides of industry and with the political authorities before the summer recess, so that any conclusions drawn can be taken into account in the next marketing year.

That is what the Commission is committed to: a firm and stringent market and price policy, an inspiring structural policy and a policy that offers hope for the future. I hope that these three objectives can be achieved in close cooperation with this Parliament.

(Applause)

President. — The joint debate is closed.

8. *Actual expenditure under the supplementary budget for 1984 and in the agricultural sector in 1985*

President. — The next item is a joint debate on two oral questions, with debate, to the Commission:

— by Mr Langes, on behalf of the EPP Group, Mr Dankert, on behalf of the Socialist Group, Lord Douro, on behalf of the European Democratic Group, Mrs Barbarella, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, Mrs Scrivener, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, Mr Pasty, on behalf of the EDA Group, Mr Cot, on behalf of the Committee on Budgets, and Mr Aigner, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control (Doc. 2-1304/84):

Subject: Actual expenditure under the 1984 supplementary budget and prospects for actual expenditure in the agricultural sector in 1985

As comprehensive information on actual expenditure in 1984 (including the 1984 supplementary budget and transfers of appropriations) is a crucial factor in resolving the 1985 budget problems, we would ask the Commission:

1. Can the Commission state the precise difference between the increased expenditure under the 1984 supplementary budget for the Guarantee Section of the Agricultural Fund (Chapters 10 to 29) and the actual expenditure in this sector up to 1 January 1985?
2. To what extent has expenditure in the non-compulsory sector been used to finance agricultural expenditure?
3. As regards the implementation of the 1984 budget, were there liquidity difficulties at 31 December 1984 and how has the Commission resolved them?
4. Has financing from the intergovernmental agreement been fully supplemented?
5. To what extent does the actual expenditure in the agricultural sector in 1984 suggest the need to reappraise the estimates of agricultural spending in the Guarantee Section for the whole of 1985?

President

— by Mr Le Pen, on behalf of the Group of the European Right (Doc. 2-1611/84)

Subject: Probable actual expenditure in the farm sector in 1985

1. Could the Commission state the exact difference between the increase in the expenditure allocated to the EAGGF, Guarantee Section, under the supplementary budget for 1984 and the expenditure that will actually be necessary in this area between now and 1 January 1985?
2. To what extent has actual expenditure in the agricultural sector in 1984 led to new forecasts for Guarantee Section agricultural spending for 1985 as a whole?
3. How does the Commission intend to reconcile Guarantee Section farm spending for 1985 with the enlargement of the Community while keeping the VAT call-up rate below 1.4%?
4. What is the Commission's strategy with regard to budgetary discipline and in particular the method of calculating farm spending within the frame of reference proposed by the Council?
5. Could the Commission give details of the transfers it intends to carry out in order to cover EAGGF (Guarantee Section) expenditure?

Mr Langes (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, our main task is to draw up the budget and thus determine the policy which this House wants. This is particularly important for the European Parliament, because we have no legislative powers and thus do not determine the Community's agricultural rules. It is equally important to scrutinize the events of the previous year in order to check whether funds were effectively and thriftily spent. This was my reason for putting forward this oral question, which is supported by all the major groups in this House, by the Committee on Budgets and the Committee on Budgetary Control.

The questions, Mr Christophersen, have been put to you. We wish to know what exactly happened with the 1984 budget. What about the supplementary budget? Did the governments actually keep the promises they made in Fontainebleau? Did they cough up a further thousand million? For Parliament the decisive question is whether the other policies, for example, the regional policy, were implemented in addition to the agricultural policy. Was the amount we earmarked in the budget to combat world hunger — a third of the total made available worldwide — actually spent in 1984? Or were savings made in order to finance other measures — of agricultural policy, for example — in order to stop gaps?

We do not wish simply to check things. It is equally important for us to know how the budget was imple-

mented so that we know what our budget for 1985 must look like.

I do not need to remind the House of our reasons for rejecting the Council's draft budget. We rejected it because the Council submitted a budget which was dishonest. It covered only nine or ten months. Parliament said that we had to know the costs involved. We want to know what the revenues will be, and we want a Community budget which really covers twelve months. The question thus is this: what are our liabilities now for 1984? Is it clear what else we shall have to finance in 1985?

Commissioner Christophersen should realize that these questions might enable Parliament and the Commission to join forces in order to convince the Council that the Community needs to be a thrifty organization but must also provide money for measures which are necessary; the European Community does not, as is repeatedly claimed in many national capitals, Bonn included, live in all its policies beyond its means.

We know the products which are in surplus, and we have previously discussed with Commissioner Andriessen the need to reduce them. We know that it is not possible. Everyone knows it, including those who have concerned themselves especially with agriculture. We know too that increases must be made in the related policies, so that we can correct the imbalance in the budget and can pay the United Kingdom its rebate.

We therefore look forward eagerly to the final accounts which the Commissioner will lay before us for 1984, and to what he will say to us about 1985, so that we can work together to obtain an honest and fair budget for the citizens of this Community.

(Applause from the centre)

Mr d'Ormesson (DR). — (FR) Will the budgetary disciplinary measures, Mr Commissioner, not lead to a change in the aims of a Treaty of which the common agricultural policy is the foundation? That they involve a risk of dislocation of the Community to the benefit of a free-trade area is obvious, like it or not. Price freezes, cuts in the prices of cereals and fruit and vegetables, and an extremely stringent dairy quota system plus rising production costs, social costs and tax pressure in countries with weak currencies will all lead to tension and then to upheaval in the rural sector.

This is the economic situation in which the European Parliament's refusal to approve a budget which does not cover the year of guaranteed agricultural spending took place. This is why the Group of the European Right has the honour of asking the Commission how it hopes to meet obligatory spending between now and the end of the year. And how will it finance enlargement next year, as the projected VAT increase has already proved highly inadequate? Lastly, the Group

d'Ormesson

of the European Right would like to know about the Commission's conception of budgetary discipline and the method of calculating agricultural expenditure within the frame of reference proposed by the Council.

This discussion comes at a time when anguish, doubt and despair, the result of the drop in agricultural incomes in all-too-many Member States has hit a large number of homes in rural areas.

In 1976, after the tragic events at Montrodon, when two policemen were killed by angry vine growers, François Mitterrand, the MP, cried at Carcassonne that: 'Some economic violence justifies political violence'. Now that the Community has 13 million unemployed, should we not do our utmost to see that a feeling of revolt of even greater proportions does not grow up among jobless farmers? Why refuse to admit that the common agricultural policy is leaking at the seams and that its regulations are rendered pointless by fraud, national aid and compromise? Policies cannot be built on compromise. Look at the facts. Hardly had the Dublin compromise on the common organization of the market in wine been reached than Spain, for which it was designed, attacked it and does not intend to budge. But by declaring to anyone who wants to hear that Spain will join the Treaty of Rome, come what may, on 1 January 1986, certain Heads of State are depriving themselves of their best arguments and voiding the negotiations of their substance.

Diplomacy has clearly lost, in discretion, its principal virtue. A year ago in this House we talked about nothing but European Union. Today it is a regression of Community achievements we are offered, with a free-trade area as historical perspective. The direct consequence of this, the renationalization of agricultural production, will be the answer to the farmers' exasperation and a fall in the birth rate will be the answer to the gradual decline in the role and influence of the Community.

I maintain here that there will be no economic recovery unless we have a vigorous policy of birth to the north of the Mediterranean and of development of the assets of the south. Life is movement, will, energy and effort. It dies if it is only concerned with itself. The building of Europe cannot be maintained and developed unless it wants to spread its influence to Africa and the Middle East where there are potential markets that meet the aspirations of some and the needs of others.

But, let me remind you, larger transfers of our wealth to Africa mean that the conditions must be right for an increase in the actual demand the countries of Africa can pay for. What I heard at the ACP-EEC Joint Committee meeting in Bujumbura does not suggest that this will happen. Weakness and demagoguery never produced great designs.

Perhaps we do not understand the hopes and possibilities that might result from an Africa with a market economy, agreeing to guarantee investments in the recipient countries and practising a contractual policy whereby the Community has priority in its purchases of food requirements, which will increase, in exchange for our own purchases at fair prices. An Africa that, thanks to the support of an energetic and vigorous Community policy, would reject the essential cause of its poverty — totalitarian Marxism. The Africa we all here love is dying of hunger while the Community is in danger of breaking down under the weight of its surpluses. Recovery in north and south will not come from illusory discipline and false ideas, but from the will to live and to produce and to create in freedom.

Mr Christophersen, Vice-President of the Commission. — (DA) Mr President, I should like to thank Mr Langes and his colleagues, who have given me an opportunity to answer five interesting questions today. I do not know whether I shall have any reason for gratitude afterwards.

At all events I am grateful today, because it gives me an opportunity to present to Parliament a more general outline of our budgetary situation, and I feel that this is a good time to do it. I fully agree with Mr Langes when he points out how important it is for us to be able to form a realistic picture of our budgetary possibilities at an early stage here in Parliament.

However, I should like to start by answering the five specific questions which have been put to the Commission, because the answers to them also convey a concrete impression of where we stand at the present time in purely budgetary terms.

The first question relates to whether there really was a need, as was stated in the latter part of 1984, for a supplementary budget. The question arises because there was a certain discussion at that time — perhaps in the Council of Ministers as well as in Parliament — as to whether there really was a higher expenditure requirement than originally anticipated.

I can inform you that the developments which we now know took place in 1984 fully confirm the need for a supplementary budget. Appropriations totalling 18 375.9 million ECU were entered in the supplementary budget for the EAGGF Guarantee Section, and the advances paid out have completely absorbed this sum. In addition the Member States requested 191.3 million ECU for December 1984, which could not be met. Thus our situation is in reality such — and I shall return to this, Mr President — that, not only did the Community need all of the additional appropriations, but some of the expenditure requirement remained unmet. Indeed it emerges from the data supplied to the Commission by Member States that expenditure of about 202 million ECU could not be defrayed in 1984, and we shall therefore be obliged to process that expenditure under the 1985 budget.

Christophersen

I should like now to deal with the second question, which concerns the extent to which non-compulsory expenditure has been used to finance the agricultural policy. The answer to this question is that no non-compulsory expenditure has been transferred to or used for the EAGGF Guarantee Section. The Commission stuck to what was adopted here in Parliament and what was adopted by the Council in the review of income in supplementary and amending budget no 1 for 1984, as it stood after Parliament's second reading. It is anticipated that some financing will be possible through savings of 266 million ECU as a result of an expected surplus in the current financial year, and appropriations of 300 million ECU were cancelled at the close of 1984, which broadly speaking corresponds to the amount set down in the supplementary and amending budget, of which Parliament also took note on the second reading.

I might add that the balance for the 1984 financial year as a whole will be negative. The Commission deplors this of course, but we may as well say it now since we have the figure: there will be a deficit of about 520 million ECU, which will have to be carried over to 1985.

The third question put to the Commission concerns liquidity problems at the close of 1984. As expected, liquidity problems arose in the final weeks of 1984, on the one hand, because the shortfall in traditional own resources became a reality — in this case it arose in the first instance in agricultural levies, with revenue falling short of the budgeted figure of 664 million ECU — and, on the other hand, the Commission had to note delays in the payment of advances on the part of a number of Member States under the agreement between the Member State Governments. I should like to return to this matter when I come to deal with the fourth question put to me.

In short, we are in a situation in which, in the second half of 1984, we faced such grave liquidity problems that the Commission was forced to seek overdraft arrangements with the national finance administrations. The overdraft amounted to 130 million ECU at the end of 1984. Clearly this overdraft was in full conformity with Article 12 of Regulation no 2891 on the Community's own resources, but it is also worth emphasizing that it was the first time the Community was forced to make use of this facility. On the other hand — and I should like to take this opportunity to say so — we have reason to be grateful to the national administrations for their spirit of cooperation because, amongst other things, they made it possible for us to solve the liquidity problems without serious consequences. But it should also be stressed of course that, if the Member State Governments had given effect to the agreement reached on the payment of advances before the close of 1984, we should not have got into this situation at all. That needs to be added.

The fourth question follows on from this, referring as it does to the implementation of the intergovernmental

agreement. As you know, the previous Commission expressed its concern over the nature of that agreement, concern as to whether it would be implemented in good time and, as you also know, the Commission clearly stated its preference for an EEC regulation with immediate effect in all Member States. The Commission had, on the basis of the decision taken, asked the Member States to pay the necessary advances by 5 November 1984 at the latest.

I regret to have to inform you that only one Member State out of the ten responded to this request, and only four other Member States paid the amount before the end of the year, so that at that point only half of the total amount to which the ten Member States were committed had been paid. I may add that four other Member States made their payments early in January. At the present time only one Member State has not made the necessary payment, but it is about to do so.

This shows clearly the weakness inherent in an agreement of this kind entered into by the Member State governments, for it exacerbates the difficulty of long-term financial and budgetary planning and control in the Community. I should be added of course that the delays were to some extent the result of formal problems, which should have been overcome in the Member States, and of procedural requirements, but that does not alter the fact that it was ultimately the Community which was saddled with a problem because of weaknesses in the agreement.

The final question I have been asked concerns the extent of our problems in 1985, and I must say here, with reference to our agricultural situation from the expenditure point of view, that farm policy spending, as reported with the publication of the Commission's price proposals for the 1985-86 production year, must be reviewed in an upward direction, mainly because of factors which have already made their appearance. I have already pointed out the need to transfer 202 million ECU of expenditure from last year to this year. Then there is the need to take account of increases of 450 million ECU resulting from short-term economic trends. And there is the price proposal itself, but its budgetary consequences will be extremely modest compared with these figures. On the other hand we can subtract a smaller amount of 150 million ECU, this being a sum we have gained from the clearance of accounts.

If we make an appraisal of our total expenditure situation for the current year in the agricultural policy sector, we can conclude that there is a need for expenditure totalling about 20 000 million ECU. Set against this is the Commission's original budget proposal, and the figure of 18 000 million ECU contained in the Council's budget proposal. In other words, relative to the budgetary situation with which we are confronted at the present time, the task is to secure coverage of a further 2 000 million ECU of expenditure under the agricultural policy. That is clearly the situation today.

Christoffersen

It may change as things develop; it may change in an unfavourable direction, if international economic trends and developments on the currency market move against us. It may also change in a favourable direction, but we have no control over these things. We can do no more than examine the picture as it appears now. This is an obligation which the Commission, the Council and Parliament jointly share.

If I pass on to our general budgetary situation in 1985 and look at trends in other items — and Mr Langes has also asked me to do that — there are fewer changes to be noted. I have mentioned last year's deficit of 520 million ECU, which is being carried forward. On the other hand we can make upward adjustments in certain items of revenue as of now but the combined effect of the changes is that, over and above the 2 000 million ECU, we have to find a further 100-200 million ECU if we are to have a balanced budget for the current year, which of course we must.

I have tried to give a bird's eye view of our budgetary situation, but I should also like to present some more general points on the current political outlook.

Of course the Commission has discussed the position we are in, and I have given an account on the Commission's behalf of our views on the matter in the Committee on Budgets. I have on the Commission's behalf explained our assessment to the Council, and I would repeat to you what I said: the Commission is following all developments with the closest attention. The Commission has to stress the need for a very rapid solution of the budgetary problems. If we do not achieve an early solution, the Community will grind to a standstill in one sector after another. Unless we can achieve a quick political settlement over the coming months, unless we have a budget which is able to function for all practical purposes, before we really get into the summer, the Community will not be able to honour its obligations to hundreds of thousands, to millions of people.

The Commission therefore wishes to urge upon the other institutions the need for a rapid solution, and I take this opportunity to express our appreciation of the Italian Presidency's initiative in seeking a rapid settlement in the Council. As soon as the procedure in the Council of Ministers has reached a point at which it is clear that a solution can be finalized, the Commission will take on its share of the responsibility. We shall take whatever initiatives are necessary to ensure that no *momentum* is lost.

But it is clearly the Council itself which must settle the points of conflict which have made it impossible for Parliament to adopt a budget. The Commission is not taking a passive line therefore, but it expects others to take their share of the responsibility as well.

Until some settlement is reached, we shall have to continue working under a system of provisional twelfths.

This arrangement has come into effect in accordance with the principles set down in a memorandum which the Commission sent to Parliament on 4 January of this year. The arrangement can be characterized briefly as follows: according to the system of double limitation which the Commission feels must be applied — i.e. the lowest amount is always taken, either from the item which existed last year or from the rejected budget for this year — the total appropriations available for 1985 under the provisional twelfths arrangement will be just short of 25 000 million ECU in commitments and a little over 23 000 million ECU in payments. And these amounts are more than 10% lower than last year. In concrete terms, therefore, this means that the possibilities open to us are already considerably reduced, and that they will be reduced still further. The problem arises in particular in the EAGGF Guarantee Section. Here the arrangement is that so-called advances are first made available to the Member States, and these advances are entered in the budget as combined provisional commitments. The advances are then adjusted by detailed payment charging for each budget item on the basis of the statements which are later submitted by the Member State Governments covering the specific administrative expenditure, and this specific charging takes place 2-3 months after the advances have been made available. This means in purely practical terms that, as far as the EAGGF Guarantee Section is concerned, we have more than a twelfth at our disposal — in fact we have three twelfths plus one twelfth. With expenditure unchanged, this should make rational administration possible. But, if we get into a situation in which expenditure this year is greater than expenditure last year, there will be difficulties, and we have got into just that situation. We can already see that in the first three months of this year the need for payments from the EAGGF Guarantee Section will be considerably greater than last year, and — I must say this to Parliament — that will force the Commission to ask for additional twelfths. It cannot be otherwise, but it also highlights the fact that, week by week, we are now approaching the point at which we shall no longer be able to honour our obligations.

In a similar way, revenue is of course received on the basis of the 1984 financial year. I do not need to go into details here. But we can say that, to begin with, the provisional twelfths arrangement generally imposes difficulties in the day-to-day running of the Community. Secondly it makes it difficult or impossible to plan for the introduction of new activities, and the difficulties in these areas will be felt increasingly keenly as time goes by. The Commission must therefore urgently press for a rapid solution of the problems, and it expects Parliament to give strong support to this view.

But the whole situation we are in also highlights the fact that, in a slightly longer perspective, it is unacceptable for us to budget from month to month in this way. I think that the present situation underscores the

Christophersen

need for longer-term budgetary planning in the Community, and the most important thing in that connection is of course that the Council should adopt the Commission's amended proposal to raise the ceiling for the Community's own resources to 1.4% of the VAT take. It is no exaggeration, it is a reality, that the Community's future stands or falls by the urgent adoption of this measure. It is quite clear that it will not be possible to finance the 1986 budget with the present ceiling on VAT receipts, and these arrangements cobbled together to finance temporary shortfalls can only be resorted to on a limited number of occasions. If they are repeated, they will lose their credibility and no long-term, multiannual budgetary planning can be conducted on the basis of *ad-hoc* solutions. We need — and we must demand — certainty with regard to the development of our revenue position over the years to come. But it is a matter of urgency; time is pressing with regard to ratification. We know how difficult it can be in some Member States to get the ratification procedure completed in sufficiently good time. If we are to get an increase in own resources ratified in all Member States so that it can take effect from 1 January 1986, there is not much time. With every week that passes the chances of success become slimmer. We must therefore expect the Council to conclude its deliberations quickly on this proposal, because a settlement is very urgently needed and also because it must be viewed in terms of the budgetary problems we shall already be faced with in the current year.

In the slightly longer term, it should also be emphasized that the need for increased own resources is imperative. Even so this will not be the cause of runaway expenditure in the Community in the years to come: in the Commission's view expenditure policy must be pursued in a responsible manner; priorities must be allocated. But, if there is to be room for the development of new policies, if the desires expressed for action to promote economic convergence in the Community are to be met — to mention only two important areas — if there is to be scope for solutions to the problems stemming from the enlargement of the Community, even with a disciplined and responsible approach to expenditure, there will be a need for increased own resources. In addition, as a large Community faced with variable magnitudes on the international market, we must also recognize that we are confronted with the consequences of falling dollar rates, with the consequences of changed world market prices and many other factors of short-term economic fluctuation.

These remarks, Mr President, lead me on finally to one last but extremely important matter, one on which the Commission hopes soon to return to Parliament with something more concrete, namely the need for multiannual budgeting. Such a long-term budgetary procedure is absolutely essential if we are to project the consequences of our own decisions, if we are to bring all the good but expenditure-consuming ideas into a framework, if we are — for our own sake — to

evaluate the real cost of the wishes we have for the development of the Community. The Commission is thus currently studying ways of introducing a multiannual budgetary control system of this kind.

Mr President, with this answer — admittedly rather wide-ranging but I believe not unnecessarily so — I have sought to give Parliament and the authors of the questions an impression of the position we are in, of the tasks facing us. Clearly the Commission has its views on how the problems are to be solved. It is possible that we shall not always agree on how things should be done, but that does not alter the fact that we each have our role under the Treaty. If we are both committed to playing it loyally and in a spirit of good cooperation, I am also convinced that through the discussions we have in Parliament we can shoulder the burden together.

(Applause)

President. — I have received from the Committee on Budgets a motion for a resolution, with request for an early vote pursuant to Rule 42(5), to wind up the debate. This motion bears the Doc. No 2-1640/84. The motions under Doc. Nos 2-1617/84 and 2-1645/84 have been withdrawn. The vote on the request for an early vote will be taken at the end of the debate.

I should also like to inform the House that in all probability there will be an opportunity to continue the debate on this item after voting-time, since voting-time will probably not last until 7 p.m.

IN THE CHAIR: MR GRIFFITHS

Vice-President

9. Votes

Report by Mr Raggio, on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, on the Communication from the Commission to the Council (2-946/84 - COM (84) 344 final) on the statistical machinery to establish the order of priority to be applied when granting European Social Fund assistance to regions (Doc. 2-1333/84)

After the adoption of paragraph 12

Mr Welsh (ED). — As chairman of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, I think I should make the technical point that it is really incorrect for the rapporteur to speak in favour of amendments deleting texts which the committee has actually adopted.

President. — Mr Welsh, you will need to speak to your rapporteur.

Mr Welsh (ED). — Through you, Mr President, that is just what I have done.

Explanations of vote

Mr Hindley (S). — I am in favour of this report. I say that, however, with a hint of scepticism, and that I would like to explain. The institutions of the EEC would seem at times to give as high a priority to collecting statistics on deprivation as to enacting measures to overcome that deprivation itself. This is clearly demonstrated by the ever-growing and disgraceful discrepancy between agricultural expenditure and what may be called social expenditure in this institution. The evidence of our own eyes is still more impressive than any statistics, something that I am conscious of every time I leave the North-West of England, which is continuing its economic and social decline, and fly to areas like Strasbourg. I accept that we do need statistics, but I warn people against two very obvious dangers.

First of all, the collection of statistics often becomes an aim in itself. I have seen grown men — I do not include women, since they tend to show much more sense in such matters — get carried away and wax lyrical in intellectualizing about the meaning of statistics and their complexities, forgetting quite conveniently the grim reality behind those statistics.

Secondly, it must be said quite clearly that statistics are used consciously by officials as a delaying tactic. They seek to use their complexity as an excuse for doing nothing at all. I am in favour of the redistribution of wealth in society. If such tentative first steps as sharpening up the collection of statistics lead eventually to that distribution, I would support them as a first step.

(Applause from the Socialist benches)

Mrs Lizin (S). — (FR) I shall abstain, in spite of the fact that the Raggio report, as it stands after amendment, is basically satisfactory.

On this occasion, I should like to draw your attention to the way the Social Fund intervenes in Belgium. It does so, I think, in rather too scattered a manner. This certainly helps get this European financial instrument known in the relevant circles, which might not otherwise have heard about it, but it certainly also harms its effectiveness. So I should have liked it to have been made much clearer that, in a country such as Belgium, where there are only a few regions, the Fund should confine itself to the mining areas in Flanders and the areas where the iron and steel industry is being reor-

ganized in Wallonia. The Social Fund would have been clearer and so would our report.

Mr Prout (ED), in writing. — Any improvement in the statistical machinery to establish the order of priority to be applied when granting European Social Fund assistance to regions is to be welcomed. Even more important than getting the criteria right is getting the timing right. A lag of even two years in the application of statistics can severely distort the order of priorities. For example, the spectacular increase in the level of unemployment in the West Midlands region of the United Kingdom in the early 1980s ought to have led to a swift change in Social Fund priorities for spending in the United Kingdom. It did not because out of date statistics were still being used.

Parliament adopted the resolution¹

10. Actual expenditure under the supplementary budget for 1984 and in the agricultural sector in 1985 (contd)

Mr Dankert (S). — (NL) Mr President, I want to talk less about agricultural expenditure than about the budget deficit. At the end of his answer to the question the Commissioner touched on a number of general points, concerning in particular the course of events in connection with the system of twelfths. In this connection I should like to say that, although we have a new Commissioner, the old Director-General is still there and the discussion is a little like the one we had in 1980. I do not think that Parliament has yet said all it has to say, and in my opinion we shall have to have a more extensive debate in this Parliament on the double restriction. I believe that this double restriction is not applicable at present and the only figure that counts is the one given in the chapters of the 1984 budget.

Mr President, I should just like to say a few words about the problems connected with the supplementary 1984 budget and the effects it will have in 1985. The Commissioner has gone a long way towards clarifying the situation. I felt this clarification was necessary because I had the feeling that the lack of clarity about 1984 in the minds of certain Members of the Council was one of the reasons for the lack of urgency where the 1985 budget was concerned. The figures provided by the Commissioner do not make the solution of the problems connected with the 1985 budget any easier. I therefore find it hard to say whether we have made a great deal of progress. Commissioner Christophersen has referred to a 520m ECU deficit in 1984. He indicated that this was largely due to the sector of the Community's own resources, where the Council, in its

¹ The rapporteur spoke *in favour* of Amendments Nos 1, 6 to 8 and 18 to 21, and *against* Amendments Nos 2 to 5 and 9 to 16. For the announcement of subjects to be included in the topical and urgent debate, see Minutes.

Dankert

conceit, wanted to adopt a different line from the Commission and Parliament. We were thus proved right in the end. The sad thing is that the money is not now available.

I should like some more accurate information from the Commission, because Vice-President Christophersen has spirited away in 1985 some of the 520m ECU he described as being a deficit at the end of 1984, leaving only 200m ECU. I do not know what savings dodge or sleight of hand the Commission has in mind, but there is a discrepancy between these two amounts. Perhaps this could be clarified.

Secondly, how has the intergovernmental 1 000 million been booked? The Commissioner has said that 500m, or approximately half, was received in 1984, the other half in 1985. When I look at the supplementary 1984 budget, I have the impression that the Commissioner has included the whole 1 000 million in 1984 when calculating the deficit even though it was not paid until 1985. I do not know whether that is quite right in accountancy terms.

A second question I should like to ask is this: what is the Commissioner going to do about Willy De Clercq's Belgians, who have still not paid? Would it not be a good idea to deduct this amount from the advances, or is the Commission going to take them to Court, because it has, of course, had implications? Mr Christophersen has just said that he had to do the rounds of the Member States' Finance Ministers. This means that various Finance Ministers have had to grant the Commission short-term loans because their counterparts in other Member States did not want to foot the bill. I feel further clarification is needed here in view of the disinclination of certain Members of the Council to honour their commitments.

I should also like to hear rather more from the Commission about the effects this will have in 1985. As we have already said, and the Commissioner has said so too, the calculations made so far indicate a deficit in 1985 of some 3 000m ECU, including the compensation to be paid to the United Kingdom. This figure also includes the 700m in agricultural compensation. Mr Christophersen has just added some more. In his calculation he first arrived at 800m for agriculture, while Mr Andriessen says 700m. I do not want to rub salt into the wound, but this means that non-compulsory expenditure is also included. In other words, the Commission will after all exceed the 3 000m we have recently been discussing by a not inconsiderable amount. Mr President, I believe that is going to cause some difficulty.

There has just been a discussion on a proposal from the Italian Presidency concerning the financing of the Community's own resources in 1985. When I consider the problems to which this will give rise in either case, whether these resources are increased or an intergovernmental agreement is reached — and I say the

amount will be roughly 3 500m ECU — it means that the Federal Republic will soon be tapped for something like DM 3 000m and a country like the Netherlands for a cool 500m guilders. I assume that provision has not been made for such expenditure in such Member States. It must be found in current budgets. Adjustments through spring financial reports are highly unlikely, because I think it will be difficult for the Commission to produce a budget proposal before decisions are taken in the Member States on the budget for the rest of the financial year. I therefore think that, irrespective of whether the Community's own resources are increased to 1.4% or an intergovernmental agreement is reached, the Member States will inevitably have to make transfers to the Community to the detriment of their education and social budgets. This will give rise to a very bitter debate in these Member States, which makes me think that it is unlikely an intergovernmental agreement of this kind or the new decision on 'own resources' can be ratified in time to alleviate the problems in 1985.

My question is therefore: has the Commission any ideas on how the problems which will occur in 1985 should be tackled in view of the difficulties in this connection? That is also why I said that it is a good thing that we now know that this supplementary 1984 budget was necessary. In the Council it has too often been claimed that this was not the case, but having said that, Mr President, I also say that we have far from solved the problems arising in 1985, and I believe rather more detailed information on this point is needed from the Commission.

Mr Cornelissen (PPE). — (NL) I should like to express appreciation on behalf of the PPE Group, above all for the Commissioner's answer. He has taken over the financial helm of our Community at an extremely difficult time, and I wish him every success. I can promise him that my group will observe his progress constructively and, of course, critically.

Mr President, in politics, too, the main thing is not policy itself but the results achieved with it. We therefore very much welcome the fact that we have today been told of the results achieved with the 1984 budget. The obvious question is: can we have an assurance that it will be customary in future for the European Parliament to be informed of the previous year's overall financial results at its February part-session? I would call it a kind of *Notenboom* procedure, Part II. I also think it would be a good thing because we usually have a debate on the new agricultural prices during the March part-session, and it is very important to have the previous year's results on that occasion.

From the Commissioner's answer I conclude that the 1984 results will not make it any easier to find a solution to the budgetary problems that will arise in 1985. I will just mention a few aspects. On balance there was a deficit of 520m ECU in 1984. Some 20 000m is

Cornelissen

needed for agricultural expenditure, rather than the 18 000m entered in the 1985 budget that was rejected. In other words, we have another setback here, a deficit, if you like, of 2 000m ECU, and that is still based on the present situation and the agricultural prices now proposed by the Commission. I listened carefully to the debate yesterday and today, but I have not yet heard any appeals for a reduction in agricultural expenditure in 1985. A deficit of 2 000m then. To this must be added the British contribution, 1 500m ECU gross. If I add up all these figures, Mr President, I arrive at a total deficit above the rejected draft budget of 500m plus 2 000m plus 1 500m, making 4 000m ECU, and all this as things now stand.

Mr President, in the circumstances I have some difficulty with the Commissioner's approach to finding a solution for the 1985 budget. He refers to the responsibility which all concerned bear. But my group feels that the Commission too must accept its responsibility in this respect. I would also refer in this connection to a motion for a resolution tabled by the Committee on Budgets, which calls on the Commission to set the procedure in motion.

We are thus in fact asking the Commissioner to submit a new budgetary document. Another reason why this is so necessary is that it will make the gravity of the Community's present financial situation abundantly clear. Finally, I should like to ask if the Commission is also prepared to submit to us a document explaining why some 300 million ECU of non-compulsory expenditure was not used in 1984.

Mr Curry (ED). — Mr President, first of all I should like to bring some comfort to the Commissioner. He has been talking about holes all day — budgetary holes. My intention has been caught by an article in today's *Dernières Nouvelles d'Alsace* which says that the number of holes bears no relationship to the quality of the Gruyère cheese and that the Office of Cheeses in Switzerland has said that while the quantity of cheese with insufficient holes has risen by 20% over the last year, the quality of the product is still reliable. Unfortunately, Commissioner, the Community is not a cheese and hence the holes in the Community have a more important incidence.

I should like to consider Mr Andriessen's document, 'Volume II of the Commission proposal on the fixing of agricultural products, the financial implications'. Financial implications are not popular in sections of this Parliament, but we are obliged to scrutinize them from time to time. I see that the preliminary draft budget asked for 19 300 million. The revision of the short-term trend — which is a roundabout way of saying 'what has happened to the dollar' — is 450 million.

Then we have the shift of payments, which you have enlarged upon, and then — what I find is an enchanting rabbit out of a rather mysterious hat — the clear-

ance of accounts. Who are the sinners who are to provide 150 million? What are the sins which have been adjudicated? Have they been adjudicated yet? Will there not be a political compromise in the Commission which might make this mysterious present disappear? Could you explain where this happy and fortuitous 150 million comes from?

Then we have the incidence of the farm prices. Not mentioned here but appearing in other parts of the budget is the fact that when you cut farm prices you also cut the Community resources you get from your levies. So the very act of cutting prices has an incidence on the revenue as well. This is not an argument against cutting them, it is simply an arithmetic conclusion. So there is a slightly higher cost than is mentioned in the specifically agricultural connection.

What concerns me is the whole principle of budgetary discipline. The original estimate was 19 300 million. If you apply the budgetary discipline formula, that gives you a maximum for next year of 20 600 million. The services of Mr Andriessen are estimating that they can hold agricultural expenditure next year at 19 500-20 000 million. I am very much afraid that the Ministers of Agriculture will say, 'What a marvellous idea budgetary discipline is. We never thought it would be so helpful to us. In fact, there is 600 million extra'. Are you confident that budgetary discipline will not turn out to be an double-edged sword and an incitement to profligacy rather than an incitement to restraint? That is a very real danger.

Finally — and I notice that time has not stood still for me — may I welcome Mr Andriessen's words about what we would call a medium-term financial strategy. Mr Andriessen also talks about a medium-term agricultural strategy. May I express the hope that he talks about his two strategies so that they are complementary?

Mrs Barbarella (COM). — (IT) I should like to put two precise questions to Commissioner Christophersen. First of all, I should like him to make it somewhat clearer to me — to me, and to others as well — what debts are outstanding from 1984. I have to say that, despite the accuracy of the Commissioner's statement, I have still some doubts. I should like to understand better the meaning of the figure of 520 million units of account deficit of which the Commissioner spoke. Does this figure include also the 202 million EAGGF (Guarantee Section) deficit, or not? And, while we are at it, how is this deficit of 520 million units of account made up?

And, still on the same subject, I want to add that we should like to be somewhat better informed regarding the structural expenditure, for which commitments were given in 1984 and which will be paid in 1985. From this standpoint there is a shady area that I think deserves to be clarified. Some people have said —

Barbarella

there have been rumours according to which the structural expenses transferred to 1985, and I am talking about payments, amount in reality to approximately 1 000 million units of account. It is evident, Mr Commissioner, that this 1 000 million would considerably increase the 1985 payments and, obviously, would be added to the deficit of 520 million that you referred to, and the 2 000 million agricultural expenditure, which you also referred to, to cover 1985 expenditure in full.

I therefore think it necessary that you should be more specific on this point, so as to enlighten us better as to what the real debts for 1985, deriving from the execution of the 1984 budget, are. You will certainly understand how concerned Parliament is to learn that the already worrying financial situation in which we find ourselves today will be made even worse by these enormous figures.

The second question that I should like to put to Commissioner Christophersen is this: I should like to know what initiatives the Commission intends to take regarding the 1985 budget.

The Commissioner has told us twice — I noted this — that we have to find a quick solution to our budgetary problems. We all agree: but we should also like to know what definite measures the Commission intends to put forward. So far, the Commission has been silent on this point. We should like to know, in definite terms, what the Commission proposes to do.

Mrs Scrivener (L).—(FR) Mr President, honourable Members, our debate today is necessary because, I think, it enables us to clarify matters.

It enables the House to express all its anxiety about the financial situation that has been with us since 1984 — with, of course, its extension into 1985 too. It also enables the new Commission to clarify all the shadowy areas which may still seem to exist, by giving Parliament all the information required. And, ultimately, I think this exchange between our two institutions should mean we can re-establish most of the confidence which, it has to be admitted, has been somewhat shaken over the past few months. In this way, it should introduce a new type of relations — at least I hope it will.

Parliament asked some very precise questions. I believe Mr Christophersen replied with clarity and I thank him for it.

The Commission request about a supplementary budget for 1984 was, in fact, fully justified because, without further income, the Community would have been unable to pursue its activities. So may I denounce the attitude of certain Member States which, at the time, spread the rumour that these funds were not needed and the supplementary budget was pointless.

This is not the way to carry on and ultimately their only intention was to sow the seeds of doubt and, of course, to pressurize the European Parliament about its attitude to the 1985 budget.

But we cannot live in a Community where, all the year round, the institutions are tossing different figures at each other without ever giving any serious proof.

Today, I think, you have tried to find answers to my questions, but tomorrow, the Commission will have to give us its own financial details. We must stop this game of hide-and-seek we have played too often in recent years. The Commissioner's figures confirm our idea that the 1985 budget needed to be rejected and it is not 1 300 million ECU but 2 000 million and maybe even a little more that needs to be found for agriculture. This puts an end to the pipedream of some governments which thought they could find the means of coping with such a deficit in the course of the year and believed that, ultimately, they could finance 12 months' spending with 10 months' credits.

Mr President, Parliament did not see fit to include a question on the financial implications of enlargement on the agenda. We are sorry about this because we need to know the exact cost to the Community before and not after the decision on enlargement. That is what you said — not on this point, perhaps, but in general and, of course, we share your feeling.

So we are awaiting a precise estimate of the financial implications of the entry of Spain and Portugal from the Commission. The idea is not to delay enlargement. On the contrary, it is to prepare it to best advantage so as to avoid the Community being suffocated.

Those are the one or two things I wanted to say on my Group's behalf. The budget has to remain the reflection of what we want to do. It cannot be otherwise.

President. — Before we move on to the next speaker, I want the House to consider the request for an early vote on the motion for a resolution in Doc. 2-1640/84.

(Parliament approved the request)

The vote will be held at 6 p.m. tomorrow.

Mr Curry (ED). — It is not to complain about the result, Mr President, but if the bells ring outside to alert Members to a vote which is taking place simultaneously, it is not very helpful to them. If we are to have a vote, a little notice so that the troops can be gathered would be helpful. This was not heavily contested, so it is immaterial, but as a normal practice it would be quite useful.

President. — I realized that the bell was going, Mr Curry, but we were pressed for time, and I am sorry that it happened on this occasion.

Mr Pasty (RDE). — *(FR)* Mr President, what common agricultural policy do we want for Europe and what should it mean for the budget? The Community institutions have apparently not always answered this question and, under pressure of events, have been content to meet the most urgent needs — that is to say to dam up expenditure without any serious thought about a clear picture of the future of European agriculture.

This absence of a picture of the future has for all too long been an alibi for not changing the rules on the way markets are managed, which as they were designed in the 1960s, are no longer right for the economic realities of the 1980s. It is clear that, today, now we are rediscovering the virtues of a market economy, a system of price guarantees for unlimited production is no longer defensible. But this has led to a gradual dismantling of what was there, without any other prospects being offered to the Community's agricultural producers — hence their currently very profound distress.

Allowing people to believe that the CAP has been completed because milk quotas have been introduced and there are production thresholds for cereals and that there is a framework for it all because of what we are pleased to call budgetary discipline would be an even greater error than the one consisting of so far not changing the existing rules because it would soon condemn a large part of European agriculture to extinction.

The present system combines the drawbacks of liberalism — risk, that is to say — with those of dirigism — constraint. It deprives the farmers of the advantages of either of these two systems. All you have to do is read the Official Journal of the European Communities to see that there has never been such a plethora of agricultural regulations and that it is perhaps time to impose production quotas or thresholds for this unbridled regulatory activity centred on the Rond-Point Schuman in Brussels.

It is urgent for the Community to fix the aims of its agricultural policy and the means of attaining them. It must start by having a policy of guiding production in the light of foreseeable trends on the world market and also of the need we shall be faced with in the coming years to step up our food aid to take up the challenge of hunger in the world.

It is moreover wrong to claim that Europe has reached agricultural self-sufficiency. The Community's food and agriculture trade balance is showing very much of a deficit with the rest of the world — USD 21 000 million in 1983. Our livestock industry is still very dependent on protein imports from the USA and Brazil and the deficit with these countries was as much as 10 000 million ECU in 1983. If the Community wanted to assure its independence in this vital sector of its economy, and this is a vital one — and considerations of a strategic and an economic nature should encourage it to do so — then millions of hectares should go to the production of the vegetable protein we currently import. The pressure on the EAGGF would be reduced by this amount.

It is imperative, if Europe wants to go on playing a political role in the world, for it to maintain its position on the great international food markets and give itself the means of doing so, in particular by bringing its export credit practices into line with those of its competitors — and I am thinking of the USA here. Lastly, all possibilities of using agricultural products for industrial purposes, particularly for ethanol production, should be investigated.

Asserting Europe's agricultural vocation by ensuring that it is more independent of the rest of the world for its food, by consolidating its position on the world markets and making the Community's effort with food aid more selective with a view to reducing structural inequality — which means finding an answer for the SMI and reserving structural aid for the unfavoured regions — should be the guidelines of a renewed common agricultural policy of the kind that would give the European farmers confidence once more in their future and in Europe.

Our Group hopes that these new guidelines will be reflected in the budget proposals for 1985 in respect of which the European Parliament is still awaiting Commission and Council initiative.

(Applause from the right)

President. — I am sorry I cannot take any more speakers this evening, we have run out of time. The debate will have to be concluded tomorrow.

(The sitting closed at 7 p.m.)¹

¹ For the next day's agenda, see Minutes.

ANNEX

*Votes***Commission action on European Parliament opinions on Commission proposals delivered at the December 1984 and January 1985 part-sessions**

This is a report on action taken by the Commission on amendments proposed at the December 1984 and January 1985 part-sessions, within the framework of Parliamentary consultation, and on disaster aid as arranged with Parliament's Bureau.

A.1. Commission proposals to which Parliament proposed amendments that have been accepted in full by the Commission

1. Report by Mr Sälzer on the Commission's proposals to the Council (COM(84) 271 final):

- (i) for a Council decision adopting a research and training programme (1985-1989) in the field of controlled thermonuclear fusion;
- (ii) for a Council decision complementing Council Decision 84/1/Euratom, EEC, of 22 December 1983 — realization of a tritium handling laboratory.

An amended proposal for a Council decision complementing Council Decision 84/1/Euratom, EEC of 22 December 1983 — realization of a tritium handling laboratory — has just been approved by the Commission for transmission to the Council. This new proposal incorporates Parliament's amendments.

As to a proposal for a Council decision adopting a research and training programme in the field of controlled thermonuclear fusion, the Commission has approved an amended proposal, incorporating all Parliament's amendments, for transmission to the Council.

Commission's position at debate: verbatim report of proceedings, 16 January 1985, pp. 110-112.

Text of motion for a resolution adopted by Parliament: Minutes of 17 January 1985, pp. 42-46.

2. Report by Mr Van Rooy on the Commission's proposal (COM(84) 412 final) for a seventeenth directive on the harmonization of the laws of the Member States relating to turnover taxes — exemption from value added tax on the temporary importation of goods other than means of transport.

The Commission has accepted the two amendments suggested by Parliament:

- the first aims to ensure that the proposed provisions do not put small and medium-sized businesses at a disadvantage as compared to multinationals;
- the second stresses the notion that in the event of the benefits of temporary importation being transferred to any other person, that person must satisfy the conditions under which the exemption was initially granted and must assume all the obligations incumbent on the holder of the original authorization. A proposal for a directive amending the Commission's original proposal will be transmitted to the Council in the very near future.

Commission's position at debate: verbatim report of proceedings, 13 December 1984, pp. 283-288.

Text of motion for a resolution adopted by Parliament: Minutes of 13 December 1984, pp. 70-72.

A.II. Commission proposals to which Parliament proposed amendments that have been partially accepted by the Commission

1. Report by Mr Turner on the Commission proposal to the Council (COM(84) 231 final) for a decision adopting a programme on the management and storage of radioactive waste (action programme on nuclear fission energy research).

A proposal amending its original proposal has just been adopted by the Commission for transmission to the Council and to Parliament for information.

This new proposal incorporates all Parliament's amendments (with the exception of amendments 4 and 5) relating to various annexes to the Commission's original communication to the Council.

Commission's position at debate: verbatim report of proceedings, 15 January 1985, pp. 71-72.

Text of motion for a resolution adopted by Parliament: Minutes of 17 January 1985, pp. 38-40.

2. Report by Mr Abelin on the Commission proposal to the Council (COM(84) 404 final) for a directive on the harmonization of the laws of the Member States relating to tax arrangements for the carry-over of losses by undertakings.

The only amendment of substance proposed by Parliament is the extension from two to three financial years of the period against which losses for any given year may be offset. The Commission has accepted this amendment.

The Commission is now working on a proposal for amendment to that effect; it will be sent to the Council and to Parliament for information in the very near future.

Commission's position at debate: verbatim report of proceedings, 17 January 1985, pp. 127-128.

Text of motion for a resolution adopted by Parliament: Minutes of 17 January 1985, pp. 74-75.

3. Report by Mr Cassidy on the Commission's proposal to the Council (COM(84) 182 final) for a directive amending Directive 69/169/EEC on the harmonization of provisions laid down by law, regulation or administrative action relating to exemption from turnover tax and excise duty on imports in international travel.

In its resolution Parliament considers that the tax-free allowance for travellers coming from non-member countries should be raised, from 1 January 1985, to 150 ECU for travellers aged 15 and over and to 50 ECU for travellers under 15. The Commission had proposed annual increases raising the allowance from 60 ECU in 1985 to 85 ECU in 1988.

The Commission agrees with Parliament that the level of tax-free allowances for travellers within the Community should not be used as a point of reference for determining allowances for travellers from non-member countries.

Parliament's figure of 150 ECU would mean a tripling of the allowance for travellers from non-member countries and bring it much closer to the current intra-Community allowance of 280 ECU.

It would be inadvisable to support the principle of such an alignment. What matters is for the Community to speed up implementation of a specific system of allowances to create a genuine internal market.

However, to go some way towards meeting Parliament's concern, the Commission intends to amend its proposal shortly to raise the tax-free allowance for travellers from non-member countries from 1 January 1985 to 100 ECU for travellers aged 15 and over and to 40 ECU for travellers under 15.

The Commission will raise the possibility of obtaining reciprocity from non-member countries under the New York and Kyoto Conventions with the Council.

Commission's position at debate: verbatim report of proceedings, 17 January 1985, pp. 115-116.

Text of motion for a resolution adopted by Parliament: Minutes of 17 January 1985, pp. 57-58.

4. Second report by Mr Sherlock on proposals (COM(84) 226 final) supplemented by COM(84) 532 final and COM(84) 564 final, concerning:

- I. a directive on the approximation of the laws of the Member States concerning the lead and benzene content of petrol;
- II. a directive amending Council Directive 70/220/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to measures to be taken against air pollution by gases from engines of motor vehicles.

On 23 January the Commission decided to present an amended proposal to the Council under the second paragraph of Article 149 of the Treaty.

Commission's position at debate: verbatim report of proceedings, 12 December 1984, pp. 195-196 and 198.

Text of motion for resolution adopted by Parliament: Minutes of 12 December 1984, pp. 65-71.

B. Commission proposals to which Parliament proposed amendments that the Commission has not felt able to accept

1. Report by Mr Casini on the Commission's proposal to the Council (COM(84) 214 final) for a Regulation (Euratom, ECSC, EEC) introducing special and temporary measures to terminate the service of certain officials in the scientific and technical services of the European Communities.

The report contained a proposed amendment to the Commission proposal. This amendment was adopted by Parliament on 18 January.

The amendment would limit the scope of the regulation to officials who request application of the measures concerned.

The Commission feels that, given the specific skills required by the various JRC research programmes, it must be possible to terminate the service of high-grade officials with or without their consent if the desired objective (adaptation of JRC structures of the JRC to the research programmes) cannot be achieved on a voluntary basis because of the skills involved.

The Commission's position reflects the present situation of the JRC. It has no desire to create a precedent.

Parliament's resolution calls for the following additional comments:

Point 2 of Resolution

'Notes that the problem stems from the permanent contracts under which these scientists and technicians were engaged, which entitle them to remain on full pay until retirement age, even though their particular skills are no longer required;'

This comment may well reflect the reality of the situation, but it is not correct to say that the individuals concerned are regarded as having been engaged on permanent contract. They are, in fact, officials.

Point 5 of Resolution

'Expects the Commission to set this proposal within a personnel administration system providing greater flexibility and mobility on a voluntary basis;'

The Commission can confirm that termination of service is only one of the mobility measures envisaged.

Point 6 of Resolution

'Points out the need to offer research workers within Europe better opportunities for exchanges; insists that recruitment to replace retired officials should be conducted as far as possible on the basis of exchange contracts following the recommendations of the Münch report;'

The Commission is aware of the benefits to be gained from scientific exchanges with national research bodies. It feels, nevertheless, that this would only go part of the way towards meeting its requirements. It therefore wishes to retain the option of direct recruitment of staff with the necessary skills.

Point 7 of Resolution

'Calls on the Commission to show separately in the budget the cost of the measures proposed, indicating the number of persons concerned and those who have subsequently found employment;'

The cost of the measures will be shown under a separate budget heading. As far as the other information requested by Parliament is concerned, the Commission does not feel that the budget is the proper place for publication of such information. I would, however, be prepared to supply Parliament with this information direct.

Commission's position at debate: Verbatim report of proceedings, 17 January 1985, pp. 281-282.

Text of motion for a resolution adopted by Parliament: Minutes of 18 January 1985, p. 29.

C. Commission proposals in respect of which Parliament delivered favourable opinions or did not request formal amendment

1. Second report by Mrs Weber on the Commission's proposal to the Council (COM(84) 291 final) for a directive on the financing of health inspections and controls of fresh meat.

Parliament approved the Commission's proposal.

The Council adopted the proposal on 19 January.

However, the text adopted by the Council differs from that approved by Parliament in one respect: the Member States have reserved the possibility of collecting a higher amount than provided for in the Community context.

Commission's position at debate: no debate

Text of motion for a resolution adopted by Parliament: Minutes of 18 January 1985, p. 17.

D. Information on aid for natural disasters granted since the last part-session

Intra-Community emergency aid

None

*Emergency aid to non-member countries**Financial aid*

<i>Country</i>	<i>Amount</i>	<i>Grounds</i>	<i>Administered by</i>	<i>Date of decision</i>
Ethiopia	35 000 000 ECU	Famine	EEC delegation	21 December 1984
Mali	10 650 000 ECU	Famine	EEC delegation	21 December 1984
Mauritania	1 500 000 ECU	Famine	EEC delegation	21 December 1984
Niger	10 250 000 ECU	Famine	EEC delegation	21 December 1984
Chad	6 000 000 ECU	Famine	EEC delegation	21 December 1984
Sudan	12 000 000 ECU	Famine	EEC delegation	21 December 1984
Cameroon	1 600 000 ECU	Famine	EEC delegation	21 December 1984
Sudan*	3 000 000 ECU	Famine	UNHCR	21 December 1984
Mozambique	3 600 000 ECU	Famine	Licross	21 December 1984

* Ethiopian refugees.

Food aid

<i>Country</i>	<i>Quantity/ Product</i>	<i>Grounds</i>	<i>Administered by</i>	<i>Date of decision</i>
Sudan	9 221 t cereals	Famine	WFP	29 January 1985
Uganda	2 980 t cereals	Famine	WFP	29 January 1985
Kenya	197 t vegetable oil	Famine	WFP	29 January 1985
Burundi	198 t vegetable oil	Famine	WFP	29 January 1985
	132 t sugar	Famine	WFP	29 January 1985
Ethiopia	2 000 t cereals	Famine	ICRC	29 January 1985
Ethiopia	500 t butteroil	Famine	Oxfam	29 January 1985
Ethiopia	500 t butteroil	Famine	Dutch	29 January 1985
	100 t sugar	Famine	Interchurch	29 January 1985
	100 t dried fish	Famine	Aid	29 January 1985

SITTING OF WEDNESDAY, 13 FEBRUARY 1985

Contents

- | | | | |
|--|-----|--|-----|
| 1. <i>Decision on urgency:</i>
<i>Mr Tolman; Mr Musso</i> | 77 | | |
| 2. <i>Supplementary budget 1984 (agricultural sector 1985)</i>
<i>(Docs 2-1304/84 and 2-1611/84) (contd):</i>
<i>Mr Eyraud; Mr Aigner; Mrs Boserup; Mr De Vries; Mr Fich; Mr Langes; Mr Christophersen (Commission); Mr Curry; Mr Christophersen; Mr Cornelissen; Mr Christophersen; Mr Fich; Mr Christophersen</i> | 78 | | |
| 3. <i>ERDF — Report (Doc. 2-1544/84) by Mr De Pasquale:</i>
<i>Mr De Pasquale; Mr Griffiths; Mrs Boot; Mr Hutton; Mr Lalor; Mr Vandemeulebroucke; Mr Poetschki; Mr Guerneur; Mr Varfis (Commission)</i> | 84 | | |
| 4. <i>Welcome</i> | 90 | | |
| 5. <i>Integrated Mediterranean programmes — Oral questions with debate (Doc. 2-1457/84), by Mr De Pasquale and others, to the Council; (Doc. 2-1591/84), by Mr De Pasquale and others, to the Commission; and (Doc. 2-1458/84), by Mr Lambrias and others, to the Council:</i>
<i>Mr De Pasquale; Mr Lambrias; Mr Forte (Council); Mr Delors (Commission); Mr Sakellariou; Mr Ligios; Mr Hutton; Mr Alavanos; Mr Romeo; Mr Musso; Mr Almirante; Mr Avgerinos; Mr Bernard-Reymond; Mr C. Beazley; Mrs De March; Mrs Fuillet; Mr Lambrias; Mr Filinis; Mr Mattina; Mr Poettering; Mr Trivelli; Mr von der Vring; Mr Maher; Mrs Gadioux; Mr Forte; Mr Delors</i> | 91 | | |
| 6. <i>Welcome</i> | 112 | | |
| 7. <i>Question Time (Doc. 2-1593/84) (contd):</i>
<i>Questions to the Council</i> | | | |
| • <i>Question No 82, by Mrs Ewing: Alleviation of transport problems in peripheral areas and islands:</i>
<i>Mr Forte (Council); Mrs Ewing; Mr Forte; Mr Hughes; Mr Forte; Mr Raftery; Mr Forte</i> | 112 | | |
| | | • <i>Question No 83, by Mr FitzGerald: EEC investment aid for Cork City and County:</i>
<i>Mr Forte; Mr Flanagan; Mr Forte; Mr Raftery; Mr Forte; Mr Griffiths; Mr Forte</i> | 113 |
| | | • <i>Question No 84, by Mr Flanagan: Consumer protection:</i>
<i>Mr Forte; Mr Flanagan; Mr Forte</i> | 114 |
| | | • <i>Question No 85, by Mr Hutton: Use of abstention in Council decision-making:</i>
<i>Mr Forte; Mr Hutton; Mr Forte; Mr Cryer; Mr Forte; Mr Newton Dunn; Mr Forte; Mr Van Miert; Mr Forte</i> | 114 |
| | | • <i>Question No 86, by Mrs Thome-Patenôte: Cost of the European passport:</i>
<i>Mr Forte; Mrs Thome-Patenôte; Mr Forte; Mr Taylor; Mr Forte; Mrs Lizin; Mr Forte; Mr Taylor; Mr Forte; Mr De Vries; Mr Forte; Mr Vandemeulebroucke; Mr Forte; Mrs Viehoff; Mr Forte</i> | 115 |
| | | • <i>Question No 87, by Mr Barrett: Cork-Limerick gas pipeline:</i>
<i>Mr Forte; Mr Flanagan; Mr Forte; Mr Raftery; Mr Forte; Mr Taylor</i> | 117 |
| | | • <i>Question No 88, by Mr Donnez: Site of the European Synchrotron:</i>
<i>Mr Forte; Mr Donnez; Mr Forte; Sir Peter Vanneck; Mr Forte</i> | 117 |
| | | • <i>Question No 90, by Mr Van Miert: Statute of Members of the European Parliament:</i>
<i>Mr Forte; Sir James Scott-Hopkins; Mr Forte</i> | 118 |
| | | • <i>Question No 91, by Mr Andrews: Signatories to the Council of Europe convention for protection of individuals with regard to the automatic processing of personal data:</i>
<i>Mr Forte</i> | 118 |
| | | • <i>Question No 92, by Mr Pearce: Meetings of the Council:</i>
<i>Mr Forte; Mr Pearce; Mr Forte; Mr Cryer; Mr Forte; Mr Newton Dunn;</i> | |

- Mr Forte; Mr Cot; Mrs Ewing; Mr Forte; Mr Van Miert; Mr Forte; Mr J. Elles 118
- Question No 93, by Mrs Dury: Texts pending before the Council:

Mr Forte; Mrs Dury; Mr Forte; Mr Marshall; Mr Forte; Mr Tomlinson; Mr Forte; Mr Clinton; Mr Forte 120
- Questions to the Foreign Ministers 121
- Question No 114, by Mrs Ewing: Turkish Peace Association prisoners:

Mr Forte (Foreign Ministers); Mrs Ewing; Mr Forte; Ms Tongue; Mr Forte; Mr Ulburghs; Mr Alavanos; Mr Forte; Mrs Lizin; Mr Forte; Mr Pearce; Mr Forte 121
 - Question No 116, by Mr Van Miert: Situation in Uganda:

Mr Forte; Mr Van Miert; Mr Forte 123
 - Question No 117, by Mr Selva: European anti-terrorist squad:

Mr Forte; Mr Selva; Mr Forte 123
 - Question No 118, by Mr De Vries: Persecution of the Baba'is:

Mr Forte; Mr De Vries; Mr Forte; Mr Marshall; Mr Forte; Mr Alavanos; Mr Forte; Mr Habsburg; Mr Forte; Mr Clinton; Mr Forte; Mr Vandemeulebroucke; Mr Forte 123
 - Question No 119, by Mr Deniau: 40th anniversary of the Yalta agreements:

Mr Forte; Mr Deniau; Mr Cot 125
8. Provisional twelfths — Report (Doc. 2-1550/84) by Mr Curry and Mr Fich
Mr Fich; Mr Cornelissen; Mr Christophersen (Commission); Mr Cot; Mr Cornelissen; Mr Christophersen 126
9. Combating terrorism — Oral questions with debate by Mr Formigioni (Doc. 2-1451/84/rev. II) to the Foreign Ministers and (Doc. 2-1452/84/rev.) to the Commission:

Mr Formigioni; Mr Forte (Foreign Ministers); Lord Cockfield (Commission); Mr Amadei; Mr Habsburg; Mr Prag; Mr Barzanti; Mrs Veil; Mr Baudoin 128
10. Votes
Mr Arndt; Mr Fich; Mr Sutra; Mr Fich; Mr De Pasquale; Mr Hutton; Mr Sakellariou; Mr Filinis; Mr Cot; Mr Christophersen (Commission); Mr Ford; Mr d'Ormesson 136
11. Combating terrorism (contd):
Mr Van der Lek; Mr Romualdi; Mr Tortora; Mrs Fuillet; Mr Lecanuet; Mr Ulburghs; Mr Penders; Mr Cassidy; Mr Estgen; Mr Forte (Foreign Ministers) 138

IN THE CHAIR: LADY ELLES

Vice-President

(The sitting was opened at 9 a.m.)¹

1. DECISION ON URGENCY

Proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 2-1592/85 — COM(85) 13 final) for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 804/68 on the common organization of the market in the milk and milk products sector and Regulation (EEC) No 857/84 adopting general rules for the application of a levy referred to in Article 5c of Regulation (EEC) No 804/68 in the milk products sector

Mr Tolman (PPE), Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food. — (NL) Madam Presi-

dent, in connection with the item you have announced, namely the decision on the urgency of a number of proposals, I should like, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, to make the following remark on the proposal for a regulation on milk and milk products.

The Committee on Agriculture is in favour of urgent procedure. Although three proposals have been tabled, Parliament's opinion has been requested on the second proposal only. From a legal point of view I think this is correct, although it can happen from time to time that even jurists have different interpretations, as you know, Madam President. Nevertheless, the Committee on Agriculture wishes to make a comment on this in passing: since the other two proposals concern rules of application which are actually just as important, we wonder whether it would not be more sensible to forward the other proposals as well to the Committee on Agriculture for its opinion and to submit them to Parliament.

¹ Approval of the Minutes: see Minutes.

Tolman

So we agree on urgent procedure, Madam President, but I felt it was necessary to make this more than formal comment.

(Parliament adopted urgent procedure)

President. — I propose that this item be entered on Parliament's agenda for Friday. The deadline for tabling amendments will be 1 p.m. today.

*
* *

Proposals from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 2-963/84 — COM(84) 554 final) for two regulations and two directives concerning the Mediterranean area

Mr Tolman (PPE), Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food. — (NL) We agree, Madam President.

Mr Musso (RDE). — (FR) Madam President, in order to avoid all ambiguity, I should like to ask you to clarify one point. Is it right that the request for urgency relates to the Committee on Agriculture's report, of which I am the author?

President. — Mr Musso, there are two matters here. One is the Council regulation amendments and the other is your report. Subject to approval by the House, I propose that your report should be taken on the Friday morning together with the items requested by the Council.

(Parliament adopted the President's proposal and the request for urgent procedure)

The deadline for tabling amendments to Mr Musso's report will be 1 p.m. today.¹

2. Supplementary budget 1984 (agricultural sector 1985)
(contd)

President. — The next item is the continuation of the joint debate on two oral questions on agricultural expenditure (Doc. 2-1304/84 and Doc. 2-1611/84).²

Mr Eyraud. — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, agricultural expenditure for 1985 will depend first of all on the prices which are set. But they will also depend on our determination to apply three of the basic principles of the Treaty of Rome: the single mar-

ket, financial solidarity, and the Community preference.

First the single market: the differences between guide prices, wholesale prices and the prices paid to producers are becoming wider and wider. Moreover, it is unrealistic to propose a reduction, or even a freeze, in agricultural prices, or limits on production. We would be wiser to set a limit to aid, and guarantee — but guarantee properly — no more than the amount consumed in the Community. Those who wish to produce more are then free to do so, and sell at world prices. Such a mixed economy could without doubt be met with the 20 000 million ECU referred to yesterday by Mr Christophersen, and perhaps with less. In all events, it would stop national governments taking steps to renationalize the common agricultural policy.

Financial solidarity. Yesterday Mr Thareau, referring to the Commission report on the agricultural situation for 1984, stressed the twenty-to-one income differential between the front runners and the tail-enders in agriculture. Differences between individuals and between regions will only worsen if we tackle the CAP from only the budgetary point of view. There is not much financial solidarity in attempting to cut back further appropriations which in 1984 totalled just 0.60% of the Community's GNP. It is not just farmers but the entire rural community which suffers by it. And there is no argument that the true figure is well below 0.60%, when we consider what food aid compensation costs — a third of budgeted expenditure — and the failures to apply the Community preference.

Such failures represent at least 4 000 million ECU in lost income, which is more than a fifth of the EAGGF Guarantee Section budget, and this is the case particularly because of our increasing imports of substitute products in place of Community protein. I should in fact like the Commission to put a precise figure on the cost of food aid compensation, and on failure to respect the Community preference. The lengthy and remarkable speeches made yesterday by the Members of the Commission responsible for agriculture and for the budget showed us that the Commission is open to dialogue and does indeed seem to have decided to try to find the answers, particularly through a good commercial policy.

In conclusion, may I remind the Commission of its responsibility to ensure respect for the Treaty of Rome — all of the Treaty of Rome.

Mr Aigner (PPE). — (DE) Madame President, ladies and gentlemen, I would first like to thank the Commissioner warmly for his cautious but very clear and sympathetic comments on the financial situation. He gave a clear indication that the Commission shares our desire to avoid at all costs using non-compulsory expenditure to cover compulsory expenditure to the detriment of the new policies. He made this very plain

¹ Documents received: see Minutes.

² See previous day's debate.

Aigner

in his reply and is also aware that Parliament has the last word on this matter.

Mr Christophersen, we rejected the budget in order to force the national governments to make their decisions clear at last to their respective parliaments. They cannot decide in favour of expenditure totalling millions and then leave the matter of where the money is supposed to come from in the hands of providence. Now at last — and this is a point which I have already made in the Bundestag — we are permitted to discuss these financial questions. We contributed towards this, and that was certainly a good thing. But, Commissioner, you should also make it quite clear to the general public that the ministers' decisions have created commitments which cannot be covered this year by a VAT rate of 1.4%. To take just the commitments which the Community has already entered into, the Court of Auditors' latest report stated that there were nearly 12 000 million units of account in the pipeline. This will have to be recovered in the next few years. We must be given a definite indication of the funds which the Community will need.

We must also, regardless of the financial possibilities, take advantage of market opportunities. Regardless of what the market offers, we must also be able to market existing supplies and surpluses, because any delay would cost millions more. I would like to ask a question on this point. As you promised, Commissioner, you will soon be commenting on further questions of detail before the Committee on Budgetary Control. Could the Commission examine the whole system of advances to see whether a better financial situation can be created without these advances paid to the Member States? Four years elapse between the payment of an advance and the establishment of an account, and the result is a deficit which is lost to the Commission because of arbitration formulae used in an attempt to reach a compromise.

Of course, we do not at the moment have time to go into matters of detail, but I would be grateful, Commissioner, if you could discuss these questions in detail with us in committee as soon as possible.

(Applause)

Mrs Boserup (COM). — *(DA)* Madam President, first of all I would like to thank the Commissioner for an excellent speech which we found very helpful, although we can gain no satisfaction from it as it does not allay our fears concerning future difficulties. What especially concerns me are the incredible political and formal difficulties the Member States will face when presented with supplementary bills of this size. The Commissioner must surely be aware that all the Member States are pursuing extremely restrictive financial policies, which means that public expenditure must remain within certain supportable limits, and I would therefore like to ask the Commissioner how he ima-

gines such difficulties can be resolved. Considerable amounts are involved, and quite unpredictable political difficulties may arise if such amounts can only be paid by refusing outright social or other expenditure strongly desired by the population. I do not think that this situation can continue. At all events I am convinced that the majority in Parliament was right to reject the accounts for 1982 on the grounds that, amongst other things, the Commission's monitoring and forecasting of expenditure were inadequate. It appears that its monitoring and forecasting continue to be inadequate, and I can only express the hope that things will be better under the new Commission.

Mr De Vries (L). — *(NL)* Madam President, I would like to make a couple of short comments with reference to what Mrs Scrivener has said. The budget situation within the European Communities is becoming increasingly serious and according to the Commission's statement yesterday, the 1984 budget shows a shortfall of 520 million ECU in spite of the supplementary advances paid by the Member States in 1984. The 1985 budget will cover ten months at the most and if West Germany and the Netherlands get their way, this shortfall will also be met by supplementary national advances. A third series of national supplements will then become necessary in order to pay Britain, in the course of 1985, its promised 1 000 million ECU — assuming that the Fontainebleau Agreement is honoured.

The repayment of the national advances for 1984 and 1985 will take up a large part of the budget in 1986 and later years. If you then add the costs associated with the accession of Spain and Portugal, the inescapable conclusion is that there will be a shortfall again in 1987 and perhaps even 1986. In other words, the Commission can begin right now on the report that it is required, under the Fontainebleau Agreement, to submit a year before the exhaustion of the new own resources.

That creates a bizarre situation in which the Member States will have to agree to a second increase in own resources, to 1.6%, with effect from 1 January 1988, if only to finance the repayment, in effect to themselves, of their own advances. That is, of course, unless they want to settle that problem too by means of an inter-governmental agreement. And then there is the exiting question of what effect this will all have on the so-called British question, since everyone, except the British, agrees that the repayments to Britain are conditional upon the continuing validity of the first, 1.4% own resources agreement. If, however, this has been superseded by 1987 or even earlier, we can expect a brand new rumpus with Great Britain well before 1988.

Seen in this light, the opposition on the part of Germany and the Netherlands, to the proposal to bring forward the date for the implementation of the own

De Vries

resources agreement to before 1 January is short-sighted. Who is actually governing in Bonn and the Hague? Chancellor Kohl and Prime Minister Lubbers who have repeatedly affirmed their intention of proceeding with European integration? Or their national accountants, Messrs Stoltenberg and Ruding, who never miss an opportunity to block progress by refusing a Community solution to the 1985 budget problems.

My Group, the Liberal and Democratic Group, urges the governments of the Federal Republic and the Netherlands to abandon their current strategy of linking own resources with the accession of Spain and Portugal. Far from advancing the cause of Europe, this linkage paralyses it.

Under no circumstances must the own resources agreement come into effect later than 1 January 1986. The Fontainebleau Agreement is not clear on this point and I would therefore like to hear Mr Christophersen's views on this matter. Am I right in thinking, Mr Christophersen, that, regardless of whether Spain and Portugal accede later than 1 January 1986, own resources will still be increased with effect from January so that these two issues will be separated in practise, as I have just advocated, not later than 1 January 1986?

Mr Fich (S). — (DA) Madam President, I would like to express my thanks for a speech which was in my view a good reply to the questions raised. Nevertheless, I would like to put three further questions, since there were three points which I believe were not covered.

The first question concerns the 500 million deficit for 1984: is it not true that this is to be paid in 1985, meaning that on top of the 2 000 million deficit in the agricultural sector there will be a further 500 million to cover the 1984 deficit?

As for my second question, the Commissioner made no mention whatsoever of the refund to the United Kingdom. Is this not a time-bomb which will involve an additional 1 000 million to be covered over and above the deficit we already have, resulting in a provisional shortfall of 3 500 million?

Coming to my third question, the Commissioner stated that we were obliged to cancel 300 million, mainly for 1983. This is not the interesting figure, though. What is of interest — and I would like confirmation of this point — is the fact that we had an appropriation for 1984 amounting to 4 300 million under non-differentiated appropriations, i.e. mainly non-compulsory expenditure, and of this figure 700 million was not used in 1984. Part of this 700 million can of course be carried over to the next year, but the fact remains that of the 4 300 million set aside for activities primarily in the non-compulsory sector the

Commission was unable to use 700 million. If the Commissioner can confirm this, I would conclude that this is pretty feeble; appropriations are there so as to be used in these priority areas.

Mr Langes (PPE). — (DE) Madam President, Commissioner Christophersen, as you will be aware, everyone who has spoken here on this subject has been extremely pleased that in February 1985 our questions have been answered so clearly. Thank you very much.

Of course, these clear replies were not encouraging. Although we cannot calculate the figure accurately to the nearest one hundred million, there is a yawning deficit of 3 500 to 4 000 million ECU in the 1985 budget. This is obviously a disturbing situation, especially since we also have to consider how, in connection with the farm price talks, we can find a solution which, while at all events reducing surpluses, does not damage farmers, especially those on small and family holdings, to such an extent that they are forced into unemployment. Thus, we must pursue an appropriate agricultural and social policy in a very tight financial situation.

This will make our work on the budget extremely difficult over the next few weeks. I would like to remind you, Commissioner, of the discussion which a small group of the Committee on Budgets held with you and President Delors, and I would be very grateful if you could submit a document to the Council and Parliament on the basis of our discussions here today, setting out clearly the figures relevant to our talks over the next few weeks so that we are not forced to begin by arguing over minor shortfalls.

When I have to go to the dentist's, I like to get the worst over with straight away and am pleased when things do not turn out as badly as expected. In the same way I think it would be much better for the Community if we could tell our governments quite simply that these are the facts — they might turn out rather better, but we should first act on the assumption that they will not!

Therefore, Commissioner, we once again urgently appeal to you to produce a document on which we can base our debate over the coming weeks. For we are concerned not merely with the financial question of needing a certain amount of money, but we must also conduct a political debate with the national governments and of course within the parties to make it clear that Europe cannot go on like this and that clear solutions are needed with regard to VAT and the raising of the VAT rate, otherwise Europe will cease to be viable.

If funds are provided by the Member States, as happened with the supplementary budget for 1984 and will probably happen again next year, because increase in the VAT to 1.4% has still not been ratified, it must

Langes

be made clear that these subsidies must stop and that it is beneath the Community's dignity to beg favours from the national governments. Surely none of us can have conceived the European Community in this role. We in this House shall thoroughly examine the political facts as required and promise that we shall do our best to ensure that a thrifty but sensible budget is produced.

Mr Christophersen, Vice-President of the Commission. — (DA) Madam President, I would like to express my thanks for the lengthy but constructive debate conducted yesterday and here this morning, and would like to start by making a couple of comments on Mr Langes' concluding speech.

Mr Langes called on us in the Community to take the correct figures as our starting point, using the allegory of how one should prepare oneself mentally for a visit to the dentist — and in fact I would go along with this way of describing the task in hand. I can assure you both the Commission and myself agree that one should work on the basis of the real figures, since even if the figures themselves are open to criticism, it would be unreasonable to expect the Commission to conceal the truth. I would therefore like to say to the Members who have expressed their concern at the growing deficit that, although they are in fact right to be concerned, the Commission cannot reasonably be taken to task on this account. The Commission will not accept the blame now that the results of the policy pursued by the Institutions are becoming apparent, in the form of substantial financial requirements. This is something which both Council and Parliament should have taken into account when voting on the proposals requiring this expenditure. In order to make the extent of our problems clear, I would like once more to outline the budget problem facing us in 1985. Many figures have been mentioned, but I believe that the situation can be summarized as follows: we knew in December that there would be a shortfall of 1 315 million ECU in the draft budget submitted by the Council of Ministers, representing the difference between the Commission and Council proposals. As a result of economic developments arising from the Commission's price proposals and the carrying over of 1984 payments to 1985, we now find that we will need to add 639 million to this 1 315 million. We thus arrive at 1 954 million ECU for the guarantee section of the EAGGF, an amount which is covered at this point in time.

There are then two further figures: we now find that overall deficit in the 1984 budget was 520 million an amount which must therefore be carried over to the 1985 budget — I shall return later to the details behind this figure — while on the other hand we are now able to revise expected revenue in 1985 upwards by 318 million ECU. Accordingly, the shortfall as calculated by the Commission will be 2 156 million ECU, plus — as Mr Fich and others are of course right to point out — the amount promised to the United King-

dom at Fontainebleau. I did not think I needed to mention this point, for I in fact believed that most were aware of it, but it is of course true that this amount has to be found as well.

It is clear that the figures I mentioned are calculated on the basis of certain assumptions, which are liable to change. In the words of Mr Langes, it may happen that once we actually get to the dentist it will be less painful than we feared, although if we are to draw up our budget sensibly, we cannot assume in advance that things will turn out better than they appear. We can be pleased if they do, but we should nevertheless take reality as our starting point. Other Members, such as Mrs Boserup, ask how the Governments of the Member States are supposed to solve this problem. That is a good question. I am pleased that Mrs Boserup has adopted a restrictive attitude to growth in public expenditure, but the governments and parliaments of the Member States will obviously have to allocate their expenditure according to priorities in the light of national and Community objectives. The Commission cannot relieve the Council of Ministers of this responsibility, since it is up to the Council of Ministers, and Parliament, to consider whether or not to accept this consequence of the Community. The Commission is naturally prepared for this eventuality, because it regards the budget amongst other things as an instrument for developing the Community.

In this connection, I would like to stress that the Community budget differs in certain respects from national budgets: growth in the Community budget need not entail growth in overall public expenditure. In many cases, growth in the Community budget may reflect relief of the national budgets. The Community's agricultural policy is a historic example in this respect, because one of the aims of the common agricultural policy is to relieve national budgets of considerable expenditure and instead apply the same resources to better effect through using these to finance a common policy. But this is a political problem of course.

Mrs Barbarella raised the question of commitments for 1985. I can state briefly that the commitment appropriations were taken into account in drafting the budget for 1985. They therefore do not represent supplementary expenditure, and on the whole it is a general principle that commitments for multi-annual programmes are included in the budget for the year in which they arise.

Mr Dankert asked about the deficit in 1984: how did it come about? What figures is the Commission using? At the moment, the situation can be summed up by saying that we overestimated Community revenue in 1984. That is the main factor involved, and the deficit of 520 million ECU is therefore primarily due to a loss of revenue. The agricultural levies in particular were considerably overestimated. Mr Dankert also asked about the budgetary consequences of the fact that a number of Member States did not pay their contribu-

Christophersen

tions under the intergovernmental agreement until after the end of 1984. The answer is that this did not have any effect on 1984 in purely accounting terms, but did influence the Community's liquidity situation. We therefore need to make a distinction between accounting and liquidity effects. The entire amount of 1 003 million ECU was entered in the books as paid in 1984, but we did have a problem as regards liquidity. This was also the reason why the Community for the first time had to make use of its overdraft facilities with the national financial administrations and part of the reason why certain payments had to be postponed from 1984 to 1985.

A number of Members were concerned about — or at any rate interested to know — the way in which the savings of around 300 million ECU on non-compulsory expenditure came about. Mr Aigner also raised this subject in his contribution. He called for a form of assurance that compulsory expenditure would not be systematically funded by subsequent savings on non-compulsory expenditure. Clearly, this is a view which I support and understand, because naturally it reflects Parliament's desire to work with real appropriations and not just appropriations on paper. However, I would draw attention to the fact that Parliament was aware of the reduction of around 300 million ECU in non-compulsory expenditure for 1984, which I referred to as a contribution towards financing the supplementary expenditure and took it as one of the starting points for its second and last debate on the supplementary budget for 1984. It was therefore nothing new, but formed part of the basis for the approval of the supplementary budget, and the 300 million were distributed over a number of individual sectors, i.e. the social sector, the Regional Fund, aid to third countries, EAGGF structural appropriations and a series of minor appropriations. So there is nothing new about this matter, it was part of the way in which the supplementary budget was funded. Mrs Scrivener raised the question of the burden which the enlargement of the Community would place on the budget. Although I would like to answer this question, I am not in a position to do so at the moment, since the budgetary impact of enlargement clearly depends to a great extent on what happens during the final enlargement negotiations. The faster integration of the two new countries proceeds, the fewer the derogations and the shorter the transitional period, the closer will be their alignment with the Community in purely budgetary terms and the greater their degree of budgetary integration. On the other hand, if they have more derogations and a longer transitional period, their budgetary integration will have to be correspondingly more gradual. However, I cannot go into any more detail on this subject or quote any figures, but I believe that most people would agree with the Commission on this point.

Mr Curry called for better control of the resources used. I would like to return to this subject on a later occasion before both Parliament and the Committee

on Budgetary Control, because there is clearly a need for better internal and external control, better project evaluation, better ongoing monitoring and improved cooperation between the Community and the national administrations, which are the responsible authorities in many cases. Mr Curry raised the subject of the 150 million ECU we expected to recover in connection with the clearance of accounts for earlier years and asked the following polemical question: who will then have to pay? I can reassure Parliament that this will not be any single country: I do not know whether there is anyone here who would feel directly addressed. Nor does this involve a single category of expenditure, but rather a wide range of minor expenditure which, as we know, the final statement of accounts has shown to be too high. In such cases, the Commission must insist that the money is repaid as a matter of principle. This is, incidentally, a principle to which I attach great importance for future statements of account since there are, unfortunately, several items of expenditure where it has been difficult, or even impossible, to obtain sufficient documentary evidence of legal basis for the expenditure. The Commission's position is that where such cases cannot be cleared up, repayment of these resources should be possible, at least in principle. We cannot insist that the national administrations spend resources where there is no legal basis for such expenditure. This would never be accepted in any of the individual countries. The Community therefore cannot accept this either.

Another question raised was when and how the Commission would attempt to influence the current budget situation. Mr Langes mentioned this point in his concluding speech, though Mr Cornelissen and others touched upon it as well. As far as 1985 is concerned, I would like to repeat what I said yesterday: the Commission is following developments very attentively, but clearly it is neither able nor willing to relieve the other institutions of their responsibility. On the basis of the draft budget submitted by the Commission last summer, the Council of Ministers has a clear responsibility to prepare a proposal to be submitted to Parliament for final consideration. The Commission cannot of course take on this responsibility. It is a matter for the Council, which must live up to its obligations. The Commission will lend the necessary assistance. It will press the Council to conclude its deliberations on the draft budget as quickly as possible to allow Parliament to adopt a definitive opinion on it as soon as possible. Immediately this matter is clarified, the Commission will take the necessary steps to ensure that at the end of the day we are dealing with the real figures. We will see to it that the figures are revised where necessary, but it is not at present up to the Commission, but rather the Council, to draw up a draft budget to be submitted to Parliament for final consideration. The Council is well aware of this, as is Parliament. The Commission therefore takes the view that its rôle now is to urge the Council to live up to its obligations in the Community and obviously, when the situation starts becoming clearer, we will have to consider the

Christophersen

question raised by Mr Langes and others as to how the Commission should help structure the final discussions, so we can get a clear picture of the budgetary problems we are to decide on at the end of the day.

This much is clear, and the Commission is prepared to supply the necessary material to ensure that we do not end up adopting a budget which turns out in a few months to have no connection with reality, which is obviously not the way to manage the development of the budget. This is a job for the Commission since it is able to do what the other institutions cannot — namely set out the budgetary facts in proper perspective.

In this connection, I would also like to express my thanks for the kind remarks concerning our endeavours to devise a multiannual procedure for drafting budgets. We cannot go on working with *ad hoc* solutions: we need to analyse and prepare developments over a period of several years. And from the Commission's point of view, it clearly also explains why it is important to finance the Community budget from own resources — predictable, independent own resources — for if, every year, we had to depend on the good will of the Member States, we would obviously not be able to carry out effective multiannual budgeting. I am therefore pleased with the support my remarks on multiannual budgets have received. Mr Aigner touched upon the need for clarity and transparency, and a more realistic form of accounting for predictable expenditure on, for example, building up Community, or intervention stocks. I can appreciate this standpoint, to which I am not unsympathetic, and I am considering how to improve the calculation of the expenditure which we know will be incurred by this policy. However, I do not have any concrete proposals to make at the moment — I would like to return to this subject on another occasion.

The same applies to the comments on the advance payments system. I would be willing to discuss this matter with the Committee on Budgetary Control and the Committee on Budgets if asked to do so, but I am not in a position to make any meaningful comments at the moment.

I think I have answered the first point raised by Mrs Boserup. As for the second, calling for better expenditure forecasts, I do not think there is any disagreement between us.

Mr De Vries raised an important question: if Spain and Portugal join the Community later than anticipated, will own resources nevertheless be increased on 1 January 1986? I do not want to start speculating on behalf of the Commission on the possibility that enlargement will not take place on time. I cannot accept this standpoint, since the Commission takes the view that enlargement will take place on 1 January 1986. Accordingly, the other points agreed at Fontainebleau will naturally take effect as well. However, we

are also aware that there is a political dimension, for whatever has been agreed regarding an increase in own resources, it will not come into effect until the ratification procedures have been completed in the Member States. Politically speaking therefore, it is possible for Member States to link the two events in practice. However, I do not want to start engaging in alarmist speculations at this juncture on a possible postponement of enlargement, since we find this is inconceivable. We fully believe that enlargement can and will take place on 1 January.

I think I answered the question by Mr Ove Fich concerning the 520 million in my opening remarks on the nature of the budget deficit. It is clear that these 520 million will be paid in 1985, but as there are movements in the other direction the figure stays at 2 156 million.

I would just like to thank you for your many contributions and apologize for burdening Parliament with a string of figures. However, if you ask for them, it up to me to provide them. This is not an attempt on my part to tie Parliament in knots or to confuse the debate by mentioning figures — the intention is first and foremost to establish the necessary clarity which is essential to the dialogue between the Commission and Parliament although, like many of those who have spoken, I acknowledge that some of the figures are disturbing. However, they represent a common challenge, since no one can now claim to have been caught unawares by developments. Now we all realize what kind of task is facing us, and I thank Parliament for giving me the opportunity to help achieve this realization.

(Applause)

Mr Curry (ED). — Madam President, I have a small problem about the figures, and I wonder whether the Commissioner could clear it up for me.

He said that the EAGGF was going to be 639 million more than the Commission anticipated. If I have read the document which goes with the farm prices correctly, that is made up of the changes in the economic situation, the price proposals and the carry-over, which is 202 m. He then said that the 1984 deficit was 520 m and that revenue would be 318 m more than expected, so once again the figure of 202 m appears. Now is this the same figure? Are there two figures of 202 m? Is it one figure counted twice? Could he clarify that 202 m for me?

May I make the suggestion that when there are to be a lot of figures, if the Commissioner found it possible to give the interpreters' booths just a list of the figures he will use, in tabular form, I am sure it would help them and help us. We appreciate the problems which are involved for all of us and we do not want to get the figures wrong.

Mr Christophersen, Vice-President of the Commission. — (DA) Madam President, I would like to avail myself of the opportunity to give an answer in writing — I think it would be difficult to engage in an extensive mathematical exercise at this point. I can say the following; however, the 202 million is the same 202 million, but there are movements in various different directions. The figure I referred to — the 1 956 million — is a net sum, but it would be easier to show the connection in writing.

Mr Cornelissen (PPE). — (NL) Mr President, my first comment on behalf of my Group was that we would like to see a report presented during the February session of each year analysing the results achieved in the previous year. May I assume that the absence of any reaction to this proposal on the part of the Commissioner means that he is in agreement with it. As a Parliament, we will then of course have to take the initiative to ensure that this item is placed on the agenda. It is certainly important to know whether the Commission can be relied on to do its bit.

Mr Christophersen, Vice-President of the Commission. — (DA) Mr Cornelissen need not fear that we shall not cooperate with Parliament. I should not need to say this at all, for the Commission is after all supposed to work with Parliament. Moreover, it is clear that we have nothing to hide — we are willing to submit the figures, so there is no need to worry about this point. The more openness, the better, for this will commit Parliament, including Mr Cornelissen, all the more. I therefore have nothing against mentioning figures. This is no problem for the Commission, and the more people know about the situation, the more difficult it is for them to evade their share of the responsibility. I am thus only too willing to do this.

Mr Fich (S). — (DA) Madam President, I put a very concrete question to the Commissioner which was not answered. 4 300 million was approved under differentiated appropriations, of which 700 million was not used — amounting to 16 %. I would like the Commissioner to confirm this, since I regard this as a scandal.

Mr Christophersen, Vice-President of the Commission. — (DA) Madam President, I cannot give a clear reply on this point off the cuff, but I am prepared to find the answer. It is just that I do not want to stand here improvising on shaky ground. Even though it might appear so, this would hardly be convincing.

President. — Thank you very much, Commissioner, for answering Members' questions. Perhaps you could answer these questions to the Committee on Budgets when you go to that committee, because they are obviously matters of great interest to Members.

The debate is closed.

The vote on the motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-1640/84) will be taken at the next voting time.

3. ERDF

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 2-1544/84) by Mr De Pasquale, on behalf of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning, on the results of the conciliation with the Council on

the proposal from the Commission to the Council for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 724/75 establishing a European Regional Development Fund.

Mr De Pasquale (COM). — (IT) Madam President, it is our intention to use the resolution under review as a means of submitting to the House for its approval a largely positive reaction to the new Regional Fund regulation which the Council adopted after discussion with Parliament and which came into effect on 1 January of this year.

Ladies and gentlemen, you will remember how long and troubled was the passage of this decision, how many delays and misunderstandings arose and how much resistance was put up. The Council had undertaken to adopt the new regulation by 1 January 1981 and what happened was that it adopted it by 1 January 1985, exactly four years later, a delay which has had not a negligible effect on the operation of the Fund and on its ability to tackle the regional imbalances which have meanwhile grown worse. When the governments finally reached agreement we were called upon for discussions. The date in question was 19 June of last year, the day following the European elections, which was clearly not an ideal one.

We should turn our minds, ladies and gentlemen, to considering what the current discussion procedure, which has been made virtually non-existent, is really worth. Before governments reach agreement the Council is not in a position to consider anything and consequently there is nothing to discuss. However, once the governments reach agreement there is discussion but the Council is no longer able to change anything and all discussion thus becomes a pure formality and, more often than not, one which humiliates Parliament.

In our case, moreover, the then President-in-Office of the Council, Mr Cheysson, said that the agreement reached by the governments had been so laboriously and painstakingly drawn up that not even a comma of it could be changed. Although he understood Parliament's position he asked us not to insist on any

De Pasquale

amendments that we wanted as, whatever they might represent, they would not have been considered. In the light of this situation any unwillingness on our part to enter a discussion would have produced no effect or, what is worse, it could have supported the efforts of those seeking to postpone that whole issue indefinitely. The Parliament delegation — eminently led by Vice-President Estgen, whom I should like to thank on behalf of the Regional Committee, unanimously decided to pursue the matter. As far as the whole affair is concerned we can unequivocally put on record that the new regulation is better than its predecessor and that some of the amendments called for in the various opinions expressed by Parliament have been incorporated into the new text, albeit in part and to an insufficient degree.

Section Two of the motion for a resolution lists the positive amendments which in our view are capable of lending a new impulse of the Fund both for the structurally weak regions and those affected by industrial decline. We have every confidence in proven methods and the undertaking announced by the new Member of the Commission for Regional Policy, Mr Varfis, to whom, on behalf of the Regional Committee, I extend my best wishes for the success of his task.

It goes without saying that if the management of the Fund is to be consistent with the new objectives the Fund will gradually change from what it is at the present, a passive distributor of refunds to the Member States, to become an active programming and coordination tool for both Community and national resources to be used to redress the internal balance of the Community.

The organization of programmes and the drawing up of programme contracts will mean both for the Commission and the various Member States that firm decisions will have to be made on the area to be selected, clear-cut priorities established, account taken of the differing local situation, all of which will involve the implicit upgrading of the part played by regional institutions, to ensure transparency, a cumulative effect as well as the use of the Community contribution.

What is more, beyond a certain threshold the Member States have no automatic right to payment and consequently prime importance should be attached to the quality of the measures to be supported. The new regulation also allows a greater balance in the relationship between the intervention payments for infrastructure and the financing of production investments and the upgrading of the regions' local potential.

These are all causes, ladies and gentlemen, for which this Parliament has always fought and which could now be given new life provided that in the Commission's departments and the administrations of the Member States there is no tendency to become passive and revert to the old styles of management which the new regulation gives us the possibility of changing.

These positive objectives cannot, of course, offset the negative aspects contained in paragraphs 3 and 4 of the resolution on which I shall not dwell here. Nevertheless, we have obtained considerable results having signed a common statement to which the Council, the Commission and the Parliament were all signatories and which could be considered an integral part of the regulation. The declaration contains an undertaking to hold a three-way meeting at least once a year so that the application of the new standards can be jointly monitored. It is also desirable that Parliament's amendments which are not accepted by the Council should be the subject of an in-depth examination.

Provided that the signed undertaking is respected the result could be useful cooperation and joint programmes could be developed as a basis for new improvements. However, while on the subject of respecting written undertakings, there are first signs that all is not well: the Council was unwilling to publish the joint declaration in the Official Journal. What reason could there be for keeping this document, to which we attach great importance, undercover and unknown and not making it official? Clearly there is somebody within the Council who considers it no more than a piece of paper. What then is to be made of the stated intentions of the various Presidents of the Council to the effect that the greatest possible account will be taken of the opinions expressed by Parliament? In this case however, they are not unilateral decisions but joint decisions agreed and signed by all three institutions. Mr President of the Council we call upon you formally to ensure publication in the Official Journal of the joint declaration and to agree with the Commission and with ourselves the date for an initial tripartite meeting to review the problems of the restructuring of the Fund. I should like to conclude, ladies and gentlemen, by calling on you on behalf of the Regional Policy Committee to vote in favour of the resolution and thereby approve the action of the Parliament's delegation to the consultations in the knowledge that a step forward is being taken and that further steps will be needed to ensure that the Fund can become in the short term an effective means of applying Community regional policy.

(Applause)

Mr Griffiths (S). — Madam President, on behalf of the Socialist Group, I give the De Pasquale report a guarded welcome, because the conciliation procedure, as we must recognize, is not the perfect instrument that Parliament would like to see. Furthermore, as Mr De Pasquale pointed out, the actual conciliation procedure on this occasion amounted to Parliament being forced to accept the Council's point of view because anything else would have resulted in a further holdup in the implementation of the new regulation. I think this underlines the difficulties in achieving interinstitutional agreements when there are major differences between the institutions, but particularly when within

Griffiths

the Council there are differences which are proving difficult to resolve because of its own decision-making procedures.

As far as the new Regional Fund is concerned, we must say that there have been some improvements. That is why Parliament's conciliation team in the end was able to accept the Fund as it now is. We have, for example, the indicative ranges which I hope, and the Socialist Group hopes, will result in the poorer countries of the Community getting to the top of their ranges and the richer countries only achieving the bottom of their ranges. If that does not happen, we are going to increase regional differences and also impose difficulties on the implementation of the Fund itself.

We also welcome the move to programme financing, if only for the reason that the Commission's own civil servants could not possibly manage to keep a proper check on every individual project brought before them. We welcome too the increase in support from the Regional Fund. Now that this is standing at 50% — and in some cases 55% — it will be able to make a substantial contribution to those regions receiving money from the Fund, provided national governments do not find some way of clawing back that money into their own treasuries. I regret to say that no national government has got a good record on that score to date. We also like the emphasis on the initiatives coming from within the regions themselves rather than being imposed from outside.

On the whole we hope that something positive will come from this new Fund regulation. We hope that something positive will come from the annual inter-institutional meetings which have now been agreed to assess the workings of the new Regional Fund guidelines; and we hope that the Council's commitment to re-examine the outstanding points of difference between the institutions will again result in positive moves in the right direction.

However, we do ask whether or not the Council will keep its word. Quite frankly, its record so far is not good. From the beginnings of the Regional Fund there has been a commitment to take action to reduce regional disparities. That has not happened. We see, for example, in this year's budget, which we have not yet managed to pass, that spending in the Regional Fund is going to go down. We see that national governments are reducing the amount of money that they are spending on their regions. I am sorry to say that the government of the United Kingdom is taking the lead in this respect. So the priority given by the conciliation agreement to helping the regions and particularly to helping young people and women must, I think, be taken with a pinch of salt unless the Council is going to increase significantly the resources available to the Regional Fund and to regional initiatives, particularly when they are taken by bodies within the regions themselves.

We in the Socialist Group believe that if you are going to have a true European Community, if you are going to have a European Community true to its own people, there will have to be an emphasis on the essential need to increase employment opportunities in the regions and to ensure that the wealth created in the Community will be shared more equally among all of its regions from the centre to its outermost areas.

Mrs Boot (PPE). — (NL) Madam President, Parliament intends today to consider the conciliation procedure between Parliament, the Commission and the Council in connection with a new ERDF regulation. This indeed takes us right back to June 1984 — a period completely overshadowed by the European elections but nevertheless chosen by the Council for drawing up the new version of the regulation, known as ERDF III a).

Our Group has repeatedly called for a speeding up of the decision-making process within the Council on the reform of this fund. The draft Council resolution was the result of over two years of negotiations within the Council. Although our Parliament finally gave its approval, during the conciliation procedure, to the result of those negotiations, we should not conclude from this that the regulation is now satisfactory. It is in fact a bare minimum since, the Community aspects have been very much watered down — Parliament's amendments but also and I am referring not only to the original Commission proposals — largely in that contributions to the Member States are still far too often cash payments based on national regional policy rather than expenditure within a real European regional policy.

Our Group believed however, that it was more important to have a regulation than to continue negotiations between Parliament and the Council still further. To begin with, we regard the agreement to hold an annual tripartite meeting to evaluate the application and effect of the new regulation as one of the major victories in the declaration following the negotiations. The second main achievement is the fact that the Commission, Council and Parliament are all convinced that effective contact between the Commission and regional authorities is essential. As far as this last point is concerned, I would stress on behalf of my Group its hope that the European Commission's Consultative Committee, mentioned in the Griffiths draft resolution, will be formally constituted, since this will allow us, as a Community, to take a fresh approach to strengthening European cooperation.

As regards the regulation itself, we welcome the most important changes in ERDF III a) including, in particular, the increased coordination between Community policies with regard to the funds. For the first time, this principle of coordination is laid down in the regulation itself and not in a separate resolution. In this way a legal basis has been established and some small

Boot

progress made. Secondly, there is the mechanism of the upper and lower limits for the payments to individual Member States, which will provide the European Commission with greater room to manoeuvre in setting conditions according to Community criteria. As a Parliament, we should not omit to press the European Commission on this point. Thirdly, there is the system of programme financing and fourthly, the expansion of possibilities for instituting specific Community programmes which give greater freedom for action on a sectoral level. Here I am thinking of programmes to re-place the industries we have lost such as textiles, coal mining and so on. Fifthly, there is the strengthening potential of the regions themselves and of their SMES.

In sum, Madam President, we are happy that this regulation has finally appeared and draw particular attention to the fact that three institutions, i.e. the Council, the Commission and Parliament have explicitly declared that regional equilibrium must always have priority within the Community. Incidentally, Madam President, I believe that the Community needs a genuine European government.

(Applause)

Mr Hutton (ED). — I think the House should not let this opportunity pass without making it clear to the Council that the conciliation on the new European Regional Development Fund regulation was a cynical exercise of just going through the motions of conciliation without any serious intention of really conciliating.

After three years of wrangling, the Council finally cobbled together a compromise on the ERDF regulation while our attention was directed elsewhere, to our election last year. As Mr De Pasquale said, this conciliation took place two days after the election count, and the President-in-office of the Council simply announced a take-it-or-leave-it deal, pointing a gun at the Parliament's head. That is not what I understand by conciliation.

I hope this House makes it absolutely clear to the Council that it does not regard its behaviour as being in the spirit of cooperation between the institutions of this Community, and that the three-institution annual review of the regulation will be carried out with real meaning by all three institutions.

Mr Lalor (RDE). — Madam President, while the new ERDF regulation may contain some very welcome innovations, it still falls far short of our expectations. The gap will continue to widen between the rich and the poor regions and nations, and unemployment will continue to soar. Why? Simply because the Council has failed to address itself to the fundamental weakness of European regional policy — namely, the lack

of resources. This was the major problem under the original ERDF regulation, and it is likely to remain the major shortcoming of our new Regional Fund. The emphasis should have been placed on quantitative rather than qualitative improvements in the ERDF.

The last Irish President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers, Mr Barry, said this week in Ireland that the Community had failed to provide the financial resources necessary to boost existing policies, to initiate new programmes and to transfer funds from richer to poorer regions. He went on to say that an Irish national debate about EEC membership might not be a bad thing. I feel that this is a rather ominous sign and a reflection of what regional policy, is doing for us.

I welcome the improvements which have been agreed, despite their inadequacies. I hope that the annual meeting of the three institutions will take place and that the undertaking given in paragraph 6 of the resolution to balance 'regional development and structural adaptation aimed at correcting long-standing structural disequilibria' will be adhered to. It will be necessary to compel member governments such as my own in Ireland to give the increased power and influence to local authorities in the selection of projects envisaged in the new regulation.

I will certainly be supporting Mr Vandemeulebroucke's Amendments Nos 2 and 6, aimed at extending the involvement of local authorities. I was struck as well by Mr Griffiths' comments on the similar situation that exists in the UK. It is a problem where local authorities will have to be seen to be more involved.

Mr Vandemeulebroucke (ARC). — *(NL)* It could be said that the De Pasquale report is in fact being debated too late. After all, the new ERDF regulation has already been in force since 1 January 1985. Nevertheless, I regard this report as very valuable since it puts its finger right on what we, in the field of regional policy, had already seen as shortcomings.

I want to mention only a few aspects such as the need for coordination between various Community policies and the abolition of the system of fixed national quotas. Then there is the gradual replacement of the project financing system by a system of programme financing. I also consider it extremely important that we are now to have an annual trilateral consultation procedure between the Council, Commission and Parliament and I just hope that the Council and Commission will honour this agreement.

It would perhaps have been better, Madam President, if the De Pasquale report had been accompanied by other evaluatory reports on regional policy, since in this way, we would also have been able to analyse some shortcomings such as the absence of cross-border cooperation information to the regions and local

Vandemeulebroucke

authorities about the workings of the Regional Fund. What use is a Regional Fund that up to now has operated only through the Member States — in other words through the capital cities — with all too little information and public relations efforts have reached local authorities and regions.

On the other hand, Madam President, it is a good thing that this session also includes debates on the operations of both the Social Fund and the Regional Fund since if you run down the list of regions with particularly high unemployment, these usually coincide with those regions requiring particular attention from the Regional Fund. Regional imbalance is, incidentally, still increasing even though the Regional Fund has already been in existence for 10 years. Compared with the rich regions, the poor regions are now four times worse off than they used to be and employment is a dramatic six times worse. We must therefore, I think, ask the fundamental question of why the regions should still be lagging behind and why we cannot manage to put them back on their feet. I believe this is not simply due to a shortage of finance for the European Regional Fund but much more to the absence of an integrated approach. We should be looking not just at the European Regional Fund, but also at the Social Fund, the structural fund for agriculture and even energy policy — and I am thinking particularly of alternative forms of energy. We should give absolute priority to fusing all of these together into a single policy instrument.

Obviously, therefore, we also favour the integrated policy required by the Mediterranean programmes. The present proposals contained in the Mediterranean programmes are, I think, still too narrow but we should nevertheless waste no more time and put them into operation. A new budgetary line must be established for this purpose and we must forestall any claims by the British Conservatives, for example, to the effect that what we are really doing is robbing Peter to pay Paul. We cannot accept the idea of first saving and then establishing a separate line in the budget for the Mediterranean programmes.

Madam President, if we really want to achieve a regional policy, it is essential that we establish a dialogue with local authorities and the regions. However, this will be possible only if the regions have their own organizational structures. It is for these reasons that I have taken the liberty of putting forward a number of amendments along these lines. It is not only the principles, Mr De Pasquale, that are important; I believe that we must at the same time use these amendments to establish a policy for the future and I therefore think that they will be very useful for this report as well.

Mr Poetschki (PPE). — *(DE)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the new regulation on the European Regional Development Fund is doubtless an

improvement on the previous regulation, although not all of Parliament's wishes, ideas and political views were taken into account in the conciliation procedure.

The demands which have not been met include mainly those for improved coordination between the national development programmes, the acquisition of reliable structural data and improved statistical analysis using standard indicators based on reliable statistics valid for all Community countries. We wanted to strengthen the Commission's administrative powers and to give priority to productive investment over infrastructure investment. We fully recognize that it is important to carry out infrastructure measures in many regions and that these are worth promoting. They should not, however, take clear precedence and cause other investments to be completely neglected.

These demands must also be met in the interests of a balanced European regional policy. I regard it as a political step forward that account should be taken of regional and local authorities and, I hope, of the democratically elected regional parliaments when regional development programmes are drawn up. Those living in the regions usually have a far better idea of the development needs of their own areas than a remote central government.

For me, the mobilization of a region's own potential implies the active involvement of all available forces in the region. Now that we have abolished the distinction between 'quota' and 'non-quota' sections, we welcome the new type of programme which has emerged, namely the national programme of Community relevance, whereby the Commission will enjoy greater scope for decision-making in such programmes, thus enabling it to act more quickly. Although the need to coordinate national and Community development programmes will still necessitate a permanent dialogue between the Commission and the national authorities, we believe that the regions must still have direct access to Brussels.

(Applause)

This would eliminate a great deal of red tape and lengthy administrative procedures and, far more importantly, Europe would take on a positive meaning for those living in the regions.

In setting priorities in the new regulation, particular attention has been paid to frontier regions and peripheral coastal areas and islands. Frontier regions in particular, which have adjusted to cross-frontier cooperation, need European partnership and a European dimension. Regional planning, structural policy and regional development policy belong together and should transcend national frontiers. Europe's internal frontiers will then one day come to be regarded as remnants of the past.

I would like to mention one point which was not dealt with, at least not very thoroughly, in the conciliation

Poetschki

procedure. I am referring to the 'indicative ranges' with their upper and lower limits mentioned in Article 4 of the regulation. Quota-related or indicative ranges will not in the long term result in a balanced European regional policy, since they tend merely to lead to a policy of compensation.

My Group regards the new regulation on the European Regional Development Fund as an important step on the way to a genuine Community policy in this field. We attach particular importance to the joint declaration of the Council, Commission and Parliament following conciliation on the reform of the Fund with the agreement concerning a yearly exchange of views between the three institutions. We approve of the declaration and welcome the report by the Chairman of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning, Mr De Pasquale. I would like to thank the rapporteur for his excellent report.

(Applause)

Mr Guermer (RDE). — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, this reform dates from 19 June last, and it is a good one. It puts the accent on programmes rather than projects, which was the previous faith; it makes the regions participate in their own development policy; and gives a basis for coordination of Community policies.

This improvement can only be welcomed at a time when regional development seems to have been forgotten. Ten years of crisis, of unemployment and of rural exodus have impoverished regions which were already poor and, in some ways, helped those which were already wealthy. The impression has been that regional policy was the policy of the years of plenty, and that now a maximum return on investment is needed, investments are best made in the regions with the best return, rather than those which actually need the aid.

It is therefore up to European policy to make up for the shortfall in national regional policies, and the new ERDF is certainly a more efficient way of doing it. It can become even more so, on two conditions. The first, of course, is some political determination by the national governments to smooth out inequalities between regions, and the second is willingness to concentrate our efforts. Concentrate them geographically, because there is no point in spreading aid thin and far. Aid must be concentrated on those outlying regions which are farthest from the great centres of consumption and production, and I believe that it must likewise be concentrated on our best cards, that is, the specific measures and activities which can take off in the regions. And one condition for that is that regions can themselves be asked directly to prepare their own development with the Commission, without the barrier of the national administrations. That is the essential step forward if regional policy is not to remain as it is

at present, a mere drop in the ocean of the enormous needs of the outlying regions.

Mr Varfis, Member of the Commission. — *(GR)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I think it is particularly encouraging to note that, apart from certain reservations which were expressed, all of us have ascertained that the new regulation constitutes an important step towards a more consistent, more effective and more coordinated regional policy. We consider that the Joint Declaration issued following the conciliation procedure is equally binding, that it is inseparably linked with the regulation and also a step in the right direction. I too would like to say that I share the Parliament's regret that this Joint Declaration was not published in the Official Journal of the European Communities. I am particularly glad that I have been given an opportunity to point out that, in the tough negotiations in the two to three years to which the speakers referred, Parliament made a paramount contribution towards formulating the rules and guidelines for improving the situation as compared with the past and we are certain that there will be fruitful dialogue in the future with a view to introducing yet further improvements.

Perhaps the new regulation does not give the Commission as much power as Parliament would have wished and, naturally, as the Commission itself would have wished. However, we must recognize the fact that the Commission can move with far greater flexibility than in the past, that it has greater administrative powers and more opportunities to undertake substantial initiatives. However, for this reason it naturally has more responsibilities, in particular in the first year of implementation of the new regulation, which is a year for testing and scheduling the implementation of the opportunities before us.

I would like to take this occasion to thank the rapporteur, Mr De Pasquale, both for his wishes and the expression of his conviction that the Commission will do all it can to exploit these possibilities. I do not intend to reiterate these possibilities which we are all familiar with, but, as regards the comments made by the distinguished Members, I would like to stress certain points which are critical for the success of the undertaking.

One initial point — and I think it was Mr Poetschki who mentioned it — is that we must have suitable tools in order to ascertain precisely what the situation is in the regions so as to formulate and propose priorities to the Council on the basis of the data we will gather. To this end I think that the periodic reports are of major importance and that the second periodic report which is now being examined by Parliament will provide an opportunity for fruitful dialogue between the Commission and Parliament so that we can move in the direction I referred to.

Varfis

The second prerequisite for success to which many speakers referred, in particular Mr Vandemeulebroucke, is the gradual replacement of the plans by national programmes of Community interest and, in general, by integrated programmes and integrated actions. This concerns packages of coherent multiannual actions which demand coordinated financing — and here I refer also to what Mr Vandemeulebroucke said — with far greater coordination of the funds than there has been in the past. This coordination of funds is a cornerstone in the coordination of regional policy. The Regional Fund must finance not only works for developing the regions, but also other areas, such as research and small and medium-sized undertakings, while the other structural funds will have to be in the service of regional policy.

Finally, I believe that a basic prerequisite for success is the intensification of dialogue and the attempt to ensure fertile dialogue not only with the Member States, but also with the regions — this was stressed by all speakers and I found this unanimity impressive. I would like to tarry on this point a little because it is both critical and difficult. The regional and local authorities, as you all know, submit their request for ERDF interventions to the national authorities, which in turn submit them to the Commission. So we should and will try to ensure that the regional and local authorities participate more actively, wherever possible, always bearing in mind the institutional structure of each Member State as regards the drafting of the regional development programmes which are submitted to us, and likewise the preparation and implementation of national and Community programmes. Their role can and must be a major one in defining and implementing measures for exploiting domestic development potential. The regional and local authorities will on request obtain technical support which will help them to make effective use of the appropriations from the Regional Development Fund.

At this point I would also like to dwell briefly on something which the Commission considers important and which concerns technical support. Our experience has shown that the effectiveness of regional policy is in large measure hampered by administrative shortcomings in the less developed Member States at national and regional level, both in the preparation and management of programmes and plans. We must not forget that these weaknesses are to a large extent directly or indirectly linked with the level of development of the regions. The new forms of intervention proposed, which are envisaged in the new regulation, can be successfully implemented provided there is technical support for the regional and also the national authorities, naturally in so far as they want it. The new regulation does in fact provide an opportunity for the greatest possible success in promoting this technical support.

I would also like to underscore some other points to which Mr Poetschki in particular referred, in which major emphasis is placed on productive investment.

This is something we will endeavour to do but I must stress from the outset that this is not an easy task, because as you know the contribution of the Regional Fund to productive investments mainly depends on the applications submitted by the Member States and because it is often easier for the national authorities to submit applications for infrastructure works which they themselves control. At any rate the new regulation, the common programmes and the integrated actions give us an opportunity to advance in this direction.

Finally I would like to refer to the point which Mr Griffiths very correctly emphasized concerning the need for better exploitation of the programmes which are submitted to us — both at Community and national level. After all, what is our basic objective? It is to ensure better linkage between national and Community priorities. This is the purpose of the dialogue and it is in this direction which the improvement of the regulation must lead when we come to discuss it.

I would also like to stress that the Commission has already studied the matter and hopes, that from this year on it can improve this procedure.

In conclusion, Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to say once more that the first year of the new regulation is a critical one, it is a year in which the new principles, procedures and the forms of intervention envisaged in the regulation will be tested. Something which is of great importance to the Commission is the fact that at the end of the year, in accordance with the Joint Declaration, the results of implementing the regulation will be reviewed and assessed jointly with the Parliament and the Council. Then we will examine the improvements which will probably be necessary so that we can move forward together, as in the past, with a view to achieving what is a basic objective of the Treaty of Rome, which we must never forget: reduction of the imbalances with a view to achieving convergence of the economies.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be held at the next voting time.

4. *Welcome*

President. — I would like to extend a particularly warm welcome on behalf of this House to the Chairman, Lady Llewellyn Davies, and members of the Select Committee on the European Communities from the House of Lords whose reports are known, of course, to very many Members of this House and are much appreciated by all the institutions of the European Community. I hope that this visit will be successful and enjoyable.

(Applause)

5. *Integrated Mediterranean programmes*

President. — The next item is the joint debate on

- the oral question with debate (Doc. 2-1457/84) by Mr De Pasquale and others, on behalf of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning, to the Council.

Subject: Launching of the integrated Mediterranean programmes

The European Council meeting in Dublin on 3 and 4 December 1984 took no decision on the setting up of the integrated Mediterranean programmes, in spite of the serious economic and social situation in the Community's Mediterranean regions.

Bearing in mind the importance of the Commission's proposal and the opinion delivered by the European Parliament on 29 March 1984, would the Council of Ministers state:

(1) whether it intends to adopt the regulation on IMPs, thereby complying with:

- the European Council's commitment at Fontainebleau that the scheme would actually be launched by 1985, and
- the date indicated by the European Council in Dublin for the adoption of this regulation (March 1985);

(2) whether it intends to deviate from the European Parliament's proposals and, if so, what other solutions it intends to adopt and when it thinks it can open the conciliation procedure;

(3) whether it does not believe that the new imminent accession of Spain and Portugal makes it even more urgent to launch the IMPs immediately providing them with adequate funds for the entire duration of the scheme (6 years) as from 1985.

- the oral question with debate (Doc. 2-1591/84) by Mr De Pasquale and others, on behalf of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning¹ to the Commission.

Subject: Integrated Mediterranean programmes

Given that integrated Mediterranean programmes (IMPs) are of major importance not only in reducing disparities between the regions of the Community in its present form, but also in limiting as far as possible the repercussions of the accession of Portugal and Spain on the Community's Mediterranean regions,

(a) will the Commission agree to give its full support and top priority to the amended proposal for a regulation introducing integrated Mediterranean programmes, submitted by the previous Commission?¹

(b) in particular, will the Commission confirm that the appropriations for the IMPs should not be less than proposed in 1983, i.e. 6 628 million ECU over a period of 6 years?²

(c) can the Commission also confirm that these appropriations must be additional to the budget allocations for the structural funds, whose operations cannot and must not be depleted but, on the contrary, steadily increased?

- the oral question with debate (Doc. 2-1458/84) by Mr Lambrias and others, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, to the Council.

Subject: Council's failure to draw up a regulation implementing the integrated Mediterranean programmes

On 28 March 1983, 23 August 1983 and 3 November 1983, the Commission submitted to the Council proposals for the institution of the integrated Mediterranean programmes (IMPs). On 29 March 1984, the European Parliament adopted a resolution endorsing these proposals with a number of amendments. In June 1984, the European Council at Fontainebleau decided to proceed with the IMPs and, on 21 September 1984, the Commission submitted to the Council an amended proposal for a regulation instituting the programmes.

1. Since these Community actions embody the political will to bring about a partial reduction in the inequalities between the Mediterranean regions and the more developed countries, would the Council state to what extent it remains convinced of the need to implement the IMPs, which all the institutions considered an appropriate means of achieving convergence,

2. Negotiations with the two applicant countries are progressing rapidly and the third enlargement of the Community is imminent. Since the IMPs also incorporate measures to mitigate the adverse effects of enlargement, would the Council state whether it acknowledges the urgent nature of these delayed programmes,

3. If the Council acknowledges the expediency and the urgent nature of the IMPs, would it state why it has not drawn up the relevant regulation at the proper time, without which all reference to the IMPs is academic,

4. What would be the Council's view if the European Parliament were to request the initia-

¹ The Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning unanimously approved the tabling of this oral question with debate at its meeting on 24 January 1985.

¹ COM(84) 499 final, 6. 9. 1984 — OJ C 280, 19. 10. 1984.

² COM(83) 24 final, 28. 3. 1983. — OJ C 251, 19. 9. 1983.

President

tion of the conciliation procedure set up by agreement between the three institutions on 4 March 1978, which stipulates that the procedure must be initiated should the Council disagree with Parliament's opinion?

Mr De Pasquale (COM), Chairman of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning. — (IT) Mr President, the Committee on Regional Policy, which I have the honour of chairing, wishes to raise with the Council and the Commission the burning question of the integrated Mediterranean programmes so that Parliament can be directly informed about what is happening and about the true intentions of those involved.

I thank the President of the Council and President of the Commission for having agreed to answer us in good time, that is to say, before any decisions are taken which would place a *fait accompli* before Parliament.

Our overwhelming desire is for clarity and honesty so that we can get the issues out into the open and reach satisfactory conclusions.

At the European Council meeting in Fontainebleau, the decision was taken to launch the IMP scheme by 1985. This announcement gave us to understand that progress had been made in examining the proposal and that an agreement was about to emerge. In Dublin, however, the Prime Minister of Greece, Mr Papandreou, made his views known in a forceful way at just the right time, with the result that the cat was let out of the bag and it was revealed that this promise was merely a smoke screen. Up until that moment, the Council had simply ignored the Commission's proposals and Parliament's opinions and in the final analysis its real intention was to shelve the Mediterranean programmes.

I make no apology for saying that such behaviour is damaging and undermines the whole basis of our living together as a Community. Nobody should be allowed to make promises, undertake commitments, set timetables, organize discussions, set up pilot projects and raise expectations and then let everything fizzle out to nothing.

The Mediterranean areas, which were the cradle of European civilization and which are now the weakest and most exposed part of the Community, greeted the announcement of the IMPs as a positive sign of attention, as a practical manifestation of the will to tackle the problems of their development. Now, after the latest news, there is great disillusion. The Commission has been asked to submit a new proposal which will obviously be trimmed down in comparison with the first.

A number of excuses are proffered for this. It is said, for example, that something had to be done to mollify

Greece, which raised the loudest protests and drowned all the other voices. None of us denies the special needs of Greece, set out in the well known *memorandum*; I myself, in the last parliament, tabled a motion for a resolution on Greece's regional problems. But now we are dealing with something quite different. We are talking about the Mediterranean as a whole, about the need to harmonize the economic interests of the entire area, especially in view of the forthcoming enlargement, so that the entry of Spain and Portugal — which cannot be put off any longer — does not trigger a war among those who are poor and exacerbate competition between weakened areas and similar types of produce on a stagnant market. The IMP scheme is the first attempt to devise a specific policy to benefit the Mediterranean areas. This is its political merit, which must be maintained.

It is also said that the intention is no longer to treat the IMPs as a specific scheme appropriation item and to deal with them under the ordinary budget allocations for structural funds. It is obvious that if this were to happen, the whole idea of an integrated action programme would fall by the wayside and, above all, much of the Community character of the programmes would be lost. The IMPs would be reduced to an empty shell. Even more important, it is physically impossible to extract a substantial quota from existing funds to devote to IMPs. Let us take as an example the EAGGF Guidance Section: from this fund, the only possible appropriation that could be awarded to IMPs is that provided for under Article 18 of the proposal on efficiency, which is equivalent to only 700 million in five years. Nothing can be done about the remainder, since it is a question of refunds to States. As a result, even supposing that it is possible to draw funds from the EAGGF, the fact remains that the overall appropriations destined for agricultural structures are already quite inadequate, given the general requirements of the Community's agricultural economy.

As to the Regional Fund, which has not registered any increase in real terms, the so-called 'fund distribution keys' have only just come into existence, and an attempt is being made to award, under the new regulation, aids that have already been granted and can already be used.

If we want to talk about integrated Community programmes, a specific appropriation with its own budget line is indispensable.

Do not tell me that it is impossible to find 5 000 or 6 000 million in 5 or 6 years for the Mediterranean programmes when, in one year alone, we spend more than 20 000 million on agricultural markets! The truth of the matter is that it is a question of political choice. Do we or do we not wish to undertake structural action programmes capable of promoting a process of integration and the restoration of balances in the Community, beginning with the Mediterranean regions, which have always suffered the most negative

De Pasquale

aspects of common policies and whose gross domestic product is less than 50% of the average in the Community? An answer to this question must be provided. We put our trust in you, Mr Delors: you personally wanted to retain responsibility for coordinating structural funds and hence the Mediterranean programmes. We welcomed this choice in the belief that you were serious in your intentions. But please take care not to make any false moves. If you were to begin by sweeping aside the first attempt at coordinated Community action aimed specifically at the Mediterranean areas, your own credibility and that of your Commission would suffer greatly.

As for the Italian government, which holds the Presidency of the Council at the moment, we are asking it to refrain from behaving like the beaver in the fable, which being pursued by hunters who wished to cut off its testicles in order to extract medicinal substances from them, cut them off himself in order to escape. We are asking the Italian Presidency to adopt a strong and consistent position and not to give in to short-sighted excuses or unacceptable blackmail. We are not defending special interests, whether Italian, Greek or French. We are advocating something of general interest for the whole Community. The growing disparity in incomes, in productivity, in inflation rates and unemployment, in population and education levels is seriously hampering a relaunching of the European economic system as a whole. We are convinced that a boost to the growth of the less advantaged areas in the south of Europe and Mediterranean is in everybody's interest, even in that of the more favoured areas.

To sum up, as far as we are concerned, there are three conditions which are absolutely crucial and which, I believe, we will continue to uphold in the context of formal consultations, namely:

- 1) that these provisions would allow planned and integrated projects to be implemented in concertation with the regional authorities in the areas concerned;
- 2) that the financing needs to be specific, additional to existing amounts and adequate to meet the extremely extensive requirements of these areas;
- 3) that the decision be taken as swiftly as possible.

The Committee for Regional Policy, which worked so hard to improve the original text, requests Parliament to give broad and firm support once again to the action undertaken and which must be continued, by voting for the joint motion for a resolution tabled by the majority of political groups in this House.

(Applause)

Mr Lambrias (PPE). — *(GR)* Madam President, I am grieved because, taking the floor for the first time in this House, I am obliged to castigate the disfunctions

in the relations between the fundamental institutions of the Community. I have to expound on the troubled course of an inspired Community idea, i.e. the integrated Mediterranean programmes and to demonstrate that this course clearly highlights the Council's highhanded stance *vis à vis* both the Parliament and the Commission.

I will not weary you with an account of the successive phases through which the endeavour to realize this inspired but at the same time very down-to-earth policy has gone through. I would only point out that its roots go back to 1979, when Greece had not yet joined the Community, but when this decisive event was in the offing. How, therefore, can one characterize the Council's stance when, after so many years and after the painstaking and costly work which has been invested — i.e. studies, discussions, reports, negotiations — the Commission and the Parliament arrived at a striking identity of views, both as regards the necessity and the methodology of implementation of the integrated Mediterranean programmes, and yet the Council remains inactive? It is avoiding to act as it should and as it has so often promised: to issue the legally indispensable regulation so that the integrated Mediterranean programmes can get under way within the current year. However, what I fear more, Madam President, is that behind this indescribable tug-of-war lies concealed an unconfessed attempt to distort the policy. Indeed, it appears that a radical review of the 'philosophy' which is expressed in the integrated Mediterranean programmes is being devised. Not only are attempts being made to consign the integrated Mediterranean programmes to the Greek calendars, ignoring the pressing needs which dictate them — the review, I fear, is aimed mainly at weakening these programmes, at what is superficially a quantitative but in reality a qualitative retrenchment, at stripping these much-tormented plans of the valuable idea they contain: that is to say, that the basic concern and paramount responsibility of the entire Community must be to reduce the tremendous disparities between its various regions.

Madam President, I would hasten to add that my bitterness as regards this dubious obstructionism is not due to the fact that Greece, my native country, is one of the three countries which expects aid from the integrated Mediterranean programmes, so as to correct some of the structural weaknesses of its economy and to limit, to a certain extent, the adverse effects which Greece knew it would experience by joining a club of countries far more developed than itself. I would like to express my bitterness but also my anguish as a European, as one of the many advocates and partisans of the European idea who are present here. And it is the European idea in all its political, social, economic but also cultural and purely spiritual, effervescence, that is being hit by the procrastinations and machinations which have dogged this imperative policy for the past five years. These misgivings are not of tardy origin. On 16 October, i.e. long before the Summit Conference in Dublin, I had the honour to submit, on

Lambrias

behalf of the European People's Party, together with signatories from all the national delegations, the question we are discussing today. Alas, our fears were fully justified. Naturally, we are not glad about this but deeply regret it.

In Dublin, as you know, it was precisely the long-suffering integrated Mediterranean programmes which were and are jeopardizing nothing less than the enlargement of the Community to include Spain and Portugal. That is to say, they threaten to torpedo a major, politically and ethically imperative, development in Europe. And no doubt you will remember that the Council again expressly promised — and it reiterated its pledge at Fontainebleau — that by the time of the Dublin Summit the prerequisites for enlargement would have been satisfied. The assurances of the Irish Minister responsible at the time, Mr Alan Dukes, are still ringing in my ears: he came to the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning, stating that before the expiry of 1984 the Council would have completed all the formal acts necessary for implementing the integrated Mediterranean programmes as of the current year. How, then, can our Europe regain its credibility — as the new President of the Commission Mr Jacques Delors rightly pinpointed as prime duty in his inaugural speech here — when its fundamental institutions disappoint us ourselves, if not to say delude us?

How are we to be inspired again by the ethical vision proclaimed by Jean Monnet, which Mr Delors also referred to, when unacceptable linkages are being made between various Community policies and the negotiations are degenerating into oriental-style haggling? When the book-keeping mentality of deals and mutual favours is steadily growing stronger, undermining and ousting the highminded idea of the political unification of Europe? Is it difficult, even for those who are least familiar with macroeconomics, to understand that in the long and medium term it is in the interests of the Community as a whole and, in particular, of the more developed regions, to reduce the gap between them and the less developed and declining regions? Can we conceive of a flourishing Europe while the Mediterranean — its very cradle — continues to stagnate?

However, Madam President, although Mr Delors put it very well and we all applauded him, nevertheless even he lapsed into that book keeping mentality which he himself deplored — because such, unfortunately, is the sway of events in the relations between the three basic Community institutions. With the obvious approval of the Council following the setback in Dublin, the Commission began to work out new ideas for the integrated Mediterranean programmes. Perhaps we will hear some of these new ideas today, somewhat embellished and no doubt phrased in a roundabout way. I regret to say that we do not need these ideas.

The Parliament has spoken. It is not becoming of the dignity of the institution and of the directly elected

representatives of our peoples, who demand of us more coherence and continuity, to renege on decisions that have already been taken and into which so much effort, earnestness and cooperative endeavour have been put. And it is not fitting for the Commission to expunge with one stroke its own equally toilsome and serious labours. The argument that the Commission is a new one — which was used to justify the unacceptable concession — is threadbare and disingenuous. The fundamental institutions have a continuity which is not interrupted by changes in their membership. Consequently, if even at the last minute the Council wishes to show the respect due to the Community institutions, it is duty-bound to adopt the legal provisions for the immediate initiation of the integrated Mediterranean programmes without cuts, without procrastination, without package deals with other structural funds which will thwart all the funds. That is to say, it must take precisely those steps which have been spelt out to it by the Parliament and the Commission, for the sake of the European idea which otherwise will have been dealt a treacherous blow.

IN THE CHAIR: MR FANTI

Vice-President

Mr Forte, President-in-Office of the Council. — (IT) The Brussels and Fontainebleau European Councils — aware of the importance of the integrated Mediterranean programmes to the countries concerned, in view of the economic and social situation in the Community's Mediterranean regions — reached the following conclusions on the IMPs:

An attempt will be made to coordinate the activities of the various Funds, for example in the form of integrated programmes.

With this in mind, integrated Mediterranean programmes will be launched in favour of the southern regions of the present Community so as to be operational in 1985. Designed to be of limited duration, such programmes will have as their aim improvement of the economic structures of those regions to enable them to adjust under the best conditions possible to the new situation created by enlargement. They will also cover problems raised in the Greek Memorandum.

The financial resources allocated to aid from the Funds, having regard to the IMPs, will be significantly increased in real terms within the limits of financing possibilities.

Since then the Council has received the European Parliament's opinion and the Commission proposal, which was amended to take that opinion into account.

At the Council meeting on 28 and 29 January 1985 the Commission announced that it would be putting for-

Forte

ward as soon as possible certain new ideas likely to facilitate agreement on the subject, in particular that of interest-rate subsidies on loans by the European Investment Bank.

At its meeting on 18 and 19 February the Council will, as a matter of priority and with the aim of bringing the programmes into operation in 1985, continue its examination of this question in the light of the European Council's discussions, the European Parliament's opinion and the new ideas announced by the Commission.

I can assure you that the Presidency will do everything in its power to bring these discussions to a successful conclusion within the time-limit envisaged by the European Council.

The Council will of course examine at the appropriate time any request the European Parliament might make for application of the conciliation procedure in the case of the proposal for a regulation in question.

Mr Delors, President of the Commission. — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, although the new Commission has been in office for only five weeks, as the person responsible for coordination of the structural funds, I have been involved right from the outset in a search for appropriate courses of action in response to the short but sharp confrontation at the Dublin European Council which, if we are realistic, taught us two things.

Firstly, it emerged that the Greek Prime Minister, Mr Papandreou, regarded the problem of the IMPs and of the response to the Greek Memorandum as an integral part of the package adopted at Fontainebleau, and secondly, that several Member States had rejected the Commission's proposal on the IMPs outright on the grounds of its cost, which they considered excessive.

These, then, are the factors to which I must give realistic consideration and on which I must report to you before you take any action you consider appropriate.

I have therefore tried, in the light of the origin of the IMPs, to devise a solution capable of forestalling demands for new conditions at the next European Council meeting which would impede both enlargement and the use of own resources.

Given the attitudes we are faced with, it seemed to me that this was where the Commission's duty lay.

Let me remind you briefly that the IMPs were devised in strict accordance with the mandate we received on 30 May 1980 with a view to alleviating certain obvious effects which, as we all know, enlargement could have on the Mediterranean regions. I think we are all in agreement on this point.

The Commission submitted a structured plan, complete with figures, and during the debate in this House I noted an amendment which seemed to me to be very important, since it called for a move away from exclusive concentration on agriculture — in spite of the dominant role of agriculture in these regions — and proposed that the IMPs should take in all the various aspects of the economic development of these regions. This amendment by Parliament brought it home to me that the two key words in the phrase 'Integrated Mediterranean Programmes' are 'integrated programmes'. In other words, everyone is agreed, I think, that the regions concerned must work out for themselves development programmes which are geared to both enlargement and their own development, and which are realistic in the light of the growth obtainable, the potential outlets and possible technical developments. It is also agreed that such programmes must be seen as a whole. That is what we should understand by an integrated programme.

Thus my first idea — and one which I have had the opportunity of presenting to the Council in order to pave the way for the written proposal which the Commission is intending to submit — is that what we are aiming for are relevant and practicable integrated programmes devised by the regions themselves.

As regards objectives, these should, I believe, be broader than those which are commonly expressed. It seems to me that the reasoning behind much of the talk on IMPs is far too often that of the 1960s. In other words people talk as if there were still scope for urban growth and the creation of jobs in industry and the services sector as afforded by the second industrial revolution. But this, ladies and gentlemen, is no longer the case. We have to adopt a fresh outlook when thinking of the development of these regions, in the light of the new international economic order and technological progress.

For this reason there are three key words in the plan which I have in mind at present: development, adaptation and support. By development I mean the development of these regions along lines which are in keeping with their history and peculiarities and which take account of the capacity and likelihood of these regions to aggravate the existing overproduction in many Mediterranean products.

As far as adaptation is concerned, what I mean is that these regions must be helped to adapt both to present-day European economic reality and to future developments. It is my belief that by including this notion of adaptation amongst our objectives, we will be able to solve both the general problems of the Mediterranean regions and the particular problem posed by the Greek Memorandum.

After all, having chosen to join the Common Market, Greece, which is almost entirely a Mediterranean region, has no choice but to adapt its economy to the

Delors

economic pace and reality of the rest of Europe. I therefore believe that with development and adaptation as objectives, we can fall in exactly with the Greek Memorandum.

Finally, the last of the three key words is 'support'. Here we must be quite frank about what is meant. Given that there is surplus production of a number of products, given that the opportunities for movement from rural areas to the towns are limited and given that these regions must maintain their individuality and traditions, it is clear — and there is no reason to conceal the fact — that certain of these programmes will be aimed towards supporting incomes and protecting jobs. This is the only realistic approach.

It is simply not acceptable to talk of these regions in make-believe terms, in terms of their 'conversion', without stating what this actually implies. This is why the programmes which I shall put before the Council will include these three objectives of development, adaptation and support. In this way, it seems to me, we shall be able to meet the general needs of the Mediterranean regions, enable the Greek economy to adapt before too long to the European economy and demonstrate our solidarity with regions which sometimes have no means to pick up on their own.

The procedure will remain in strict accordance with what was decided at the European Council meetings in Brussels and Fontainebleau, where the question of coordinating the programmes of the different Funds was discussed. Thus, what I intend to propose to you is a procedure which will allow an overall review of the integrated development programmes submitted by these regions, enable the existing funds — i.e. the Guidance Section of the EAGGF, the ERDF, the Social Fund — to be used and, in addition, prepare the ground in various ways for a manageable financial structure. In other words, there must be 'additionality', i.e. the various measures must be cumulative. However, it is important that through these new IMPs we should demonstrate the Community's know-how, which must be used across-the-board, in other words, we must be able to assess the development of a region as a whole and act accordingly.

This will lend weight to a further feature of the new Commission proposal, namely 'conditionality'. The various programmes will be adopted on their merits from the point of view of the development of these regions. And here you must allow me a digression which will, I think, find an echo amongst some of you here. Every time I present this programme I am asked: how much for Greece, how much for Italy, how much for France? This is a question which I am not prepared to answer, since I find it quite unacceptable . . .

(Applause)

. . . because it is a perverse extension of the idea of the 'fair return' to apply to all facets of Community life.

(Applause)

For this reason a committee will be formed to examine these programmes. Each of the countries will be given fair treatment and account will be taken of the need to help Greece adapt its economy. However, I personally refuse to say what percentage of the programme will go to a particular country since were I to do so, how could we claim that the programmes were to be adopted on their individual merits? In any event, we cannot make such disclosures, and if attempts were made to force us, I think it would lead to serious disagreement between the Commission and the other authorities involved. We must reestablish the Community spirit and learn to understand the high principles underlying the marriage contract, as it were, enshrined in the Treaty of Rome.

We shall, therefore, examine all aspects of these programmes across the board and bring into play the various instruments at our disposal, supplementing them where necessary, not only by providing additional subsidies but also by using all the other financial instruments which the Commission possesses, such as loans, possibly with interest-rate subsidies, and European Investment Bank operations. All this is of the greatest importance because these regions are also faced with problems of infrastructure and of emergent small and medium-sized enterprises. Can we really remain indifferent to the fact that these small and medium-sized enterprises occupy a key position in that sector of the economy which has begun to show signs of recovery? These small and medium-sized enterprises are not merely the sub-contractors of larger firms: they are themselves innovators, filling in gaps in the market. We must encourage this by means of instruments already tried and tested in other areas.

Thus a proposal for a '*modus operandi*' will be put to you, a proposal for an overall sum, which will, of course give rise to much debate.

In conclusion, let me say that the fate of our proposal will depend on the willingness of the Member Governments within the Council to bear in mind that the Community is based on three principles, which are usually evoked in connection with the CAP: a single market — but how can we enable the less-favoured regions to adapt to this market? —, Community preference and sharing of costs.

It seems to me that the central difficulty is this: having accepted membership of the Community, will all the governments be prepared to pay the price? In other words, when the Commission has submitted a realistic and practicable proposal which meets the real needs of these countries and regions, will the governments be prepared to give it their full financial backing? When all is said and done, this is the only question which really counts.

(Applause)

President. — I have received two motions for resolutions, with requests for an early vote, to wind up the debate on the following oral question:

- by Mr Hutton on behalf of the European Democratic Group (Doc. 2-1620/84);
- by Mr Avgerinos and others on behalf of the Socialist Group, the Group of the European People's Party, the Communist and Allies Group, the Liberal and Democratic Group, and the Group of the European Democratic Alliance (Doc. 2-1642/84).

The motions for resolutions contained in Docs 2-1595 and 2-1612 have been withdrawn.

The vote on the requests for an early vote will be held at the end of the debate.

Mr Sakellariou (S). — (*DE*) Ladies and gentlemen, President of the Commission, I have listened to you carefully, but since you have not supplied any information in reply to the questions put to you, namely whether the funds for the Mediterranean programmes will be additional to the Community budget and whether the volume of appropriations for the IMPs will be maintained — as the Commission has proposed — I do not need to go into your reply; you have merely told us that you would be submitting a proposal to the Council. We knew that already.

I shall not go through the Commission proposals for resolutions, Parliament debates and Council promises on IMPs, since this might shatter the European citizen's confidence in Parliament and the Commission, which would certainly be wrong and unfair. However, I shall not refrain from pointing out to the Council its own shortcomings, indecision and lack of credibility. I therefore mention the situation as regards decisions on the IMPs after three summits of Community Heads of State and Government as an example of integrated political unreliability.

(*Applause*)

At the Stuttgart Summit in July 1983 the President-in-Office of the Council, the Federal German Chancellor Mr Kohl, could see no solution to the four main Community problems. He therefore bundled them together and handed them over, still unresolved, to his successor. The IMPs were thus given a place of honour next to the increasing of the Community's own resources, budgetary discipline and compensatory payments to the United Kingdom.

A breakthrough was announced at the Council meeting in June 1984: a compromise had been struck. An assurance was given that the measures in connection with the IMPs would begin in 1985. In the end the Council meeting on 3 and 4 December 1984 in Dublin did not even begin to solve the problem of the IMPs,

but said that the relevant regulation would be passed in March 1985. The interested European public is therefore eagerly waiting to find out what solution the Italian President will have to offer next month or what artful phraseology will be used to avoid a solution.

The problem of poverty and underdevelopment in the Mediterranean regions is one of the Community's most urgent tasks, since it touches at the Community's foundations and is crucial to its continued existence and cohesion. We have put this problem off for too long. It would be naïve and irresponsible of the wealthy and more highly developed northern regions to regard this task as a charitable undertaking for the benefit of their poor neighbours in the south. We have observed and established on the basis of statistics and documentary evidence how the socio-economic gap between the regions of Europe has been widening yearly. No Community — certainly none whose goal is political union — can afford such economic discrepancies. On a national level, we can all easily see that a country with income differentials of 1 to 4 cannot hold together. What will be the effect of such differences on a European scale?

My outspoken comments in favour of the Mediterranean regions and the Mediterranean programmes are not prompted by altruism or by a vague sense of justice, well motivated though these might be. I am acting out of a deep conviction that what is good for the continued existence and development of Europe is also in the interests of my electors and the people of South Bavaria whom I represent here, since the existence and development of the Community as a whole is at stake. This goal will be served by promoting and supporting major Community projects, not by petty haggling over a few thousand ECUs for a Community-assisted swimming pool in my own constituency.

While we are thinking in terms of Europe as a whole, I would like to say to those who have been referring today to a two-tier Europe and a Europe with two rates of progress that there is no alternative to a Europe of equal Member States and equal citizens. Those who think that the Community can be turned into a vehicle with two gears will one day find themselves up the creek with only one gear — reverse.

The IMPs must not be turned into one of the Council's little games which its members, nine men and one woman, will be happily playing for years to come to the general amusement of the public. Time is getting short, for there are two more southern countries about to join the Community. It is also in the interests of Spain and Portugal that the IMPs should get under way before their entry into the Community, since one of the aims of the programmes is to offset the drawbacks which the Community's southward enlargement will entail for the poor regions in the south. They will also provide a standard for Spain and Portugal which will be guaranteed by the Community after their entry.

Sakellariou

Insistent though I am that the IMPs should be launched before enlargement, I am even more adamant that the launching of the IMPs should not be delayed in order to postpone enlargement still further. This would place an even heavier burden on the south of the Community — an intolerable situation.

Heaven knows, the underdevelopment of the Mediterranean regions is not the Community's only problem: there is also the unacceptably high level of unemployment — very cautious estimates point to an average of 13% for the Community — the decay of once prosperous cities and the disintegration of whole sectors of industry are only the tip of the iceberg. The social policies of the mostly conservative national governments seem increasingly to be orientated towards a 'two-thirds' society in the style of Reagan or Thatcher. It has now become particularly important for the Community to use its funds to help improve the situation of the remaining third.

One of the Socialist Group's main demands is, therefore, that additional funds should be made available for the IMPs under a separate budgetary heading. We want nothing to do with any clever budgetary manoeuvres in which money is diverted from the Social and/or Regional Funds. On the contrary, in addition to the separate financing of the IMPs, we stand by our demand for an increase in structural funds.

The IMPs will cost around 1 000 million ECU each year. Those who doubt that such an amount can be made available should consider the agricultural budget. The yearly financing of the IMPs would amount to no more than 5 or 6% of the Community farm budget. It is high time the Community proved that the 35 million people in its Mediterranean regions are worth at least as much as its 25 million sacred dairy cows!

(Applause from the Socialist Group)

Mr Ligios (PPE). — *(IT)* Since I only have four minutes, Mr President, I should just like to say that I concur with the way our question and motion for a resolution has been presented by Mr De Pasquale and also with what Mr Lambrias and Mr Sakellariou have just said.

There are some plain facts concerning the social and economic situation of various regions in the Community about which there has been general consensus for some time, both in this Parliament and in all the Community institutions at various levels. These are incontestable statistical and financial data which nobody questions any longer.

First of all, it has been observed that the disparity in income between the poor and rich regions of the Community, which already existed at the time when we initiated this Community-building adventure, has

not only not diminished in recent years but has actually continued to increase. From an initial ratio of 1 to 3 it went from 1 to 5 and according to some sources even from 1 to 6.

Secondly, the fact is that all the so-called Mediterranean regions, that is to say those regions in which the integrated Mediterranean programmes (IMPs) should operate, are on the lowest rungs of the income ladder in all the statistics, in all the communications drawn up by the Commission or any other institution, including those outside the European Community.

A third indisputable fact is that the enlargement of the Community to include Spain and Portugal will have a definite impact which is detrimental to the Mediterranean regions. This is a direct quote from the Commission, Mr Delors, in its second report on the socio-economic situation of the Community published last October.

Another incontestable fact is that the entire amount of aid attributed to structural funds in the regions concerned with the IMPs, in the period 1973 to 1982, represented only — I repeat only — 6% of Community expenditure. The idea of the integrated Mediterranean programmes was developed in order to remedy — at least in part — these deep injustices, the cause of serious economic imbalances, social disturbances and political demonstrations which, in my opinion, the Council has very often underestimated and continues to do so at this point in time, just as we are about to launch the integrated Mediterranean programmes. We have been discussing the scheme for years and the Commission devised proposals which we in this House approved with a huge majority in March 1984. Subsequently, the proposals were modified precisely to take account of the enormous majority in this House; after that, the Council of Ministers stated that the IMPs were to be launched by 1985 — I am still quoting official documents — to improve the economic structures in the Community's southern regions and in view of the enlargement of the Community. All this denotes a substantial convergence which accords with the principles inspiring the scheme, meaning that the financial resources to sustain it needed to be of a certain size and additional to money already available. Mr Sakellariou was quite correct to insist on this point and I too am somewhat concerned at what has been said not just by the Council but also by the President of the Commission.

Unfortunately, it now seems that even these fundamental principles are being questioned. I affirm that the Commission must work out a new proposal which should not be too different from its predecessor if it wishes to have the support — as it did in the past — of this House. If we in this Parliament make a stand, this will serve to encourage the Commission and will also act as its conscience, so that it takes account of Parliament's opinion, which is that the Parliament is the natural ally of the Commission.

Mr Hutton (ED). — As Members here will know, my group takes a rather more detached and practical view of IMPs than the others. We perfectly understand the anxieties of the existing Mediterranean members about enlargement, but we are quite certain that enlargement is too important to flounder upon the rock of IMPs. I believe that we can begin IMPs this year if we are realistic about their funding. I very much welcome the tone of the President-in-Office of the Council and the President of the Commission as the sound of common sense. At the moment, the budget simply cannot afford the cost of IMPs. We must cut our coat according to our cloth, and I believe that we cannot look at IMPs separately from the structural funds of which they must be an integral part.

I have tried to estimate what help the Community will be likely to give Greece and Italy through the structural funds over the next five years — quite apart from anything which IMPs may provide. The figures are substantial: 3 billion ECU for Greece and 7.5 billion ECU for Italy. Add those figures to the enlargement terms for Spain and Portugal, which have been largely designed to protect Mediterranean producers, and it is possible to see IMPs in a more realistic context.

Demanding too much money will be more likely to have the effect of depriving the Mediterranean areas of the very help they want. If, for example, the Greek Government should delay the increase in our own resources by making the full-blown IMPs a condition of enlargement, the Community budget will have to be cut back to stay within the 1% ceiling and I believe that many programmes which would benefit Greece will have to be trimmed.

In view of the President of the Commission's remarks, I think it would be realistic to look at a two-stage start to IMPs: the first stage being the Community's answer to the Greek Memorandum; and support for Italy and the South of France following as the second stage.

I know how difficult it is for Mediterranean Members here to accept any change from the original Commission proposals, and to that extent those proposals have now complicated this subject enormously. Nevertheless, I believe that the Members of this House will serve the Mediterranean area best if they take a realistic rather than a political approach to the subject, and realism will certainly be the approach of this group.

Mr Alavanos (COM). — (GR) Mr President, I will not speak as a 'European' as did the representative of the New Democracy Party a short while ago, but as a representative of the Greek people. Dispensing with superfluous diplomacy and European courtesies I would like to state categorically that this is an unacceptable piece of deceit at the expense of the Greek people. Over six years have elapsed since 1979 and the Mediterranean programmes are still on the drawing-board. Naturally, from today's sitting there emerges a

new element following the Greek government's veto in Dublin. This element is the tremendous concession made by the Commission by comparison with the position which it had adopted until today. Indeed, I think that the presence of the President of the Commission Mr Delors does not demonstrate the Commission's interest, but underlines in a most solemn manner the Commission's *volte face* on the Mediterranean Programmes.

What, then, are the characteristics of the Commission's about-turn?

Firstly, whereas in its first proposal the Commission spoke of concrete appropriations — 6.6 billion ECU altogether, of which 2.5 ECU for Greece — it now refuses to discuss a concrete sum.

Secondly, the subsidies, as Mr Delors himself said, are to a large extent being replaced by loans from the European Investment Bank.

Thirdly, instead of having additional appropriations, as urged by the European Parliament, but also by the Commission in its initial proposals, Mr Delors speaks of 'coordination of the Community funds' — in a nutshell, the appropriations earmarked under the various funds will now be baptised 'Mediterranean'.

Fourthly, the main emphasis is not on development but on 'alignment' of the Greek economy with the accession treaties. Likewise, Mr Delors forcibly stressed the problem of so-called overproduction, i.e. the restriction on the production of agricultural products, an overproduction which the Mediterranean programmes will encourage, as the Commission now understands them. Similar views are expressed in the telegram which the Council read to us, and I would ask it whether it expresses the stand of the Greek government as well.

If there is deceit in the history of the IMPs, then there is both perpetrator and victim. And the question is: was the Greek government alone deceived by the EEC institutions? Or must we unfortunately conclude that the Greek people was also deceived by the government's practice to date, precisely at a time when there were systematic and insistent warnings from the Communist Party of Greece?

Why does the Greek government respect the signature of the New Democracy government to the Treaty of Accession, when the Council does not respect its signature at Fontainebleau and when the Commission does not respect its signature to the preceding proposal for a regulation?

Why does the government bow its head to the approximately 120 appeals which the Commission has submitted to the European Court of Justice and allow the EEC institutions to treat it as completely lacking in credibility?

Alavanos

Why did the government retreat from the referendum on withdrawal from the EEC to the Memorandum, and afterwards to the Mediterranean programmes, while it is now coming to discuss the new ideas of Mr Delors?

And I would like to ask Mr Delors whether it is right for us not to remember the 'European ideas' and to scorn the urgent need for finance only in the case of Greece. For how much did you speak about the returns to Great Britain? How much did you speak about the returns to West Germany? How much do you speak when the subject is the delay in incomings from dairy products in France and Holland?

In conclusion, Mr President, I would like to say that there is a critical question: what argument has the government put forward for vetoing enlargement? The proposals for a regulation of the Thorn Commission? Or these new ideas of Mr Delors? We believe in fact that the Greek government has no margin for further concessions and will have to make a complete u-turn.

Mr Romeo (L). — *(IT)* Mr President, those who have spoken before me have explained the reasons for the concern which led the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning to put an oral question with debate to the Council and the Commission.

I must say that what we have heard so far from the President-in-Office of the Council and from the President of the Commission has hardly been sufficient to dispel our concern.

What is certain, is that, if the IMPs are to fulfil the purpose for which they were conceived, that is to say the consequences of enlargement, the decisions taken must convince the populations of the Mediterranean area that the scheme is really designed to protect these areas. The programmes must be devised in such a way that they can be implemented swiftly and not just remain a promise which is only kept after the damage has been recognized.

Just now, Mr Hutton told us that he and his Group were realists. I've heard this refrain before: the realism he is talking about means in practice abandoning the IMPs; in order to be realistic, one must renounce the IMPs.

Why this argument? Because the figures are enormous. Because we, in Greece and Italy, will share 10 500 million ECU in five years, which, subdivided over five years, totals a little more than 200 million. This, together with the amounts proposed by the Commission for the IMPs will give a total of 3 500 million every year. 5 800 million ECUs were spent on milk alone in 1984, as against the 3 500 million on the Mediterranean regions.

When Mr Delors tells us that he thinks the financing for these programmes will be additional, I should be

grateful if he could possibly quantify such expenditure precisely, because to draw on already existing funds would mean transferring money already appropriated from one section to another; appealing to the European Investment Bank would mean using investments which are already largely earmarked. When the Commission says that it will assume responsibility for loans with interest-rate subsidies, we have to know to what extent it can assume this burden, as these subsidies will appear on the Commission's budget. That is why, if Parliament is to give its opinion, it must have precise figures at its disposal.

These figures are also important because, if the programmes are to be substantial, it is to be hoped that the regions and States concerned will do their share. If we are talking, however, about a paltry figure of a few hundred million, it is obvious that no region and no State would want to set up the bureaucratic machinery which would cost more than any benefits to be gained, given that the loans are relatively meagre. Apart from that, the regions and States concerned would subsequently be accused of not having done things that logically they should not and could not have done anyway. In conclusion, we really have to know the kind of sums we are talking about if the regions and States concerned are to do their bit.

(Applause)

Mr Musso (RDE). — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, this debate was supposed to be about the IMPs, but after listening to the President-in-Office of the Council and the President of the Commission, it seems to me that we have let ourselves be drawn into quite a different debate, one in which we are called upon to defend the IMPs, whose very principle has been challenged.

I say this because, judging from the statements we have just heard from the two Presidents, the IMPs are now a dead letter.

For what, ladies and gentlemen, have we been told? We have been told that there are problems. The first is that of the Greek veto and Mr Papandreou and the second is that the Commission's proposals are felt to be too costly. So, in order to avoid new conditions being imposed, in order to overcome the problems, a new solution is going to have to be found. And what is this new solution to be? It is, quite simply, to do away with the IMPs and to arrange for the existing structural funds to cover the regions concerned. As if previously the structural funds were unable to operate in these regions. And how is all this to be managed? Well, it appears that we must uphold certain objectives, which are, according to the President of the Commission, development, adaptation and support. Now as far as development is concerned, I am all for it. Adaptation too. And then I hear that where neither development nor adaptation is possible, we will make

Musso

do with support. Coming as I do from the only French island in the Mediterranean, I am very worried by all this. I am worried because when I heard both development and adaptation defined in terms of technological progress, I realized that all that was left for my poor region, and for other regions of the Community further to the south or the east, was support. That means there will be no more development, no more new initiatives. There will be whole populations whose continued existence will depend on outside finance, support and subsidies. These will be populations for whom life will lose all its zest and all its meaning.

Ladies and gentlemen, I believe that a firm line must be taken by this House. A previous speaker observed that we are the Commission's ally. That goes without saying. But if we are to be its true ally, we must be prepared, when circumstances dictate, to say to the Commission: be careful, your approach is a technical approach. I would not go as far as to use the word technocratic, but a technical approach all the same, and one which ignores certain realities, one which does not take account of the sensibilities of these Mediterranean regions. You will forgive and I hope understand my ardour. You are not going to solve this problem with your technical solutions, since you yourselves admit that the problem is there and that it is an important one.

As a true ally of the Commission, this House must say: you are wrong, we will never allow the very principle of the IMPs to be challenged. We need the IMPs, we need special programmes with special funding, and there can be no question of replacing such programmes by the existing structural funds, which are needed in addition.

(Applause)

Mr Almirante (DR). — *(IT)* A short while ago, Mr President, the Greek Member on the opposite benches talked about a swindle. And now, a representative of Corsica on benches not too far from our own has expressed himself more politely but has said essentially the same thing.

It grieves me to have to associate myself with this kind of talk and these kinds of criticisms and I very much regret having to do so on behalf of all the Members of the European Right, a Group which largely represents precisely those peoples — the French, Greek and Italian peoples — on whom an attack is now being made through the incredible behaviour of both the Council of Ministers and its representative and the President of the Commission.

It grieves me to use this language, Mr Forte, especially as, being an Italian Member, I had cherished certain hopes for the Italian Presidency. I will not say any more, because in Italy too we are sitting in different parts of the House. But, as an Italian Member, I had

hoped that the Italian Government would seize this opportunity to get a firm grip on these problems, which particularly affect France, Italy and Greece and which, without any shadow of a doubt, are affecting my country and my people in a way which is most pressing.

What you have said, Mr Forte, has thoroughly disconcerted me. You said that on 28 and 29 January the Commission announced some new ideas and that on 18 or 19 February, within a few days, the Council would proceed to examine the problem and that the Presidency of the Council — in quotes and literally — would do what it could. You forgot, Mr Forte, that on 29 March 1984 everything had already been decided by the Commission, whose President was then Mr Thorn. Mr De Pasquale brought up the story of the beaver who ripped off his own testicles in order not to have them removed by hunters. But there aren't any testicles around here! You can't pull them off because they don't even exist. What is more, Mr Forte, you said that the IMPs have been planned — and this is an actual quotation — for a limited period only. Who has decided to limit their duration? What is meant by limiting their duration?

As for Mr Delors, he has said that the Commission's requests have been rejected — among my notes, I have put this down between inverted commas too — because they were excessive. After which, Mr Delors, you said that you did not intend to go into Italy's figures or France's or Greece's. We don't mind going along with you in this matter of discretion. But do you think you could at least tell us what the total figure will be? Could you possibly give us an idea of the overall commitment? Can you tell us whether this is an additional amount or whether this is just another swindle — I have to use the word again — practised not against us Members, but against the peoples whom we have the honour of representing?

Don't tell me that the Community budget cannot bear this expense! Mr Romeo has just pointed out that this expenditure would be small, minute in comparison with what is expended, not to say squandered, on other items. Do not try to tell us that the European Investment Bank will step into the breach, because we know full well that the Bank does intervene from time to time, depending on its available funds. But the actual decisions have to be taken by us here! I demand, right here and now, that the European Parliament's independence and decision-making powers be recognized. When such vital issues are at stake, Parliament cannot tolerate being treated as if it didn't count, as if it did not exist, as if it were merely a talking shop, because to do so would mean not only jeopardizing the Parliament, but Europe as a whole!

(Applause from the right)

Mr Avgerinos (S). — *(GR)* Mr President, dear colleagues, it is unpleasant and distressing to have to

Avgerinos

return to issues which have already been decided on by all the Community institutions, precisely when these institutions have repeatedly reaffirmed their decisions. It is unpleasant, seeing that there is broad agreement on this issue, not only amongst the technocrats, but also amongst politicians from all Community countries and from all the political groupings which are represented in this Parliament. It is unpleasant and at the same time distressing, particularly today after the speech by the President of the Commission, for the Community to jeopardize its credibility and to deviate in a number of points from the basic goals of the Treaty of Rome, taking refuge in sterile refusal. The Community institutions decided in favour of the IMPs, on each occasion reasserting their firm resolve to realize these programmes, and justified the need for these programmes, specifying not only their character but also when they were to begin and what sums were involved. Years ago work started on preparing the IMPs at official level and subsequently, in 1981, the Commission presented its report on the programmes for the Mediterranean areas. In 1983 the Commission went on to make statements on the programmes and at the same time the Stuttgart Council underscored the importance of the issue. Subsequently the Commission estimated the necessary expenditure at 6 600 million ECU. In 1984 Parliament endorsed the Commission's proposal and after two months came the opinion of the Economic and Social Committee. Finally, we had the European Councils of Brussels and Fontainebleau, which established that the IMPs would be expedited with a view to aiding the southern regions and that they would be initiated in 1985.

Despite this, every attempt was made in Dublin to avoid not the decision — because the decision existed — but any discussion on the IMPs. It was mentioned that our position had provoked surprise, supposedly. But who felt surprised? The Community and its institutions? It was these who took the decisions to realize the IMPs. I must stress that we are dealing with a bad case of putting one's head in the sand, because we have a Treaty which propounds as a primary objective the convergence of the economies. We have a generally accepted form of technical intervention in the right direction and we even have a series of statements of political will, and yet finally the issue is postponed time after time.

We should remember one further dimension to the problem of implementing the IMPs which is also continually overlooked. This dimension concerns a typically regional problem in its more extreme form and also the fate of the Greek Memorandum submitted in 1982. Its urgency was recognized by the European Council in Stuttgart and, finally, was largely accepted by the Commission in its well-known declaration to the Council of 29. 3. 1983.

In its declaration the Commission states that the IMPs satisfy many of the demands of the Greek Memorandum. Thus, the IMPs started out as a Community

action aimed at tackling the relative underdevelopment of the Mediterranean regions as such, long before Greece's accession. Subsequently it was considered that they could provide a solution to the Greek problem and finally, as you know, the Community adopted the view that they constituted a response to the impact which the imminent enlargement of the Community will have on the Mediterranean regions. Thus, our position springs from these Community decisions: that is to say, it is impossible to proceed to enlargement unless there is first of all a binding decision by the Community on the IMPs.

First and foremost it is necessary to make clear that a major problem exists regarding the Mediterranean regions which cannot be ignored, that in order to tackle this problem there is a need for structural interventions of a substantial order and that, moreover, the Mediterranean regions and Greece in particular cannot allow time to pass before these interventions are realized.

Thus, dear colleagues, our position must be such as to provide a concrete answer to the question: do the actions which are proposed satisfy concrete existing or emergent needs or do they not? This is particularly important with an eye to this year's marathon on the budget.

Winding up I would like to say, and I am addressing these words in particular to the President of the Commission, that an assurance is needed that the concrete funds to be provided will be granted over and above those to which each country is entitled on a regular basis — and I do not believe that you proposed to finance the IMPs from the structural funds.

Thus, I would like to stress that, firstly, the main feature of this financing is that the appropriations must be additional and supplementary ones.

Secondly, the percentage of Community financing must be sufficiently high to ensure that the programmes in question will not come to grief because of a lack of national resources for co-financing.

Thirdly, the areas of intervention, the nature of the planned measures and their duration must be attuned to the needs which have been established and should not be based on abstract plans.

IN THE CHAIR: MR DIDÒ

Vice-President

Mr Bernard-Reymond (PPE). — (FR) Mr President, Mr President of the Commission, ladies and gentlemen, over the ages, historical, geographical and cul-

Bernard-Reymond

tural influences have etched the faces of three Europes onto the map of our continent: Northern and Anglo-Saxon Europe, Latin and Mediterranean Europe and Central and Slavic Europe, and there can be no doubt that the form of future relations between these three European will be one element shaping our destiny.

The contacts which we have with Eastern Europe, which has been under the totalitarian yoke for decades now, are difficult, dangerous even, but they are necessary. They are not, however, what we are here to discuss today.

The dialogue between the northern and the Mediterranean countries of Europe is also of very considerable importance. Naturally, this is a relationship of a quite different kind, one that is founded on mutual trust between partner countries of the free world which have chosen the same political system. It would be wrong, however, to forget that here too stable relations are a prerequisite for European stability as a whole. However, with the probable accession of Spain and Portugal now just around the corner, it has to be said — and said in no uncertain terms — that up until now the European Economic Community has paid too little attention to the countries of Southern Europe. This is true of the Mediterranean agricultural policies, which were slow in gaining full acceptance in Europe, and it is true of the use of the structural funds, as witnessed by the fact that between 1973 and 1982 the total amount of aid allocated to the Mediterranean regions by the Regional Fund, the Social Fund and the Guidance Section of the EAGGF represents no more than some 31% of the overall appropriations of these funds and 6% of EEC expenditure.

The truth of the matter is that the decision-makers of Europe staked their bets on Northern Europe, on the Europe of business and industry, in the belief that investment there was likely to be safer and more profitable. For them, the Mediterranean was more the image of a glorious past, the cradle of a civilization, than an opportunity for Europe to develop. But the world does not stand still. There is nothing to say that technologies of tomorrow will take root where yesterday's industries once stood. The restructuring will not be restricted to changes in particular sectors but will involve geographical movements. Europe must wake up to the great challenge and the extraordinary opportunity which the exposure of these southern regions to the new tide of world growth will offer. And in the worldwide economic battle it is important that Europe's southern flank be strengthened.

Tomorrow, if the will is there — and the will must be there — these regions could become the California of Europe. This, it seems to me, is the true perspective in which the whole issue of IMPs should be viewed.

It is not a question of money-grubbing budgetary negotiations, nor is it a question of appeasing the south with titbits taken from the surpluses of the

north. The point is to provide the Mediterranean countries of Europe with the necessary means to adapt and to participate fully in the economic recovery of our continent. The IMPs must be looked on as an investment and not as a collection for the needy, even if there is an element of sharing the burden. The basic idea of IMPs is forward-looking and sound, it reflects a more global view of regional development and planning, identifying and bringing into play the necessary forms of cooperation. IMPs are a policy to be taken seriously, but to deprive this new instrument of the financial means on which it depends, or to derive that finance by redeploying the existing funds, to add, in other words, a pinch of IMPs to the penury of the structural funds, would reduce this instrument to a caricature of what was intended. On this point I fully approve of the stand which Greece has taken, even if discussion of the scale of financial support to be given should best be left open.

I hope that the Council will not betray its own principles and that it will very quickly succeed in finding a formula for the necessary agreement, since without such agreement enlargement can never take place.

I hope, too, that the Council will not be deaf to the pleas of the citizens of the countries concerned, who are not saying 'give us back our money' but 'give us back our future'.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

Mr C. Beazley (ED). — Mr President, I will not speak about the division of Europe, because I think such a concept is alien to the political purpose of this Parliament. The true and natural divergence in Europe, however, is not the artificially imposed East-West divide which after 40 years we look back on with sadness and indignation. It is the north-south distinction. The problem of the relation of the European countries with a Mediterranean perspective as opposed to those from the north goes back throughout history to the time of the Roman empire, essentially a Mediterranean entity which embraced and included those far-flung outposts such as my own country, Britannia. It is true that a correct balance between the northern countries and the Mediterranean countries is essential for the harmonious development of Europe, and for that reason the notion of the integrated Mediterranean programme is by no means unattractive to those of us who come from the northern seaboard of the Atlantic.

But I have detected throughout this debate a great element of overstatement by certain Members of this House who seem to be almost precluding the discussion by the Council of the Mediterranean question. Extremely strong words have been used. It has been stated that a swindle is about to be perpetrated. It seems to me that this is getting the whole question out of perspective. The President of the Commission did in fact introduce a very great note of optimism and

Beazley

hope that we would not overbid the Mediterranean problem to such an extent that the whole accession question would be negated. It seems to me that the greatest political swindle perpetrated would be if the accession of the new and young democracies of Spain and Portugal were to be blocked for cynical and nationalistic reasons. My own country also has much to suffer economically from the accession of these new countries. I believe we have to look at the economic problems carefully, but the integrated Mediterranean policy is not set in stone. It is not something sacrosanct. The end purpose is to safeguard the interests of the Mediterranean countries without blocking the accession of two new Mediterranean countries. I do think we should look at the end purpose and take heart from what the President of the Commission has said and not get ourselves in a state where we have missed the point by exaggerating the problem.

Mrs De March (COM). — (FR) Mr President, no-one can now dispute that Community policies favouring the Mediterranean regions have all failed.

The fact of the matter is, in my view, that regional disparities in the Community have widened. Although the integrated Mediterranean programmes are no substitute for far reaching changes in the misguided policies we have followed to date, they are nonetheless born of a desire to take action specifically favouring the Mediterranean regions. There is a need for this action and the agricultural organizations in France are pressing for it. What the French members of the Communist and Allies Group would like to see is a change in the content of the programmes. As they stand, they fit into a pattern of restructuring and reorganization based on a principle of levelling down which is contrary to the Treaty of Rome and offers no adequate alternatives to satisfy the real needs of these regions.

We share the view that the regions must not be seen in make-believe terms. In France, for example, does anyone believe that the problems of the south can be really solved by replacing hundreds of hectares of vineyards by feed and protein crops, or by drastically cutting back olive oil production to produce more table olives? I must also say that the Commission has continued to be very vague about the question of finding markets for these products.

The proposal to encourage the development of small and medium-sized firms and to give support for incomes and employment in the sector of the processing and marketing of agricultural products is clearly worth supporting.

We have also noted the opinion of the President of the Commission that 'conversion' will get us nowhere. After all, what will be left to process or market, once these regions are no longer producing anything? And the one or two measures taken or planned in the tourism and craft industries are not going to be enough

to cure their economic backwardness at a time when aid to the shipbuilding industry is being so scandalously restricted at Community level.

No, the fact is that speeding up the grubbing up of vineyards and orchards will achieve no more than — in the words of Mr Natali last year — leaving part of the Community market open to Mediterranean products.

Let us be quite clear on this: the proposed measures are designed essentially to pave the way for the accession of Spain and Portugal. They are in the spirit of Dublin, and are particularly disastrous for the wine-growing sector. Furthermore, the large-scale demonstrations against the Dublin agreement in Montpellier showed that our wine-growers from Provence, Côte d'Azur and Languedoc were well aware of this.

Mr President, we know now that enlargement will only aggravate the problems in these regions. The difficulties encountered at the negotiations bear witness to this. For the agricultural sector and for the fisheries sector, the consequences will be catastrophic.

The two applicant countries, with very low production costs and with 70% of the Community fishing fleet, would be formidable competition for French farmers and fishermen. It would be illusory to imagine that the IMPs will put us on an equal footing. It would also be wrong to suppose that new markets will automatically open up. The opening of markets in the applicant countries is by no means a certainty, because under GATT the disruption of trade patterns would mean calls for compensation, under pressure from the United States in particular, and the Community cannot guarantee this.

Europe is thus caught up in a web of problems which are not getting any easier. Far from resolving them, enlargement can only make them worse and create new ones, with the risk of a rapid weakening of Europe and its disintegration, leaving it no more than a vast free-trade area open to all-comers, not to mention a question which is all too often ignored: the cost of enlargement which the Commission, by its own admission, is unable to calculate — at a time when the budget crisis has still not been resolved.

Mr President, I have almost finished. It is time for a rethink. Instead of trying to make everything subordinate to enlargement, of which the regions in the south will be the first victims, it would be better to introduce a policy of real cooperation with the applicant countries, a broad policy of mutually beneficial cooperation which would go some way to solving the real problems facing all of us, on both sides of the Pyrenees.

The 1983 Franco-Spanish agreement on industry and experience with Airbus have shown that the possibilities are numerous. Only in this perspective can the implementation of the IMPs be of any real value for

De March

these regions. These programmes will then be able to replace the Community policy of destruction by a policy of development and support, as you said, making use of the existing potential instead of destroying it.

One last word on funding. This was already quite inadequate compared with the requirements quoted in the initial proposal, but now the Council wants to reduce it even further and the Commission is proposing to fall in with the present cost of things in the Community — and that means policies of austerity and crisis. The IMPs would then be nothing more than a financial ploy to remove the last traces of Greek resistance, however justified, to enlargement. Mr President, if the integrated programmes are to be anything more than a means of making the unacceptable acceptable, they must be given sufficient funds and their content must be modified to enable them to achieve the objectives for which they were originally designed: increased income and improved employment for the populations of the south as a whole.

Mrs Fuillet (S). — (FR) Mr President, Mr President of the Commission, ladies and gentlemen, why is it that the question of the IMPs needs to be rediscussed today? No decision on them was taken by the Dublin European Council nor, it seems, is any attempt being made to honour the commitments entered into at Fontainebleau, which provided for full implementation of the IMPs in 1985. Are we therefore justified in wondering whether the IMPs are a lost cause or perhaps even just a pipe-dream?

As you know, I have always been and am still an enthusiastic supporter of the IMPs. In order to fully understand the attitudes of the various sides in this matter, it is necessary to go straight to the underlying principles of these programmes. No, they are not merely a question of getting ones sums right — give a little here, get a little back there. No, they are not a matter of arithmetic. Nevertheless, aware as we all are of the budgetary problems besetting Europe, it is perhaps worthwhile to review the IMP budget and its scales of aid. On this point, Mr President of the Commission, I am in complete agreement with you, even if I am at odds with the prevailing view of this House.

Perhaps the sum of 6 600 million ECU is indeed rather too high and perhaps it is possible to find ways of achieving the same objective by investing in a different way, for example by redirecting the structural funds — the ERDF, the Social Fund, the Guidance section of the EAGGF — towards the southern regions. Perhaps the Community could use a system of loans. Perhaps making the programmes additional to the contracts signed by the regions could help to reduce the overall cost for Europe. Perhaps, for the sake of balance and fair distribution, a slightly greater share of the funds should go to France. I think, however, that it would be ill-advised to cut the amount which Greece receives, since that is where the need is greatest.

Between 1973 and 1982 the total amount of aid allocated to the Mediterranean regions through the structural funds accounted for no more than about 31% of the total budget for these funds and about 6% of Community expenditure. Neither the procedure used nor the aid itself proved capable of reducing the disparities between the regions. The fact must be faced that the gap in development between the regions has not narrowed and has even, in some cases, widened. What has become of the Treaty of Rome, which states that the development of Europe should proceed in a spirit of harmony by eliminating the disparities between regions?

We are about to welcome amongst us two Mediterranean countries to which we are linked by both historical and cultural ties. We are glad to welcome these countries, glad to increase our political standing by upholding our European conception of democracy and glad, also, to lend weight to democracy in Spain by including that country in our Community. Since one of the objectives of the IMPs is to prepare the Mediterranean regions for enlargement, the two applicant countries will not, of course, be entitled to benefit from the Mediterranean programmes. This has already been pointed out but I think it is worthwhile repeating.

The need to take account of Spanish and Portuguese problems will have an impact on the regions which Community policy has bypassed for too long. Accession must therefore be carefully prepared. Moreover because something is difficult that is no reason for not attempting it — it is precisely because one does not attempt it that it becomes difficult.

In order to achieve the main objectives of the IMPs, which are to raise the level of incomes and reduce unemployment in the regions for which these funds are intended, it is absolutely essential to respect the integrated nature of these programmes; it is essential, in other words, to try to overcome the various corporatist attitudes and make use of the Community's structural policy instruments to correct, reinforce and intensify the projects in hand. This must be done first of all in the primary sector, the linchpin of economic activity in these regions, and then secondarily in the other sectors, which will be able to accommodate the working population displaced from the primary sector. An integrated programme must lay the foundations for an organized rural environment, in which both agricultural and non-agricultural activities can develop alongside each other in these regions in a coordinated and balanced fashion.

IMP funding for the non-agricultural sectors accounts for rather less than half the total. If the IMPs are to succeed as a whole, these sectors must receive support. They are, if I may put it that way, an 'integral part' of the integrated programmes. The development of small and medium-sized businesses and of craft industries, for example, is one of the areas of application of the IMPs. These industries, which are essential to the

Fuillet

economic fabric in the regions in question, are vulnerable and are facing many problems in a vast competitive market. Their capacity for research and development in the field of new technologies is limited, as is their access to supplies of raw materials, and they have little bargaining power, but what is far more serious is that these weaknesses are accentuated by the way in which production and marketing are organized to the benefit of the larger firms.

Nevertheless, these smaller businesses have proved to be stabilizing influences regardless of the economic climate and, because they have always been able to react more flexibly to economic changes than the larger firms, have been seen to constitute a particularly effective bulwark against the phenomenon of youth unemployment. Furthermore they specialize in manufacturing quality products which meet the exact needs of consumers.

A further sphere in which the IMPs apply is the development of tourism in rural areas and the promotion of culture. There is no need, I think, to spell out the vast potential of the Mediterranean regions as regards tourism and culture. The revival of these regions will have direct, accountable consequences as well as other more indirect effects such as slowing down the rate of rural depopulation, sustaining agricultural production, lowering unemployment levels and so on.

As far as energy is concerned, these regions are at present highly dependent, since they possess few mineral resources of their own for the production of energy. However, the exploitation of geothermal resources and peat and lignite deposits could contribute to the economic development of the small and medium-sized businesses. A start must also be made, through experimental programmes, on tapping the energy potential of biomass by means of suitable crops and plantations, by making use of refuse from the big cities and unused agricultural by-products.

If all this potential for economic expansion is to be realized, attention must also be paid to the infrastructures — to transport systems, communications networks and the construction industry. To invest in such sectors is also to create new focal points for development.

Ladies and gentlemen, the pilot schemes carried out by the regional, national and Community authorities have already proved that the IMPs can be made to work.

Let us not leave it at that, let us widen the scope of the IMPs to include all the regions concerned and make provision for whatever measures are needed to ensure that they develop in an integrated manner.

To do this is not simply a matter of justice or of equity, it is also in the considered interest of Europe, of that Europe which we are seeking to achieve, a

Europe which is balanced, united and prosperous, a Europe which continues its forward march. This should be the great and noble idea, to restore a balance which neither nature nor history have achieved.

Mr Lambrias (PPE). — (GR) Mr President, I praised Mr Delors from this bench the last time he came here to explain to us with crystal clarity and genuine emotion his ideas as to how Europe should advance.

Today, I was astounded at what he said. This time, the clarity and ardour of his opinions was replaced by a non-committal vagueness. He tried to convince us — skilfully, it must be admitted — that a new, realistic plan is being prepared to replace entirely the policy of the integrated Mediterranean programmes, on which a tombstone was placed today bearing the epitaph: unrealistic or outmoded. Finally, he passed the buck to the Council. Unfortunately, however, the representative of the Council also left us unsatisfied and, to be frank, he disappointed us, because he assiduously avoided undertaking any concrete commitment, confining himself to the most insubstantial and general expressions of good will.

Thus, Mr President, our worst fears have materialized, fears which prompted us from last October on to call insistently for this discussion. It is now clear that plans are afoot, as I said in my initial speech, to strip the integrated Mediterranean programmes both quantitatively and qualitatively and to alter them completely. It appears that they will try to get us to switch our hopes to the European Investment Bank, to various loans which we can obtain from a variety of funds, and they will ask us to prepare new programmes, to submit to new procedures. We ask: if this possibility existed, could not the Parliament and the previous Commission, which has been dealing with this problem for five years, have discovered these life-giving and magic solutions? How come the new Commission found them under the threat or pressure of a concrete response which would likewise resolve, in a devious manner, the problem of the enlargement of the Community to include Spain and Portugal?

Who can be convinced that these magic and realistic solutions will be found in the time left to us? Mr President, I fear that all this does not constitute politics. What we have is a 'Kafka's Castle' — bureaucratic, technocratic if you wish, which we are invited to enter. The reaction of this entire Parliament to this subject — with the exception of one group — is characteristic. For this reason we support the joint motion for a resolution and, incidentally, I would like, in reply to one of the speakers who found reasons for optimism in what Mr Delors said, to say that realism and politicians are not incompatible concepts.

Mr Filinis (COM). — (GR) Mr President, the Communist Party of Greece (Interior) also pointed out in

Filinis

the past that the integrated Mediterranean programmes were adopted at a fortunate moment for the Community. Now they are in jeopardy because certain governments of the Member States, having assured their own demands, have broken their word, and also because the Commission has been inadmissibly compliant.

Today, voicing the demands and expectations of the farming population and of all the workers in our country, we insist on the initial sums and the initial timetables. After all, it is a fact that a realistic solution cannot exist without ensuring some fundamental and down-to-earth result for the Mediterranean countries and regions. I will not harp on the principle of 'juste retour'. However, without guarantees that each region will receive the necessary sums, the IMPs are clearly in jeopardy.

Likewise, it is essential that there be no tampering with the structural funds. Unfortunately, this is what Mr Delors proposed. Mr President, to the upheavals which our country experienced on entering the EEC will be added the upheavals due to enlargement. The IMPs constitute one of the responses which can facilitate the harmonious coexistence of Greece with the EEC and render possible the entry of Spain and Portugal.

Mr Mattina (S). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, my dissatisfaction at what has been said, both by Mr Delors and by Mr Forte, is at least equal to that already expressed by all the Members who have preceded me. I feel that a basic fact is being underestimated, namely that, in the current stage of economic transition, the southern regions of the Community are experiencing a further slowing down in their development.

Mr Delors says that we must talk about new conditions for development and ways of promoting it. Fine, let's talk about it! Mr Hutton speaks about the need to be realistic, but we must be careful here, as we are faced with a situation which forebodes ill for the future! According to calculations made by European economists, Europe's southern regions will need a good ninety years to catch up with the income levels of their richer northern neighbours, if current trends of development continue. In order to forestall this prospect, which would be tragic, we need additional resources, both national and Community. We need specific aid programmes.

In this context, the integrated Mediterranean programmes are certainly no panacea, but they do offer genuine chances of helping to speed up local economic development. If that is so, I must say that the positions adopted this morning seem very far removed from our hopes and expectations. The Council cannot keep deferring, from one summit to another and one session to another, the choice of a suitable solution for

finding the necessary additional funds to launch the programmes. Mr Forte must state, here and now, a great deal more than he already has about the directions to be taken. I should like to remind Mr Forte that the date for launching the IMPs is not 1985 as a whole, but March 1985. Time is therefore running out for us, unless of course we want to jeopardize the whole project.

As far as the Commission is concerned, I can agree with you, Mr Delors, that it is not wise to establish to whom one sum or another is to be paid, but you really ought to tell us whether the figures already fixed by the previous Commission and on which this House has already given its opinion, are to be retained. You should go even further. It seems to me that you should deny the news item which appeared in the 'Stampa', according to which the integrated programmes are to be whittled down to a package of some million ECU to be assigned to Greece and to be drawn, among other sources, from the current structural funds. It would be a very grave matter, Mr Delors, if, after having declared here in Strasbourg, only a month ago that — I quote your very words — 'The purpose of the IMPs is to make the best possible use of a legacy of resources and abilities' we were to discover that the situation had been turned on its head only a month later. If this were to be the case — I am speaking quite bluntly now — I believe that it would be the duty of this House to remind everyone that among its limited powers there is that of censuring the Commission.

To sum up, I should like to stress that the integrated Mediterranean programmes are not a Greek problem, but this has already been repeated. They mean a new outlook and are vital for the Community's southern regions, those less developed regions which are suffering the effects of structural unemployment more than any others. What is more, it is these very regions which will suffer the most serious impact from and effects of enlargement. But let us be quite clear about this, whether with or without Spain and Portugal, the need for aid from additional resources apart from the structural funds remains both definite and pressing in order to bring the Community's north and south together.

For the southern populations of the Community, the IMPs are — in the manner and terms in which they were conceived and planned — a help albeit modest — and once again I am quoting your own words, Mr Delors — 'so that development can be envisaged and implemented on the basis of the human and natural resources of each Member country'. If these words are still valid, there is no going back and no point in starting all over again; we must exclude, without any shadow of a doubt, any solutions which would spoil the only card that we have to play these days in the southern regions.

Mr Poettering (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we are all pleased that Spain and Por-

Mattina

tugal will soon be joining the Community. But for the accession of those countries, we would not now be discussing the integrated Mediterranean programmes.

I am glad that the President of the Commission, Mr Delors, is present because I wanted to remind the new Commission of the historical background to our efforts to establish a programme of aid for the Mediterranean regions. As early as February 1982 Parliament adopted a motion for a resolution concerning a plan for the Mediterranean which included the Community's southern regions together with Spain and Portugal. Our proposals, which were adopted almost unanimously by Parliament, provided for a revolving fund and a large-scale system of loans at favourable interest rates for the Mediterranean regions similar to the Marshall plan after the Second World War. To our great disappointment — and I underline this for the benefit of the new Commission — the Commission accepted only a handful of our proposals, rejecting the key proposal for a revolving fund and a system of loans.

I would point out that in March of last year, Mr Kazazis drew up a report on the Commission proposals concerning the IMPs. This report did not express complete approval of the Commission proposals: in fact, Mr Kazazis expressly stated — and here I quote from the resolution: 'Parliament welcomes the fact that the Commission has taken account of several observations in the resolution of 16 February 1982 in its proposals for integrated Mediterranean programmes, but rejects and criticizes the fact that the Commission has not taken up the idea put forward in the abovementioned resolution for resources for a Mediterranean Plan based on a revolving fund'. If there had been a vote of no confidence in the previous Commission, I would have voted against the Commission, and I know that many of my colleagues share my views on the rejection of our proposal concerning the revolving fund.

I would like to make one further comment as Chairman of the Sub-Committee on Security and Disarmament. I am wholeheartedly in favour of helping the poor regions of the Community, especially in the south, because this will contribute towards Europe's internal security; but for this we need the right machinery. I therefore earnestly appeal to the Commission and the Council to accept our February 1982 proposals on the revolving fund so that all the Community countries as well as this House can give their approval for an urgently needed programme for the Mediterranean regions.

Mr Trivelli (COM). — (IT) I think that we are all witnessing very grave events which portend consequences that cannot yet be assessed. Mr Forte and Mr Delors have said the same thing: the IMPs are reduced to a mere attempt to coordinate existing funds better, with vague promises of an increase.

It is less for Mr Delors to wrap up the complications and failure with ideas on the IMPs which in themselves are quite acceptable and which even I could share. In fact, it even makes the situation more serious because, between Mr Delors' words and the facts there is a very serious contradiction which could lead to a crisis of confidence. Besides, the silence of the Commissioner and of the Minister on the three proposals put forward in Mr De Pasquale's question speaks for itself.

We need to be clear about what is going on and therefore I put the following questions: do the positions of the Commission and Council with regard to the IMPs coincide? Is there a conflict between the views held by the Commission and the Parliament and between the positions adopted yesterday by the Commission and those of today? Could Mr Forte and Mr Delors tell us clearly whether they welcome or reject at least one of the proposals put forward by Mr De Pasquale, that is to say that funds for the IMPs should be special, additional and adequate and have their own budgetary line?

Mr von der Vring (S). — (DE) Mr President, some governments represented in the Council of Ministers have criticized the 'unrealistic' proposals concerning the amount of funds to be allocated to the integrated Mediterranean programmes. They accuse the previous Commission of having raised unrealistic expectations with the figure of 1 000 million ECU a year, and say that this will make people greedy.

We understand these complaints, because they are characteristic of the attitudes of certain governments who want free access to the Community market without giving anything in return. We should be wary of lending our support to that kind of realism. Of course, we must be realistic. We were elected to build up a European Community worthy of the name. That is our job, and it cannot be accomplished without sacrifice. Such a Community is not more 'realistic' than the Commission proposals for yearly financing of 1 000 million ECU.

Let me repeat a comment which we have made on many occasions in this House: instead of bringing about the promised convergence, the Community is allowing the gap between the rich and poor regions to grow constantly, and the crisis is proving particularly damaging to the southern regions. Even the benefits of the Common Agricultural Policy — which was originally intended to compensate for the trade advantages of the industrialized countries and should go to the south — are now enjoyed mainly by the wealthy countries.

On balance, the Community is doing nothing appreciable to reduce this gap.

In other words, fairness is not an essential criterion for deciding Community policies. It is not surprising that

von der Vring

the Council is tending more and more to forget the Community spirit and that it is the small and weak countries which bitterly insist on the right of veto in the Council, otherwise they would be trampled underfoot as a result of the 'Community spirit' of the prosperous nations. Without fairness in Community policy-making, there can be no progress and no Community which works.

The Mediterranean programmes, and especially their financing, will put the Community's desire for fairness and progress to the test. To ignore this would be totally unrealistic. The programmes are in fact a realistic approach to the problem. They recognized the fact — and this was a difficult lesson for us to learn! — that prosperity in the Mediterranean can best be strengthened by modernising Mediterranean agriculture, and not by increasing production and creating more surpluses with endless haggling over prices as the main factor determining incomes, but by improving quality and producing marketable goods. That is the best way out of this agricultural quagmire we now find ourselves in. In other words — and this House has often supported this principle — we do not want to reduce expenditure for farmers. We want an increase in structural expenditure rather than in guarantee expenditure, and we want the EAGGF to be used in a sensible, productive way.

This is an important principle underlying the reorganization of our budget, and the IMPs provide a point of departure.

I am happy to say that the Commissioner, Mr Andriessen, yesterday referred to the link with the present farm price proposals, with which we have obtained such poor results for fruit and vegetables. These are the alternatives, and they will obviously cost money. We must increase the Community's revenue if we are to develop the Community on a sound basis. But there must be no squandering of surpluses or destruction of crops. That is our position with regard to budgetary discipline. Our main criticism of the Council's approach to budgetary discipline is that the proportion of the budget accounted for by domestic product will be frozen for a long time. This will make it impossible for it to build the Europe it is striving towards. So I repeat — the integrated Mediterranean programmes will be a test of the Council's Community spirit!

Mr Maher (L). — Mr President, even though, as my accent and language will suggest, I do not come from the Mediterranean region, I rise because I believe that this question of an integrated approach — in other words, harmonizing the policies that apply to regions like this — has implications for the whole of the Community. What is done in the Mediterranean regions might very well be a headline, an example, for what could happen in other regions.

I believe that during the life of the Community — certainly since I have been familiar with it over the last

10 years — there has been a considerable wastage of resources because one part of the Commission did not know what the other part was doing as regards the impact of the policies it was following in a given region. Of course, the same can be said of Member governments, even in small countries. Frequently we find one department of government pursuing a certain policy related to a given region which is tending to minimize the good effects of another policy, or sometimes is even in flat contradiction to it.

Therefore, I am very pleased that this debate is taking place and that the President of the new Commission is present, because I do not believe that even as far as the agricultural policy as it applies to the Mediterranean and other regions is concerned, we can carry on indefinitely with the kind of narrow approach that we have had up till now in applying the agricultural policy or the regional policy or the social policy, as the case may be. We must consider all the needs of a given region, everything that is happening there, look at the lives of the people, what they require in order to create and maintain a viable and prosperous community, and then construct a policy that will take into account all the needs of that region. We must reconsider the agricultural policy, the regional policy and the social policy to make sure that the end result is to improve the prosperity of all the people living in that region, not just the farmers, not just the business people, not just the hoteliers and others.

Mrs Gadioux (S). — (*FR*) Mr President, Commission President, speaking in this chamber recently on the guidelines for the new Commission you said 'the Community can no longer reach any decisions; the Community can no longer make any progress'. The integrated Mediterranean programmes are an example of this lack of progress. We can only express our delight that we now have before us some evidence of a will to produce something. Permit me simply to make the point that the integrated Mediterranean programmes correspond to a real need. They must also meet strict requirements. Dual constraints, in fact: political and economic.

First the political angle. The problem is not a new one; it dates from the days when we were trying to reform the common agricultural policy, but it has acquired new significance with the forthcoming enlargement of the Community. Whether we like it or not, the IMPs have for one Member State become a precondition for enlargement, and this was noted at the Dublin summit. We have to be realistic: if we wish to bring new members in, we shall first have to agree on the IMPs, in as much as they appear in any case to be an economic necessity. Is there any need to repeat how important it is to keep control of changes in the dominant agricultural sector in these regions in Greece, in Italy and in France, even if we might have wished for greater importance to be attached to the non-agricultural sector, which has its role in development and job-crea-

Gadioux

tion. We may be obliged to advance cautiously, but we cannot afford to fail. Let us set out straight away the rules we must keep to. Three in number, as I see them: our actions must be clear, they must be coherent, and they must be efficient.

Clear as regards expenditure, because a number of problems — and not simple ones — remain unresolved. Such as, what share of the finance will be borne by a specific budget line, and what part by existing structural funds. Will the same criteria be applied as for the funds, or shall we make specific rules for the IMPs? What timetable can we set? These questions need unequivocal answers.

Coherent as regards our action. We must avoid spreading our efforts thinly, avoid one-off measures, and concentrate with a real will to integrate programmes, providing at the same time coordination of the various Community funds, and coordination between Member States and the Community institutions; and we must never lose sight of the additional nature of the funds.

Finally, efficient. The shares between beneficiaries must be a function of the severity of the problems of each country and each region. Finance for IMPs must have no effect on other current or future programmes for regions outside the Mediterranean, particularly integrated development operations.

Those, Mr President, are the main principles which we consider should underly the rules to be drafted for the IMPs. This Assembly, elected by universal suffrage, intends to play its role fully, to respect the undertakings it has given. This is the meeting point of the requirements of regional development and the requirements of democracy.

President. — Before calling Mr Forte and Mr Delors, I put to the vote the requests for an early vote announced from the Chair by Mr Fanti a short time ago.

(Parliament agreed to the requests for an early vote)

The two motions for resolutions will be put to the vote at 6 p.m. tomorrow.

Mr Forte, President-in-Office of the Council. — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I listened with great interest to what Mr Delors said regarding the need to take a long-term view of the integrated Mediterranean projects, from here to the year 2000, and not to look backwards, in a way which often reflects that very backwardness which has been lamented and which no one wants to see perpetuated.

We were naturally very pleased to hear that the IMPs must be funded by additional finance, even if we

should have liked to have had a more specific idea of the amount, but I believe that various Members have stressed this point sufficiently. We have also heard a great many statements on the question of the total sum, which we regard as highly important, but we have seldom heard anything — except from Mrs Gadioux and Mr Mattina — about efficiency and productivity leading to economic growth.

I believe that this viewpoint was expressed by the Commission, and that the Council also regards it as extremely pertinent, namely that the IMPs are not just one more fund, but are actually a stimulus helping to effect changes which — as has been observed here — are made all the more necessary given the forthcoming entry of Spain and Portugal into the European Community. Even without their adhesion, such changes would still be indispensable, if we are to avoid the existence of a 'second speed' Europe. If this has already come about, it is obviously because the various aid policies have not been sufficiently productive and efficient, in addition to which there is perhaps another reason — which we haven't heard much about, but what I mean is that it is vital that aid goes to citizens, businessmen, young people, and innovators, maybe even to those who are studying new technologies, and far less to the usual recipients, those representing traditional interests.

We believe that the Commission's ideas must be supported in an effort of this kind, in order — of course — to point to the concept that the IMPs must be additional and use all available instruments, yet must not create delays.

I will answer the three questions raised by Mr Trivelli: first, must all the funds be used? Yes, this goes without saying, considering what I have already said, because it is necessary for the integrated Mediterranean programmes to be used as instruments for change and to be highly productive. What about additionality? Yes, of course, there is a need to mobilize maximum resources. What about an additional budgetary line? Of course I agree, along with the need for clarity which has been voiced by Mrs Gadioux.

As for the three questions which I feel I have already answered from Mr De Pasquale and others, of course I believe that the launching of these programmes is urgent and that the timely adoption of the regulation would be an extremely desirable aim, to which the Italian presidency is committing itself, while it must not be forgotten that the agreement of all the other Member States is also needed.

Finally, in answer to the question as to what the position of the Council would be if the European Parliament were to ask for the opening of the conciliation procedure, in my opinion, the response would be positive but only of course if the purpose of this were not to create delays, therefore only if it were not to — say

Forté

— open up new types of problems rather than allowing us to concentrate on launching the IMPs.

I should just like to say a final word about funding which has not been given much consideration. I should like to emphasize that loans with interest-rate subsidies are of crucial importance as a way of promoting above all the growth of small and medium-sized firms. Let us recall that this very House, in a motion for a resolution which I remember well, stressed the importance of transport infrastructure projects — something which has not been considered, however, in the current drafting of the IMPs. A careful reading of the European Parliament's documents, therefore, shows us that we are not the only ones calling for some kind of revision.

Mr Delors, President of the Commission. — (FR) Mr President, the overriding feeling of the House has not escaped me. Your criticisms have been noted, and the Commission will take due account of them.

This is not to say that any real dialogue yet exists between us. In my earlier address to the House I gave you some indication of the increasing tension between the north and the south of the Community — tension which can be fruitful from the point of view of civilization and of culture, but which can also be a source of conflict when we are concerned with finance and economic development. Believe me, it was not by accident that I finished by raising doubts about financial solidarity, and I regret that this point did not strike home with you, since you would then have been at the heart of a problem of which you appear to be totally unaware.

Now it is my turn to put a few questions to you. Do you consider it technocratic to try to understand the difficulties and the anguish of the widely-differing regions of the Mediterranean? Can we deal with them by a few lyrical words alone? I would maintain that their problems do differ, and that hitherto we have not found a single overall response to those problems. And that it is not by talking in an abstract way about conversion that we shall do so. I have therefore sought to understand the diversity of those problems, including those of the Mediterranean islands, which I know well.

I would ask Mr Lambrias whether it is indeed a matter of cold fact to recognize that in some of these regions support for income and support for employment are important. Should we remain mere bystanders, realizing as we do what prospects there are for growth? Put it another way: we are no longer in the sixties, when growth rates of 5 and 5.5% and a regional development policy allowed us to spread out the job prospects, and even move people. My personal belief, though I do not propose to go on repeating it — demagogy has no place here — is that the models for regional development in the Mediterranean must be

retained, and not swept forward on heaven knows what mythical projects.

Lastly, is it such a scandal to include all of Greece's preoccupations in the Mediterranean programmes? A number of Greek Members have spoken and I regret to tell them that I have indeed read the Greek Memorandum and I would maintain that the integrated Mediterranean programmes as they have been presented do not cover all the demands made to bring the Greek economy into line with the European economy. They do not say enough about infrastructure, about job training, and about weaving the tissue of a productive society. Is it really such a scandal if I include them in my proposals?

I really do believe that if we seek dialogue, we should try to understand each other before we start handing out warnings.

I should like to put one last question to you: the European Council has thrown out the IMP project as it stands. Do you think we in the Commission are magicians? Can we just make the Council go away? Can we ignore the fact that four or five countries have said that the project costs too much? If it's a fight you want, and if you are really 100% behind the IMPs as they were voted through, then go ahead, but take on the right people. Personally speaking, I would prefer to avoid deferring enlargement for another two years, and avoid deferring the implementation of the integrated Mediterranean programmes for another two years: I would rather submit another proposal which maintained the spirit of the programmes but was acceptable. I am not in favour of all or nothing, and I have heard many speakers this morning advocating precisely that. If you are against a half loaf then quite clearly you are against our approach.

As to the underlying principles, the proposal which I described to you takes account of the answers to the questions I raised a moment ago. I was vague about the figures because it is my duty to put those figures to Council and to Parliament simultaneously. It includes extension of the field of application of the IMPs, extending the financial instruments, and it makes the notion of additionality an essential. Has the House appreciated that?

Extending the field of application. I said a moment ago that the integrated Mediterranean programmes were essentially agricultural in outlook. We have retained that, but agriculture is not everything. First of all there is what lies downstream of agriculture, and then there are all the other problems: small traders, small businesses, the shortage of infrastructure. The lack of an infrastructure for jobs and job training — that is a quite manifest need which the Greek authorities have mentioned to me. We shall, therefore, be extending the field of application.

Secondly, extending the financial instruments. I have reminded you that 45% of the structural funds already

Delors

go to the Mediterranean regions. This amount will be increased, naturally. The question is how. Not long ago you adopted a regulation on the Regional Fund. You have your own rules. Do you want to change all the rules of all three of our funds in order to implement the integrated Mediterranean programmes? What we are proposing is not to upset everything in order to go faster. There are a great many things I should like to say about the structural funds and the way they are used: no doubt we shall debate them some day. But if you want the IMPs to be implemented fast, then we must skirt around the rules of the structural funds and approve new appropriations which take account of the fact that these regions simply cannot afford to foot the entire bill. That is a perfectly normal procedure in finance, to go around the table and add a little from here, a little from there. And these will not be the only measures, since I have already mentioned infrastructures, small and medium business, and so on.

Extending the financial instruments also covers the interest rebates which have been so successful in ECSC finance. That is the job of the European Investment Bank. The Bank is already engaged in the Mediterranean, I hear you say. Well, the Bank will become further engaged in the Mediterranean. We shall be asking it to do so, particularly by means of the New Community Instrument, in such a way as to contribute to weaving the tissue of small and medium business which I mentioned, the third sector where there are men and women who have the will to start up a business but who lack the capital to get started. We shall be giving it to them under these general programmes.

Lastly, the essential nature of additionality. Did anybody doubt it? It is not with the present resources of the structural funds that we can implement the project I have been describing to you. More money is needed, and if you also include the borrowing and loan operations, and think of the results, rather than the mere accountancy or arithmetic of the operation, you can see that we are making a great step forward. Mere accounting must never be allowed to hide the true results.

Our aim is to redress the inexorable, or apparently inexorable, imbalance which exists between north and south. But to do so without deceiving the people of the south, by leaving the beaten path, as Mr Forte said, and offering to those who have the confidence in themselves the means to take their future into their own hands and yet remain themselves. That will be the Commission's proposal, and I think that at that point we shall understand each other better.

(Applause)

President. — I thank Mr Delors for his sincere, lucid and realistic speech.

The debate is closed.

(The sitting was suspended at 1.10 p.m. and resumed at 3 p.m.)¹

IN THE CHAIR: MRS CASSANMAGNAGO
CERRETTI

Vice-President

6. Welcome

President. — It is with great pleasure that I extend a warm welcome to the delegation of Members of the New Zealand Parliament, who are visiting Strasbourg this week for meetings with our Delegation for relations with Australia and New Zealand.

(Applause)

The peoples of New Zealand and the European Community are linked culturally, linguistically and historically and share the same democratic traditions. I am sure that the talks which the New Zealand delegation will have with the European Parliament will further contribute to cementing these links and will enable our colleagues from New Zealand to gain a fuller understanding of the European Community in general and of our Parliament in particular.

On behalf of Parliament as a whole, I wish the members of the New Zealand delegation a pleasant and fruitful stay with us in Strasbourg.

(Applause)

7. Question Time

President. — The next item is the second part of Question Time (Doc. 2-1593/84).

We begin with the questions to the Council. Question No 82, by Mrs Ewing (H-310/84):

Subject: The alleviation of transport problems in peripheral areas and islands.

Will the President-in-Office state what steps the Council proposes to take to alleviate transport problems in the Community's peripheral areas such as the Highlands and Islands of Scotland?

Mr Forte, President-in-Office of the Council. — *(IT)* The Commission has not brought any proposals

¹ *Topical and urgent debate (objections): see Minutes.*

Forte

before the Council to adopt specific measures relating to the transport problems of the Community's peripheral areas.

The Council is aware that problems of access and of inadequate infrastructure do affect many such peripheral areas, and in particular the smaller islands belonging to Member States in the Atlantic and the Mediterranean.

In this connection, the Council wishes to point out that certain steps have already been taken by the Community to alleviate these problems. Very substantial sums have been allocated from the Regional Fund for the improvement of transport infrastructure and for the purchase of transport equipment in those areas which qualify for such assistance.

In the field of transport policy itself, the Council has adopted a directive on Inter-Regional Air Services which entered into force on 1 October 1984, and should have the effect of facilitating the establishment of international air services between airports situated in peripheral regions and those in other parts of the Community.

Mrs Ewing (RDE). — May I thank the President-in-Office for his answer which touched on infrastructure, ferries and air services. And could I remind him that that leaves certain other matters such as the principle of road-equivalent tariff and trains in remote areas? Could I particularly ask him to consider the pilot schemes on road-equivalent tariff financed by the Commission and the principle of road-equivalent tariff twice passed by this House in two different Parliaments? Could I ask whether the Council has discussed road-equivalent tariff or whether this is a subject in which they have shown no interest up to now?

Mr Forte. — (IT) The Council has received no proposals from the Commission on this subject.

Mr Hughes (S). — Following on from that, am I right in thinking that the Council would be opposed to measures which could destroy public transport and peripheralize rural areas within the Community? For example, has the President-in-Office been apprised of fears surrounding the Transport Bill in the UK?

Mr Forte. — (IT) The Council has not discussed this matter.

Mr Raftery (PPE). — Could I ask the President-in-Office whether he is aware that we in Ireland have extremely heavy costs in transporting goods to our main markets? For instance, it costs us the equivalent of 2p per gallon to get our main products into the main markets of Europe, and it costs roughly £150 per

tonne more to get fish from the West of Ireland into the markets in the Ruhr than it costs the Danes to transport their products there; and we do export a much higher proportion of our output than any other country. Could I ask the President-in-Office whether they have any plans to assist our producers to compete on equal terms with those who are fortunate enough to be nearer the main markets of Europe and to have a larger home market than our Irish producers?

Mr Forte. — (IT) It is up to the Commission to make a proposal on this question.

President. — Question No 83, by Mr Fitzgerald (H-349/84, for whom Mr Flanagan is deputizing:

Subject: EEC investment aid for Cork City and County. In view of the recent devastating effects on employment in Cork City and County following the closure of all its main industries, Fords and Dunlop as well as the imminent closure of Ireland's only shipbuilding industry at Verolme, will the Council state if it has requested that special and urgent EEC action be undertaken to introduce new investment and jobs into the region?

Mr Forte, President-in-Office of the Council. — (IT) The Council is of the opinion that any initiative in this area should be taken by the Commission.

Mr Flanagan (RDE). — Since the question was tabled, as the Council knows, the Verolme dockyard has closed. The only other thing I wish to ask is this. Has any application been made by the Irish Government for aid in regard to Verolme or the Cork city and county area?

Mr Forte. — (IT) Obviously, the existing funds, in particular the Social and Regional Funds, can be used, under the appropriate terms and according to the correct procedure, in serious situations such as those described by the honourable Member in his Question. I would remind you, furthermore, that Community aid to regions going through periods of crisis has not been inconsiderable in the past.

Mr Raftery (PPE). — Is the President-in-Office aware that all the traditional industries in the Cork region — heavy industry, clothing industry, footwear industry — have failed following the removal of tariff barriers consequent upon our entry into the Community? Would the President-in-Office agree that the best prospect of developing new industry there would be to have an integrated development programme for Cork and the surrounding region?

Mr Forte. — (IT) It is up to the Irish authorities to make appropriate applications to the Commission.

Mr Griffiths (S). — Will the President-in-Office accept the information contained in this question and accept that it is being paralleled in many regions throughout the Community, including some in his own country, Italy? Unemployment is rising everywhere. Will the Council therefore take a much more positive attitude, when the Commission presents them with a new budget for 1985, towards increasing substantially the size of the Regional Fund? All the evidence suggests that that should be a major priority of the new budget. Will the Council please answer?

Mr Forte. — *(IT)* Mr Griffiths has hit the nail on the head. I hope that more money will indeed be made available in the budget so that we can deal with these problems more effectively. However, I should like to stress that the solution to problems of this kind does not lie primarily in action through the budget, but in coordination of economic and monetary policies.

President. — I call Question No 84, by Mr Flanagan (H-363/84):

Subject: Consumer protection

Despite the fact that the European Community has taken action to protect the consumer against toxic substances and to ensure the proper presentation and labelling of foodstuffs, no action has been taken to protect the consumer against faulty goods. Will the Council indicate when it intends to take a decision on this matter?

Mr Forte, President-in-Office of the Council. — *(IT)* Discussion within the Council on the amended proposals for a Council Directive on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member States concerning liability for defective products has highlighted the following three fundamental problems:

- a) should the producer of a defective product be held liable even if the state of the scientific and technical knowledge at the time when he put the product into circulation was not such as to enable him to discover the existence of a defect (development risks)?
- b) should the total liability of a producer be limited to a maximum amount?
- c) should the producer be liable, within the meaning of the directive, for personal damage only or for material damage also.

These problems have been discussed on several occasions by the Council. At its meeting on 11 February, the Council requested the Permanent Representatives Committee to examine in greater detail an overall solution worked out for these three fundamental issues.

Mr Flanagan (RDE). — Would you be kind enough to ask one of your officials to keep me up to date on developments as they come along?

Mr Forte. — *(IT)* Certainly.

President. — Question No 85, by Mr Hutton (H-369/84):

Subject: Use of abstention in Council decision making

The Solemn Declaration of Stuttgart states that the Council will use 'every possible means of facilitating the decision-making process . . . including, in cases where unanimity is required, the possibility of abstaining from voting'.

Is the President-in-Office satisfied that this provision has been implemented to the greatest extent possible, and to what extent has abstention been used in this way since June 1983?

Mr Forte, President-in-Office of the Council. — *(IT)* Since the Solemn Declaration of Stuttgart, several members of the Council have abstained during the adoption of certain acts, thus facilitating decision-making.

The position taken by members during voting in the Council is covered by Article 18 of the Council's Rules of Procedure concerning the frequency of the Council's deliberations.

Mr Hutton (ED). — I wonder if the President-in-Office would be prepared to tell Parliament what other means the Council has used since the Stuttgart Summit to facilitate the decision-making process, and since whatever they are they have not produced many results, would he give us an assurance that he will now seek new ways of reducing the veritable mountain of Commission proposals which are still awaiting a decision by the Council?

Mr Forte. — *(IT)* At the last meeting of the Council on the internal market, the Italian Presidency supported the Commission proposal, tabled by Lord Cockfield, concerning a new approach to the directives on the approximation of laws.

In accordance with Article 100 of the Treaty, which stipulates that the Council must act unanimously in connection with directives of this kind, the rule of unanimity, with the possible abstention of individual Member States, would be applied in connection with the fundamental principles and criteria. However, the specific technical aspects would be left to one or more technical committees who would decide by majority vote.

Forte

This strikes us as a good practical way of reconciling the rule of unanimity, tempered by the right to abstain, with the principle of voting by simple majority.

Mr Cryer (S). — May I first of all join with you in welcoming the delegation from New Zealand, and express my fervent support for the action of the New Zealand Prime Minister in preventing United States nuclear vessels visiting her shores.

(Mixed reactions)

Secondly, may I ask the representative of the Italian Presidency whether he does not feel that some of the secrecy of the Council of Ministers should be abandoned in the interests of open government, since he says that all the decisions taken there are taken in secret? Could he assure us that the United Kingdom Government is not abandoning the right of veto, as this was one of the basic principles in the referendum in which Britain voted to remain a member of the EEC, and that the move towards abstention and majority voting is not becoming the rule in the Council of Ministers, so that no country is placed in a permanent minority? Could he, however, in his answer deal specifically with the question of open government to which all the Member States subscribe but to which the Council of Ministers seems very much opposed?

Mr Forte. — *(IT)* The question is currently under discussion. I must add that there are doubts as to whether abandoning the principle of secret voting with a view to rendering the rules less rigid in practice would serve any useful purpose. There are arguments for and against.

Mr Newton Dunn (ED). — The question is about encouraging the use of abstention. I should be very grateful if the President-in-Office would ignore the intervention of Mr Cryer who belongs to a dying and almost dead party and actually tell us what the Italian Presidency is going to do to encourage the use of abstention since it was outlined in the Solemn Declaration?

Mr Forte. — *(IT)* We are trying to encourage this practice as much as possible by means of rules of the kind I mentioned a few moments ago and, we hope, by our own example.

Mr Van Miert (S). — *(NL)* Can the President of the Council give me his assurance that if the agricultural price fixing should reach deadlock as it has done in the past, the Italian Presidency will follow the example of his Belgian predecessor and introduce majority voting.

Mr Forte. — *(IT)* We shall see.

President. — Question No 86, by Mrs Thome-Patenôtre (H-386/84):

Subject: Cost of the European passport

One of the objects of the European passport, due to be issued on 1 January 1985, is to achieve greater unity among the citizens of the EEC.

However, it appears that certain Member States intend to take advantage of the introduction of the European passport to increase the cost of passports and thus likely to create an adverse psychological reaction to Europe.

What measures does the Council intend to take to dissuade Member States from accompanying the introduction of the European passport with a substantial increase in the charge for the issue of passports?

Mr Forte, President-in-Office of the Council. — *(IT)* A number of countries, i.e. Denmark, France, Italy, Ireland and Luxembourg are already issuing the standard European passport.

Since the Resolutions of 23 June 1981 and 30 June 1982 do not contain any provisions regarding the cost of issuing the standard passport, it is for the Member States to fix this amount.

Similarly, it is for the Member States to lay down the arrangements for issuing this passport.

Mrs Thome-Patenôtre (RDE). — *(FR)* I should like to thank the President-in-Office for his reply, but at the same time to take the opportunity of asking if he could give us further details on the precise application of the Fontainebleau decision regarding the European passport. It was stated in the press recently that on 1 January of this year, the European passport was available only in France, Italy, Luxembourg, Ireland and Denmark. Is this true and what is the situation in the other countries? What are the reasons for any delays in this matter, and what steps have been taken in these countries to inform people of this possibility? I must say that in France, this measure does not for the time being appear to be very widely publicized.

Mr Forte. — *(IT)* The Belgian Government assures us that it will do all it can to produce the uniform passport as soon as possible. However, certain technical difficulties may cause some delay.

In the Netherlands, it may be possible to introduce the European passport in the course of 1985, when the technical problems have been solved.

In Germany, it was not possible for the passport to be introduced on 1 January 1985 because of the substantial legislative work which must first be completed.

Forte

However, the German Government is doing all it can to introduce the passport as soon as possible.

In the United Kingdom, the Home Secretary stated in the House of Commons on 24 July 1984:

I have now decided . . .

- a. to accept the recommendation of the Select Committee on Foreign Affairs and the subsequent Rayner review of the Passport Office, to computerize the issue of passports. Our aim is to have a computerized system serving the public in place in 1987;
- b. to introduce at the same time as computerization, a machine readable passport designed to reduce delays at frontiers . . .
- c. to produce the new passport in the agreed common format in accordance with the agreement reached by our Community partners.

In Greece, the Presidential Decree on the introduction of the uniform passport was issued on 4 October 1983 and work on the technical aspects of its implementation has begun.

Mr Taylor (ED). — Arising from the reply by the President-in-Office of the Council which explains that five nations have failed to issue the European passport by the expected date of 1 January 1985, can he confirm whether or not he expects such passports to be issued during this year by those five countries? If not, what action does the Council intend to take?

Mr Forte. — *(IT)* I think I have explained in detail the situation in all of the Member States.

Mrs Lizin (S). — *(FR)* I should like to return to the question of the Belgian Government in greater detail. Belgium is one of the countries which intends to make the introduction of this passport a fairly expensive affair. Could the President-in-Office of the Council undertake here today — after all, this is one way of establishing contact — to remind the various Member States by means of a letter bearing today's date, that he hopes the European passport will be introduced as soon as possible, and could he, in this letter, also mention the particular problem of the costs of issuing this passport? Would it be possible here today after this debate for the President of the Council to undertake to write to the various Ministers concerned asking them to speed up work as much as possible so that Belgium, for example, which is technically in a position to do so, can introduce the European passport by the end of this year?

Mr Forte. — *(IT)* I repeat that the cost of issuing the individual passports to the citizens of the various

Member States is a matter for the Member States themselves to decide.

Mr Taylor (ED). — On a point of order, Madam President, it is totally unacceptable that at Question Time the Minister representing the Council of Ministers should refuse to answer a parliamentary question. I asked a simple question. What action does the Council intend to take against those five nations that have failed to issue a European passport? I expect a reply.

Mr Forte. — *(IT)* According to the Resolution of 23 June 1981, the Member States were to undertake to issue this passport not later than 1 January 1985, however, it did not say that they actually had to do it on 1 January 1985. All I can do is refer to what the Resolution says, not to what it might have said.

Mr De Vries (L). — *(NL)* May I ask the President-in-Office of the Council whether he is prepared to write to the Member States who have announced delays in the introduction of the European passport and to draw the attention of his colleagues to the importance which the Italian President attaches to the realization of the 'citizen's Europe' as described by Mr Andreotti in this Parliament last January? Can he give us this assurance.

Mr Forte. — *(IT)* We attach the utmost importance to this matter and will do all we can to see to it that the 'citizen's Europe' becomes a reality.

Mr Vandemeulebroucke (ARC). — *(NL)* I should like to ask the President-in-Office the following question. It has repeatedly been suggested in the European Parliament in connection with the introduction of the European passport that this document should not only have a symbolic value but should also involve, for example, certain social and cultural rights. I am thinking, for example, of a special passport for young people or senior citizens entitling them to free admission to museums. I should like to ask whether these proposals have ever been discussed within the Council and, if so, what the outcome was?

Mr Forte. — *(IT)* The Citizen's Europe Committee is in fact seriously discussing the rights implied by general documents such as the European passport, the European patent and other documents concerning the European identity. We are working in close collaboration with this Committee and look forward to hearing its results.

Mrs Viehoff (S). — *(NL)* In view of the fuss that is being made about the introduction of the European passport, I should like to ask the Ministers, in the light

Viehoff

of his last answer, what the advantages the holders of the European passport will in fact enjoy compared with holders of ordinary national passports?

Mr Forte. — *(IT)* The first and most obvious advantage is that of having a European identity, i.e. a proof of the existence of a European Community *vis-à-vis* the rest of the world. This sets an important precedent from the legal point of view in connection with the implementation of the Regulation which we are discussing in the Council on the internal market and which concerns facilitating movements of persons across the internal borders of the European Economic Community.

President. — Question No 87, by Mr Barrett (H-508/84), for whom Mr Flanagan is deputizing:

Subject: Cork-Limerick gas pipeline

Is the Council aware of an application from the Irish authorities to the Commission for EEC aid for the planned laying of a gas pipeline from Cork to Limerick, Shannon and Ennis via Ballyporeen, Mitchelstown, Anglesboro, Ballylanders, Garryspillane, Elton, Meanus and Crecova, and furthermore does the Council agree that one of the major advantages of such a scheme would be to supply low cost energy for industry?

Mr Forte, President-in-Office of the Council. — *(IT)* The application referred to by the the honourable Member has not yet come before the Council. However, the Council would emphasise, in a general sense, the importance it attaches to measures likely to contribute to the attainment of the objectives of Community energy policy.

In this connection, it would point out the benefits of measures to improve supplies, among other things and to make energy supplies available to industry at reasonable prices.

Mr Flanagan (RDE). — Wearing my own hat this time, could I add the area from Sligo across to Louth in my constituency to the piece of Ireland mentioned in Mr Barrett's question? May I also express regret that the original project which involved the north of Ireland was rejected? I think it would have reduced the cost of energy in the whole of the island. Let us hope that the Council will give the benefit of the money left available to the rest of the country, because our energy costs generally are very high.

Mr Forte. — *(IT)* This sounded more like a piece of information than a question. However, information is always welcome.

Mr Raftery (PPE). — In view of what the President-in-Office had to say about the Council's anxiety to make the best use of energy, would the Council favour utilizing the money which was not used because of the cancellation of the Dublin-Belfast pipeline to bring gas to the third and fourth largest cities in Ireland, namely, Limerick and Waterford?

Mr Forte. — *(IT)* This depends on the proposal which the Irish Government may make, which will be examined and taken into account by the Commission.

Mr Taylor (ED). — On a point of order, Madam President, out of the 443 Members of this Parliament less than 30 are present at Question Time. Why then do you, on behalf of the enlarged Bureau of this Parliament, accept questions on an issue which concerns the Commission and has certainly not been referred to the Council of Ministers, as the Minister has already confirmed?

President. — Mr Taylor, I think this is a matter which you should bring up in your political group and not here.

Question No 88, by Mr Donnez (H-521/84):

Subject: Site of the European Synchrotron

Although the Synchrotron construction project was proposed by the European Science Foundation, the matter has been referred to the Council at the request of the Danish Government for it to discuss in particular the question of the Synchrotron's location.

Is the Council cognizant of the criteria used in the selection of the location for the Synchrotron; furthermore can it explain the motives behind the criticism by certain Member States of the French Government's decision to change the location?

Mr Forte, President-in-Office of the Council. — *(IT)* The situation regarding the choice of the site for the European Synchrotron remains fundamentally unchanged since the reply given to Mr Toksvig's question at the previous sitting of Parliament on 16 January 1985. However, the next Council meeting likely to take up the question of the Synchrotron site is planned for 4 March 1985.

Mr Donnez (L). — *(FR)* I should like to thank the President-in-Office for this information but at the same time put a further question — which of course has nothing to do with me fighting a one-man battle against the French Government. Obviously, I have no wish to settle a strictly French quarrel in this Parliament. This is something I have never done in the past and I do not intend to start now. My question might

Donnez

strike you as a little naïve but I hope you will not mind me asking it anyway.

I had understood that originally the Council of Ministers had decided, with the agreement of the French Government, that the Synchrotron should be sited at Strasbourg. However, France subsequently changed its mind and decided to site the Synchrotron at Grenoble. It was then, I believe, our Italian, Greek and, in particular, Danish friends began to call for a change of site. Is this correct?

I realize that my question is a little naïve and I hope you will forgive me, but I hope to receive a clear answer.

Mr Forte. — (IT) I do not think it is true to say that there was an agreement on the siting of the Synchrotron which was subsequently changed, nor that any pressure is being brought to bear. I hope that, whatever site is finally chosen, it will be possible to establish collaboration between the various Research Centres including, of course, those located elsewhere.

Sir Peter Vanneck (ED). — I thank the President-in-Office for his first answer, but I am not entirely clear as to whether the Council of Ministers has got all the data required to form an opinion on the advantages and disadvantages of using the Danish site. I personally am in favour of this going to Denmark because, as I understand it, Denmark has not got much in the way of Community scientific projects. I do ask the President-in-Office, therefore, to make sure that everything needed to evaluate the claims of Denmark is in possession of the Council.

Mr Forte. — (IT) The Council will certainly give due consideration to all the information at its disposal.

However, we will obviously have to wait and see what the Council has to say on 4 March.

President. — Since its author is absent, Question No 89 will receive a written reply.¹

Question No 90, by Mr Van Miert (H-490/84):

Subject: Statute of Members of the European Parliament

On 15 September 1983, the Parliament adopted a resolution on this subject calling on the Council to decide on a common statute for Members of the European Parliament.

What action has the Council taken on this request?

Mr Forte, President-in-Office of the Council. — (IT) The Council noted that the European Parliament based the proposal for a statute, which forms the subject of the Resolution of 15 September 1983, on Article 13 of the Act of 20 September 1976 concerning the election of the representatives of the Assembly by direct universal suffrage. In accordance with that Article, on 4 November 1983 the Council decided to consult the Commission on this proposal, and awaits the Commission's opinion.

Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED). — Did I hear the President-in-Office correctly when he said that he was consulting the Commission on whether we should have a statute for Members of this House? Well, he had better pull his finger out and do something about it, because it is up to him to do it. It is not up to the Commission. We have been working on this in this House for a very long time, ever since I became a Member here, in 1973. I find it outrageous that he is going to the Commission now and not taking the responsibility himself in the Council of Ministers. My remarks obviously apply not only to the President-in-Office himself personally but also to his predecessors and his successors in the months ahead. However, please do something and do not go to the Commission! It is your job, not theirs.

Mr Forte. — (IT) We are legally obliged to consult the Commission.

President. — Question No 91, by Mr Andrews (H-551/84), for whom Mr Flanagan is deputizing:

Subject: Signatories to the Council of Europe Convention for protection of individuals with regard to automatic processing of personal data

Will the Council indicate how many EEC Member States have signed and verified the Council of Europe Convention for the protection of individuals with regard to the automatic processing of personal data as recommended by the Commission in 1981?¹

Mr Forte, President-in-Office of the Council. — (IT) It is for the Commission to monitor action taken by the Member States on its Recommendation of 29 July 1981.

President. — Question No 92, by Mr Pearce (H-583/84):

Subject: Meetings of the Council

Is the Council aware of any legislative body in any democratic country, other than itself whose meet-

¹ See Annex.

¹ OJ L 246, 29 8. 1981, p. 31.

President

ings are held behind closed doors?

Mr Forte, President-in-Office of the Council. — (IT) As the honourable Member is aware, the rules of procedure of various national parliaments like those of the European Parliament, make provision for them to meet *in camera*.

The Presidency of the Council would draw the honourable Member's attention to the fact that the Council's proceedings, even when they concern proposals for acts of a legislative nature, cannot be analysed in the same way as parliamentary proceedings. In point of fact, as laid down in the Treaty, the Council is composed of representatives of the Member States.

Accordingly, it is the function of these representatives to put the views of their States and vote to their behalf. In the Council's decisions its members have to do all they can to reconcile their positions to the extent necessary to enable the act concerned to be adopted according to the voting rules laid down. If the Council's meetings were made public, together with the positions and votes of its members, this would often make it more difficult to secure the concessions which each member may have to make to enable certain Council decisions to be adopted.

Mr Pearce (ED). — I would be interested if the President-in-Office could tell me when this European Parliament last met *in camera*. Could he tell me when the Italian Parliament or the British Parliament or indeed any other parliament in this Community last met *in camera*? I do not think he will be able to answer that question. If so, it seems completely irrelevant to cite a rule in this Parliament that is never used.

Would the President-in-Office not agree that the real reason why the Council meets in secret is so that the public of this Community, 270 million people, will be denied the knowledge of who is saying what on behalf of the Member States? After a thousand years of struggle for open public democracy in this continent, can he really justify putting the clock back with this shameful and indeed rather shoddy little operation behind closed doors, with words said by people who have not got the courage to say them in public?

Mr Forte. — (IT) As I have just pointed out, one may draw a rough analogy between the Council and a parliament but they are not identical. The Council has similar powers but a different structure, since it consists of representatives of the governments of the various Member States and all of these representatives have a duty to report to their own parliaments. Hence, it is possible for us to conduct this public debate here in Parliament but not in the Council, similarly, the Cabinets in the various Member States do not, I think, conduct their deliberations in public.

Mr Cryer (S). — Is not one of the more important elements in this question of secrecy the fact that when the decisions are made, no reports are then made to national parliaments so that the ordinary citizen has no opportunity of making representations? Is there not also a good deal of concern about the gap between what a parliament might know about something and what a Minister is actually doing and saying inside the Council of Ministers? Is not secrecy a potential formula for misrepresentation and hypocrisy? The Ministers are public representatives spending taxpayers' money in what is in effect a legislative chamber, because that is what the Council of Ministers does. Is it not a principle of democracy that there should be full accountability?

President. — Would you please put your question, Mr Cryer!

Mr Cryer (S). — I know you want me to finish, Madam President, I am doing just that.

Could the representative comment on the role of COREPER, the people who actually prepare the agenda and do much of the horsetrading in this?

Mr Forte. — (IT) As I said before, one can draw an analogy, but no more, between the Council and a Parliament. The Council acts along the same lines as the national governments, and it is perfectly reasonable therefore that the general principle of secret voting, which is a feature of the national governments, should be applied in the Council too.

Quite apart from that, the members of the Council are also obliged, as I said before, to report to their own parliaments. The extent to which the various Parliaments succeed in obtaining this information depends on the extent of good will and democracy and so on in the Member State in question.

Mr Newton Dunn (ED). — I can offer the President-in-Office an answer to this question. I can tell him a body that meets in secret and makes decisions — it is called the Kremlin.

Does the President-in-Office think that the public, if they knew that the Council met in secret, would approve of it?

Mr Forte. — (IT) I think the public knows that the Council meets in this way and anyway, I am sure that they are aware of the positions adopted by the representatives of the Member States.

Thus, as I said at the outset, the use of secret voting is a help in finding joint European solutions, and hence reinforces rather than undermines the principle of

Forte

European solidarity, since it makes it easier for agreement to be reached on European solutions even if these might involve national sacrifices.

Thus, while the fact remains that the national views are well-known — if not too well known at times for us to reach a compromise agreement — it would nevertheless appear that the present procedure is the most likely to promote the European spirit.

Mr Cot (S). — (*FR*) Is the fact that the secrecy of the deliberations is actually a fiction any reason for going on treating the whole thing as a charade? And, to change to a more modern image, wouldn't it be better to realize that silent films are a thing of the past?

Mrs Ewing (RDE). — As the national parliaments find out in any case how their particular state voted and therefore the argument of the President seems to go overboard, could I go back to a muchrepeated request in this Parliament over the years: if the Council has all these reservations about being open, could it not start gradually by inviting the chairman and vice-chairman of the appropriate European Parliament committee to attend when the subject-matter of their particular committee's remit was on the agenda of the Council?

Mr Forte. — (*IT*) This would not be in accordance with the rules.

Mr Van Miert (S). — (*NL*) In view of the fact that the deliberations of the Council of Ministers generally become common knowledge through the press and that compared with most national governments, we could almost say that progress has been made, could the Council of Ministers perhaps issue a directive whereby the deliberations of, for example, the British cabinet would be made public? Is the Council thinking in terms of making recommendations of this kind to the national governments?

Mr Forte. — (*IT*) I do not think the situation in the other countries is different from that in Italy, where decisions by the government are made known in the press together with the views of the various individual Ministers. This is what happens in practice.

I should like to add, however, that, as I said before, the Council differs in certain respects from national governments and parliaments.

Mr J. Elles (ED). — I just wish to say that the Council's answer to Mrs Ewing's question was quite unacceptable.

President. — Question No 93, by Mrs Dury (H-585/84):

Subject: Texts pending before the Council

In the publication entitled 'Commission proposals on which the European Parliament has delivered an opinion, now pending before the Council' (SEC(84) 1621 final), updated to 1 October 1984, some 500 texts, proposals for Council regulations and directives, are shown as still pending before the Council of Ministers of the European Communities. Some of these have been held up for several years. One of the oldest is dated 3 May 1967, in other words, 18 years ago!

Can the Council of Ministers of the European Communities account for these long delays, and what steps does it propose to take to speed up the procedure for adopting texts forwarded to it after the European Parliament and the Economic and Social Committee have delivered opinions?

Mr Forte, President-in-Office of the Council. — (*IT*) The Council would draw the honourable Member's attention to the fact that an examination of a number of texts adopted by the Council indicates that the number of proposals submitted by the Commission tends to be reflected in number of regulations, directives and decisions adopted by the Council.

During the period 1979-1984, the Commission sent the Council 3 481 proposals. In the same period the Council adopted 3 235 proposals. It is, nevertheless, correct to say that a number of proposals are pending before the Council, sometimes for a considerable period of time. Some of these are highly technical and complex proposals which require careful and detailed consideration.

Mrs Dury (S). — (*FR*) I can understand why the Council does not wish to make any decisions. It may well in fact have a great deal of work to do, but it is also possible that if the Council meetings were not held *in camera* there would be a bit more incentive to get things moving.

Nevertheless, the question I would like to ask is as follows. If the Council of Ministers cannot be bothered to organize meetings between the Ministers responsible for various questions, how can any progress be made with these proposals? For example, the Ministers responsible for consumer problems met during the Greek and French Presidencies, but not under the previous presidency. I should like to know whether the Italian Presidency intends to do anything about consumer protection problems or the directives on women's rights.

Mr Forte. — (*IT*) If I remember rightly, I chaired a meeting of the Council of Ministers for the internal market and consumer affairs on Monday, 11 February, at which we discussed various consumer questions

Forte

and decided to hold a meeting devoted exclusively to consumer questions on top of the meeting on the internal market. These meetings will be held separately to stress the importance of this subject.

Mr Marshall (ED). — Can I thank the President-in-Office for his answer which confirmed that in the period from 1979 there had been an addition of 246 to the backlog of cases? He talks about the need for careful consideration. Would he not accept that when some matters have been before the Council for over 10 years, careful consideration has been replaced either by indifference or by indolence? And would he not agree that it is high time this backlog received the urgency which it needs?

Mr Forte. — *(IT)* At the beginning of each six-month period, after examining the various documents before the Council, the Presidency endeavours as far as possible to include the proposals pending in his work programme provided this is not at the expense of more urgent matters.

Mr Tomlinson (S). — I would like to ask the President-in-Office of the Council if rather than produce texts on budget discipline which infringe the rights of this Parliament, especially on non-obligatory expenditure, would not the Council use its time rather better if it reduced the paper-jam of its own creation?

Mr Forte. — *(IT)* The procedure which I described a few moments ago as a way of making the principle of unanimity a little more flexible — as applied by the Council on the internal market in connection with the approximation of laws, where a vast number of directives are involved — is also a way of reducing the number of directives to be adopted by the Council, since the directives proper concern only principles and criteria, while the great volume of technical details and specifications form the subject of documents drawn up by technical committees, which are not such grand affairs, as it were, as directives.

Moreover, we have made a proposal to the members of the Council to produce, wherever possible, single texts to unify and simplify, formally speaking, the vast amount of legislation which has been produced in recent years.

Mr Clinton (PPE). — I am sure by this time the President-in-Office appreciates that there is fairly serious concern in this Parliament about the fact that as many as 500 proposals before the Council have not been dealt with. I am sure he is not surprised that there is serious concern — we work hard here to get proposals agreed and then nothing happens about them. Attention has been drawn to the fact that one proposal has been 18 years before the Council and has not been

considered. I would ask the President, especially during the period of the Italian Presidency, to look in particular at this and see if there is any way to get rid of this backlog and to give us the feeling that we are really working to some purpose.

President. — Mr Clinton, I am sure the President of the Council will take due note of your observation.

Mr Forte. — *(IT)* I will.

President. — We proceed with questions to the Foreign Ministers.

Question No 114, by Mrs Ewing (H-477/84):

Subject: Turkish Peace Association prisoners

Will the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation consider the case of the 18 'TPA' prisoners who are currently serving lengthy sentences in Turkey with a view to taking a joint initiative on their behalf and, if so, will the Foreign Ministers make the strongest possible representations on behalf of Mahmut Dikerdem, a cancer victim, who is being denied adequate medical treatment in Sagmacilar prison?

Mr Forte, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — *(IT)* Ladies and gentlemen, the Ten share the questioner's concern at the situation of Mr Dikerdem and the other members of the Turkish Peace Association. However, it should be noted that, while upholding the verdicts and sentences of 8 November, the Istanbul Military Tribunal has provisionally released six of the accused including Mr Dikerdem.

The final decision will be taken by the Ankara military appeal tribunal.

The Ten are concerned at the human rights situation in Turkey — particularly as regards persons imprisoned because of their opinions. We expect the Turkish government fully to respect fundamental human rights and freedoms and to make positive steps in that direction.

The Ten will continue to keep a close eye on developments in the human rights situation in Turkey.

Mrs Ewing (RDE). — May I thank the President-in-Office for his answer and for his concern. The question has been dragged out a bit and it has been overtaken by events. But, as he rightly says, 12 of those I mentioned remain in prison pending an appeal. One of them — a woman, Mrs Izban, is enduring very bad conditions in prison. But worse than that, may I draw his attention to the fact that in November when my question was lodged, the second Turkish Peace Asso-

Ewing

ciation trial involved a further 48 people, including the lawyers who dare to defend those who are accused, surely a new dimension when even defending lawyers are arrested with the others! Surely this is so serious as to merit some special overt approach now by the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation to the Turkish Government, because things are not getting better, they are getting worse.

Mr Forte. — *(IT)* I can assure you that we are hoping for a swift decision upholding the decision of the tribunal on the part of the Court of Appeal in Ankara.

We are very concerned at these latest developments.

Ms Tongue (S). — It is patently obvious that the President-in-Office of the Council is not aware of the second trial of the Turkish Peace Association that Mrs Ewing just mentioned which started last November with the obvious aim of silencing the leading defence lawyers in the first Turkish Peace Association trial. It looks increasingly likely that the lawyers among the defendants in this trial will soon be debarred from legal activity. This makes an absolute mockery of any claims made by the Turkish regime about a return to democracy. I would like to know what representations EEC Foreign Ministers plan to make to the Turkish Government in pursuit of the fundamental right of all citizens to legal representation.

(Applause)

Mr Forte. — *(IT)* As I said before, we are grateful for the latest information we have received.

However, should this turn out to be the case, we will adopt the same attitudes and course of action as in the other case referred to by the questioner — and we hope this will lead to some results.

Mr Ulburghs (NI). — *(NL)* I have heard that the Turkish Government wishes to establish contact between the Turkish and European Parliaments through its ambassador in Brussels. The letter in question was referred by the Enlarged Bureau to the Political Affairs Committee. Do you not think that a resumption of this dialogue could be interpreted as an endorsement on the part of the European Parliament of the current regime in Turkey, where thousands of people are imprisoned, and many of them tortured, for political reasons?

Last year, I personally visited . . .

President. — Mr Ulburghs, your question, is not, I think, relevant to the matter in hand.

Mr Alavanos (COM). — *(GR)* From the replies given by the President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers to

the preceding questions, it appears that he recognizes that democratic and human rights are being brutally violated in Turkey at this very moment. Thus, I would like to ask whether he can give us an assurance that, insofar as this situation continues, all financial assistance in the context of the third and fourth financial protocols between the EEC and Turkey will be frozen, together with the special financial aid to Turkey for 1985?

Likewise, Madam President, I would like to ask to what extent the Council is willing to make representations to Turkey concerning the members of the Disk trade union, precisely now that the European Confederation of Workers has, just a few days ago, agreed to let Disk join its ranks?

Mr Forte. — *(IT)* I do not think this is the place to discuss this matter.

Mrs Lizin (S). — *(FR)* I should like to return to two specific points which have already been mentioned and on which the Foreign Ministers could possibly make representations to the Turkish Government. Can the President of the Council formally undertake, here today, to make these representations without delay — in other words in the course of the week? I am referring first of all to Mrs Izban who is still imprisoned under outrageous conditions. Can he also undertake to do all he can to prevent the lawyers who have either already been sentenced or are currently being interrogated as part of the trial of the 48 new members of the Turkish Peace Association from being disbarred?

Mr Forte. — *(IT)* We conduct inquiries into every case we hear of which, like the one you mentioned, might constitute a violation of human rights so that we can subsequently voice our criticisms of the Turkish Government and make our views known — although this is hardly necessary since we react in the same way every time.

Mr Pearce (ED). — Does the Council not agree that, while maintaining pressure on Turkey to see that human rights are respected there, credit should be given where credit is due and that the Council should properly recognise that Mr Dikerdem has, in fact, been released, that the humanitarian aspects of this case have been recognized and that the Council's overall position in this should strike a balance between the difficulties experienced in Turkey, on the one hand and, on the other, the progress which that country is making towards reestablishment of peaceful, democratic and humanitarian standards?

Mr Forte. — *(IT)* This is exactly the view we take.

President. — Since its author is absent, Question No 115 will receive a written reply.¹

Subject: Situation in Uganda

The Ministers stated last month that they were considering how best to use their influence and support to restore peace and stability to Uganda and, in the meantime, to prevent human rights violations.

What conclusions have the Ministers reached, what initiative have they taken already and what results have been achieved?

Mr Forte, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers.

— (IT) The situation in Uganda is under constant review in the context of political cooperation. As regards the human rights question, representations were made to President Obote last November by the heads of the diplomatic mission of the Ten to Kampala. President Obote confirmed the undertaking on the part of his government to guarantee the respect of human rights, as far as the situation in the country permitted, and the application by the legal authorities of the legislation concerning the prevention of crime and the abuse of power.

Mr Van Miert (S). — (NL) I am pleased to hear that representations have in fact been made to the authorities. However, these representations were made last November and it is now February and it would appear that the Minister is still unable to tell us what has come of them. Could he try to do something about this? I assume that, after making these representations, the heads of the European diplomatic mission will in the meantime have reported on their practical outcome. Can the Minister give us any information on this subject or at least assure us that the Italian Presidency will be able to inform us of developments in the very near future?

Mr Forte. — (IT) We have in fact received a letter from President Obote. However, I cannot read it to you because it runs to some 20 pages. We are always on the lookout for any tangible evidence and we expect the situation may become much clearer in future. At the moment, however, it is not easy to find out what is really going on. It is hard to tell whether the letter gives a complete picture or simply a rough idea. At any rate, if we discover any irregularities we will take other steps as soon as possible.

President. — Question No 117, by Mr Selva (H-579/84):

Subject: European anti-terrorist squad

Following yet another massacre of helpless and innocent people, on the Naples-Milan train on 23 December 1984, do the Foreign Ministers feel that it is a matter of urgency to lay foundations for the establishment of a European anti-terrorist squad?

Mr Forte, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers.

— (IT) The Foreign Ministers' meeting in political cooperation have not yet discussed the possibility of setting up a European anti-terrorist squad. They have, however, agreed to closer collaboration between the Ten in the face of the disturbing new waves of terrorism in many European countries. Cooperation of this kind must nowadays be one of our main priorities and will require considerable efforts to organize and implement, as noted by the Ministers meeting in political cooperation on 12 February.

Mr Selva. — (IT) I should like to thank the President of the Council for his reply. As you said, my question refers to the active terrorism on the Naples-Milan train. Since then, terrorism has reared its ugly head once more with the killing of General Audrin in France and Mr Zimmermann, the industrialist, in the Federal Republic.

I should like to ask whether it would be possible during the Italian Presidency, i.e. before 30 June 1985, to convene an informal meeting between the Ministers of the Interior and the Ministers of Justice?

Mr Forte. — (IT) A meeting of this kind has already been planned. I might also add that, if I am not mistaken, this matter is to be discussed in connection with a subsequent question by Mr Formigoni. I will go into the matter at greater length on that occasion.

President. — Question No 118, by Mr De Vries (H-584/84):

Subject: Persecution of the Baha'is

What bilateral action did the Presidency take in 1984 in conjunction with the international organizations to induce the Iranian Government to put an end to the continual persecution of the followers of the Baha'i faith? What initiatives have the Ten decided to take during the Italian presidency?

Mr Forte, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers.

— (IT) The Ten are keeping a close eye on the situation of the Baha'is in Iran, which is a cause of great concern. During 1984 they continued to do all they could in the competent international organizations — in particular, the Commission on Human Rights — or in direct contact with the Iranian authorities. I might remind you, for example, of the representation made by the Ten in Teheran on 2 October 1984.

¹ See Annex of 13. 2. 1985.

Forté

The Ten intend to continue taking any steps possible, as and when they appear most appropriate, in their dealings with the Iranian Authorities in the interests of fair treatment for the Baha'i community in that country.

Mr De Vries. — (NL) I should like to thank the Italian Presidency for his answer, although it is not totally reassuring. The ruthless persecution of the Baha'is in Iran is virtually unparalleled in recent history. The cases of torture or imprisonment without trial or where the trial was a mere sham are innumerable. Thousands of Baha'is have been killed since 1979 and this means that the political pressure which the Ten have brought to bear on Iran has been ineffective. I should like to ask the President of the Council quite simply whether or not he is prepared to enter into consultation with the Political Affairs Committee of this Parliament with a view to determining whether other steps could possibly be taken jointly by the Ten in cooperation with the European Commission. Is he prepared to discuss this question once more on an informal basis this Parliament?

Mr Forté. — (IT) I should like to point out that we must make a distinction between procedural questions and substantive questions. We intend to take whatever action would appear most likely to produce results in the field of human rights. We are not thinking in terms of boosting our popularity and it is well known that methods of bringing psychological pressure to bear which can produce positive results with other governments may have the opposite effect with the Iranian government — I am referring in particular to the amount of publicity given to such action. We therefore intend to exert the maximum possible pressure which appears likely to produce the maximum possible results as regards the human rights situation.

Mr Marshall (ED). — As the author of the resolution passed by this Parliament early in 1984, may I congratulate the President-in-Office for the action the Council has taken; but would he accept that so far the rulers of Iran have been deaf to the pleas from outside for them to reverse this awful policy? The Iranian Revolution was undertaken by a man of God. Can I ask the Council to continue the pressure, and make it even stronger, so that, perhaps, they may eventually reverse this totally abhorrent policy?

Mr Forté. — (IT) While I would like to be God for a moment so that I could simply solve certain problems with a wave of my hand, we certainly intend to go on using pressure — as I said before — as firmly and at the same time as effectively as possible.

Mr Alavanos (COM). — (GR) Very recently the Tudeh party, the Communist Party of Iran, made a

staggering accusation. They claimed that the members of the Tudeh party who have been condemned to death by the Iranian authorities are, before they face the firing squad, brought to hospitals where they are violently and forcibly bled to satisfy the needs of the Iranian army in the Iran-Iraq war. This is an inhuman torture, morally and physically, and I would like to ask whether the Foreign Ministers would consider making representations in the light of this disclosure.

Mr Forté. — (IT) This was a hypothetical question — at least that is how it came out in the interpretation. My answer is similarly hypothetical: yes, we would.

Mr Habsburg (PPE). — (DE) After discussing the question of the Baha'i so often, only to discover that the pressure of public opinion has hardly produced any results, I would like to ask once more whether or not it is time we called on the Governments of the Member States to make more use of the United Nations than they have done so far, since we see all too often that the United Nations organization concerns itself with all sorts of problems but hardly at all with this one, even though it is the most serious.

Mr Forté. — (IT) We will give this some consideration, although the question was not very specific.

Mr Clinton (PPE). — I think the flow of representations that most of us get in our constituencies is fair evidence of the fact that whatever steps have been taken by the Council are not effective or have had very little effect. Would the President-in-Office see if there is any other approach which could be made to try and overcome this very, very serious problem for the people of the Baha'i faith?

Mr Forté. — (IT) This question was somewhat vague. If someone can suggest any more effective approaches, we will be glad to consider them.

Mr Vandemeulebroucke (ARC). — (NL) I do not think the President-in-Office correctly understood Mr Habsburg's question. He asked whether the Foreign Ministers' meeting in political cooperation are prepared to make joint representations to the United Nations. This question was not answered. It was not a hypothetical question at all and I have therefore repeated it.

Mr Forté. — (IT) I did not, I think, give a hypothetical answer to this question, but to the question concerning the possible method of torture consisting of draining the blood from persons condemned to death. Now that the question has been clearly formulated I can give a precise answer.

Forte

The problem of the Baha'is in Iran has frequently been discussed in the United Nations, with particular reference to the protection of human rights. In March 1983 a resolution was adopted, with the firm support of Italy, requesting the Iranian Government to guarantee the respect of human rights and basic freedoms to all persons living in Iran, particularly in connection with the religious intolerance *vis-à-vis* the Baha'is and the dire consequences this has had. The attitude of the Italian Presidency to this question should therefore be clear.

President. — Question No 119, by Mr Deniau (H-588/84):

Subject: 40th anniversary of the Yalta agreements

Could the ministers, on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the Yalta agreements, which are a symbol of the division of Europe into two and of Soviet hegemony over the eastern half, solemnly affirm the principle of European unity founded on a common civilization and restate that the peoples of Central and Eastern Europe belong wholly and entirely to that civilization. Could they also state what ways and means they intend to use to diminish the present division, which came about as a result of the Second World War, and prevent this situation, which is contrary to the fundamental rules of the law and of democracy, from continuing. Could they furthermore declare that the right to self-determination is a fundamental European value that should obtain throughout our continent and should apply in particular both to the choice of internal political systems and to membership of military alliances?

Mr Forte, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — (IT) The Ten are aware that 1985 marks not only the 40th anniversary of the end of the Second World War, but also the 10th anniversary of the Final Act of Helsinki which, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the generally accepted principles of international law, affirms the importance of the respect by all the countries which took part in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, regardless of their political economic and social systems or geographical location, of the principles governing their mutual relations including the principle of equality and the right to self-determination.

They particularly recall that the first principle of the Final Act of Helsinki mentions the right of all the participant countries freely to choose and develop their political, social economic and cultural system. This first principle also affirms that all the participating States have the right to belong or not to belong to international organizations, to be or not to be a party to bilateral or multilateral treaties, including the right to be or not to be a party to treaties of alliance.

The Ten reaffirm the universal importance of this principle and their attachment to the respect and exercise of these rights as well as practical measures to promote contacts between individuals and peoples, and the freedom of movement between States. The Ten will continue to stress the importance they attach to the full application of all the provisions of the Final Act while at the same time pursuing their policy of constructive dialogue and cooperation with the Soviet Union and the countries of Central and Eastern Europe.

Mr Deniau (L). — (FR) This was the answer I was afraid you would give. I had feared that when I mentioned the anniversary of Yalta — which did not result in an agreement as such but in recognition of a *de facto* situation — people would start talking about Helsinki. It would appear that everyone has the impression that the Final Act of Helsinki is not being applied in spite of the fact that it is a treaty, i.e. an agreement, while the results of Yalta are being applied even though they only consisted of recognition of a *de facto* situation and not an agreement.

Mr President of the Council, I think we should all bear in mind in all the Institutions that peoples exist as well as States, and that there is another Europe where the people do not have the right to choose for themselves and for which we represent an ideal, with our freely elected Parliament, our representative governments and our countries where people are free to choose their friends and alliances and hold their own opinions and beliefs. As I see it, we form part of the same civilization and culture and we should not forget this fact since we embody a hope for this other Europe. I would therefore be pleased if this other Europe — which is also our Europe, since it consists of Europeans like ourselves — were mentioned in this debate so that their representatives, who have lost everything simply because of their attachment to freedom, might fully realize that we recognize them as fellow Europeans and have no wish to dash their hopes.

President. — I think I should thank the President-in-Office of the Council for his answers.

Question Times is closed.¹

Mr Cot (S). — (FR) I should like, if I may, to express my surprise that the application of Rule 44 has not made it possible to include on the agenda the topical question of torture, when all the newspapers in my country and those in many others are raising the problem very directly, and when it concerns one of the Members of the European Parliament, who is even a group chairman, Mr Jean-Marie Le Pen. I greatly regret that our procedure does not allow us to raise

¹ See Annex of 13. 2. 1985.

Cot

this problem very directly and to discuss it. I would also have been interested to hear the replies from the Group of the European Right on this question, and I would ask you to look into the way in which the procedure under Rule 44 is applied.

President. — Mr Cot, the Bureau of the European Parliament has referred all the problems to do with questions to a working party, since no one is happy with the way things are going, also as regards areas of competence and their grouping. Within two weeks the Bureau will have to issue new rules.

8. Provisional twelfths

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 2-1550/84) drawn up by Mr Curry and Mr Fich on behalf of the Committee on budgets embodying the second decision to authorize additional provisional twelfths for the 1985 financial year (non-compulsory expenditure).

Mr Fich (S), rapporteur. — (DA) Madam President, since Parliament rejected the budget in December 1984 we have been operating the so-called provisional twelfths system, that is to say, every month we get roughly speaking a twelfth of the budget for 1984. Extraordinary twelfths can, however, be approved where this is held to be necessary, and it is such requests we are about to consider.

The issue I intend to focus on here is the question of extraordinary twelfths for 'Members of the Institution', in short Commission Members. It caused some amusement, I can tell you, not to say surprise, that the Commission's first act was to ask for extraordinary twelfths for Commissioners' salaries. The Commission requested 11 twelfths for this purpose, that is to say it wanted from the start the amount for the entire year to be paid out in salaries for the Commissioners. What was also surprising was the fact that the Commission's proposal was adopted by the Council, which thus also went along with the plan to give the Commissioners an extra 11 twelfths in salaries from the start of the year. The Committee on Budgets was not prepared to accept this. It did recognize though that there was a problem as regards Commissioners' salaries, since there are — to use a colloquial expression — two teams of Commissioners to be paid at the moment. One is the new Commission, whose Members are of course entitled to their salaries, but at the same time there is the remuneration of the Commissioners who retired on 1 January 1985. It is clear that more need to be paid in 1985 than in 1984, and we therefore recognize there is a problem. Accordingly, the Committee on Budgets considered that extraordinary twelfths should be approved after all, although it was not at all prepared to approve an additional 11.

We have received a revised calculation from the Commission indicating that the latter itself now estimates that only an additional three twelfths will actually be needed for 1985. The Committee on Budgets considered that we should give two additional twelfths at the moment and wait and see for a number of months. We could then deal with the question of the last twelfth when the problem arose, presumably in the summer. This means that Parliament is adopting a different position from that of the Council, which continues to stand by its decision to approve an additional 11 twelfths for the remuneration of the Commission. Consequently, in order to change this decision by the Council of Ministers, Parliament needs to adopt this amendment at six o'clock this evening by 218 votes, which at the same time should correspond to 3/5 of the votes cast. We shall find out whether these votes are forthcoming at six o'clock this evening.

As Mr Curry, my co-rapporteur, is unfortunately not present, I should also briefly like to say a couple of words about the requests for extraordinary twelfths as far as Parliament's budget is concerned. Parliament had requested an additional two twelfths in two cases. The Committee on Budgets examined this question objectively and considered one additional twelfth would be enough in both cases, also taking into account the political consideration that it would look rather odd if Parliament were to give priority to approving extraordinary twelfths for itself. The Committee on Budgets therefore adopted a very strict line as far as Parliament itself was concerned, considering that it was necessary to show that we ourselves are prepared to accept the consequences of the decision we took when we rejected the budget in December 1984.

Madam President, that was the only thing I wanted to say, and I can only express the hope that there will be enough votes for this report at six o'clock.

Mr Cornelissen (PPE). — (NL) Mr President, the rejection of the 1985 budget means that we now have recourse to the system of provisional twelfths in order to make urgent payments. A good example of these are current operating expenses such as rent, upkeep, insurance premiums, office supplies. Nevertheless, Mr President, we think it is going a bit far to rank the members of the Commission under the same heading and to regard them from now on as part of the furniture. I understand that outgoing members are entitled to an additional month's salary and to an allowance wherever this is justified by the income from any new job that they may go to. What we do find amazing is that, in spite of repeated urging on the part of the Committee on Budgets, Parliament has not been informed about the number of Commissioners entitled to an allowance.

The European Community is going through a difficult period as are, even more importantly, European citi-

Cornelissen

zens in general. Very many have seen their income fall and many have had a tremendous struggle to make end's meet. We find it incomprehensible that at such a time an additional 11 twelfths are being requested for the members of the Commission. If this Parliament is then denied the information it has requested, I can to my regret view it in no other light than as a political and psychological blunder. With proposals like this, it is hardly surprising that the citizens' Europe is not yet a reality!

My comments are directed more at the Council than at the new Commission and we are very pleased that the new member of the Commission now present has said that he will accept two twelfths instead of the 11 twelfths requested. Incidentally, I find it regrettable that the Commission is so reluctant to provide information on this matter. Can Parliament be given a very rapid answer specifying the number of members of the Commission entitled to a supplementary payment and the sum involved? This is all funded by public taxes!

May I also remind Mr Christophersen of the pledge made by Mr Andriessen during our January session? On that occasion, Mr Andriessen promised to inform Parliament about the financial consequences of the startling nomination, again by the Council, of two members of the Commission to the rank of Vice-President of the old Commission just a few weeks before the end of their term of office, in other words, literally at five minutes to midnight. We were promised that we would be informed of the financial consequences of this action and, Mr President, I would appreciate, and my group demands, the release of this information.

Mr Christophersen, Vice-President of the Commission. — (DA) Madam President, I have of course followed with interest the discussions in the Committee on Budgets on the proposals for additional twelfths — occasionally with some concern, though always with understanding. On several occasions I have also had the opportunity to discuss the proposal and exchange views with the Members of this Committee.

I would like to say that the Commission fully understands the view expressed today and expounded by Mr Fich. On behalf of the Commission, I can agree with the basic standpoint that all in the Community must of course accept the consequences of the fact that the 1985 budget has been rejected, and we must all acknowledge the constraints fixed by the provisional twelfths system.

At the same time, it is clear — as I also understand Mr Fich and Mr Cornelissen as saying — that we must all recognize that the Community should honour its commitments fully. We should do so because we are a community bound by law, and this has not been questioned by any of those involved.

As regards the requests for additional twelfths for Chapter 10 A, that is to say remuneration of both the

current and the former Commissioners, I would emphasize that the payments would of course not be increased by approving an additional number of twelfths. The remuneration of the present and former Commissioners is quite clearly set out in the regulations governing payments, so when asked, the new Commission stated that what we actually can and should spend in the immediate future to discharge our obligations was not 11 twelfths but a smaller number, and the Committee on Budgets has adopted a position on the number of twelfths we need in purely practical terms to be able to make normal payments in the coming months. This position implies that there is presumably no need for more than two additional twelfths in the following months. As Mr Fich quite correctly stated, we may need to reconsider the entire question at a later date as we approach summer, unless we are in a situation where we then have a normal budget for 1985.

On behalf of the Commission, I therefore agree that we do not need — and therefore do not want — to undertake payments over and above those corresponding to two additional twelfths, unless of course differences arise from the table we submitted to the Committee — differences we cannot foresee at the moment. I don't think this will happen, however. I would like to say to Mr Cornelissen that the Commission is naturally prepared to provide Parliament with the information needed on the Commission, concerning the question of how many of the former Commissioners are entitled to payments from the Community. I can state that a request was made to us in February for payments in respect of two former Commissioners. There are in fact quite specific rules as to when and to what extent one can receive payments from the Community as an ex-Commissioner, and we naturally assume that everyone will abide by these.

On the other hand, as regards the question of the appointment of Vice-Presidents, I have to say to Mr Cornelissen that this is not the responsibility of the Commission. Vice-Presidents are appointed by the Council, and if you are unhappy with the Council appointing new Vice-Presidents, you must question the Council as to the consequences of its decision. It may be that I misunderstood Mr Cornelissen in translation, but I would reiterate that the responsibility for this decision does not lie with the Commission.

In the Commission, we naturally gave serious consideration to the suggestion put forward by the Committee on Budgets that we could start afresh and submit a new proposal. But our analysis of the situation and the discussions I had — with the Committee on Budgets amongst others — showed that even though one could claim that this step would be psychologically very important in political terms, our problem was that the other arm of the budgetary authority — namely the Council — had already adopted the original proposal submitted for provisional twelfths, and the Commission was therefore not in a position to

Christophersen

withdraw its proposal. Accordingly, I have also clearly stated that if Parliament were instead to take the option open to it, namely if it were to adopt an amendment, we would fully accept it and administer our affairs accordingly, for Article 204 provides for just the option you are aiming to make use of today.

As mentioned, in the months to come we do not expect to have to undertake payments over and above the amount corresponding to two additional twelfths. For the time being, therefore, the Commission can discharge its obligations with these two additional twelfths, and should it encounter difficulties, I would have to turn again to Parliament on behalf of the Commission so that we can discuss the situation together. I believe that this is the simplest way we can resolve this problem, which has perhaps arisen somewhat unexpectedly for the new Commission, although we do acknowledge its existence and would like to see it out of the way.

IN THE CHAIR: MR LALOR*Vice-President*

Mr Cot (S), Chairman of the Committee on Budgets. — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to thank Mr Christophersen for his statement. If I have understood correctly, he has declared himself in agreement with the stance of the Committee on Budgets, which for the moment is to release only two supplementary twelfths for the budget heading in question, and he agrees with us that that should be enough to last till the summer — broadly speaking until June, and that if by some chance new needs arose in this budget heading then he would return to Parliament for us to take the matter up again.

I think this is important as a statement. I believe we shall have to ensure that Parliament undertands this fully when we come to vote shortly, and this is an important detail which is fully in line with the wishes of the Committee on Budgets. This is in fact the point of the amendment which will shortly be submitted to Parliament by the Committee on Budgets.

Mr Cornelissen (PPE). — (NL) If I have understood the Commissioner correctly, 10 members of the previous Commission are entitled to an allowance for the month of February. The only question I have is whether we can be informed of the total sum involved — and I stress that this means taxpayers' money. Further, there is clearly some misunderstanding between the Commissioner and myself. I am not at the moment criticizing the resolution by which two members of the former Commission were appointed by the Council of Ministers to the rank of Vice-President just before the end of their term of office. I did that on an earlier

occasion. I merely wished to remind the Commissioner of the pledge made by his colleague, Mr Andriessen, at the last session — sitting in the same seat — to inform Parliament of the financial consequences of those appointments made by the ministers. This occurred — I repeat — at 5 minutes before midnight and Mr Andriessen also said that it had surprised him. Therefore, Mr President, there is no criticism of the Commission.

Mr Christophersen, Vice-President of the Commission. — (DA) Mr President, I am not in a position to answer Mr Cornelissen's question — not because I do not want to but because I do not have the figures available. However, I am willing to bring them before the Committee on Budgets. This would be no problem. These are, after all, figures that everyone can work out for himself. They can be deduced quite clearly from the provisions governing the remuneration of Commissioners, so I am willing to make them available to Mr Cornelissen and the Committee on Budgets. With regard to the contribution by Mr Cot, I can only say that it fully accords with my own view.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

9. Combating terrorism

President. — The next item is the oral questions with debate tabled by Mr Formigoni, on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee, to the Foreign Ministers (Doc. 2-1451/84/rev. 2) and to the Commission (Doc. 2-1452/84/rev.):

Subject: the combating of terrorism

On 9 July 1982 the European Parliament adopted a resolution on the European legal area¹ in which it urged that measures should be taken to ensure that the combating of terrorism is better coordinated and organized.

Parliament confirmed this position in a resolution on violence and terrorism adopted on Thursday, 25 October 1984 (PE 93.203).

1. What has the Council (the Commission) done in response to this request?
2. Have there already been any concrete results?
3. What measures does it intend to take?

Mr Formigoni (PPE). — (IT) Mr President, we have witnessed a dramatic resurgence of international ter-

¹ OJ C 238, 13. 9. 1982.

Formigoni

rorism of late. Public opinion has been shaken and frightened by the high degree of organization that terrorism has achieved, by the news of the international connections which terrorism now enjoys, of the complicity, cover-up and other direct assistance offered to terrorists by foreign powers bent on toppling democracy in Europe and destabilizing the democratic system of the West. Nor can the fact be overlooked that a frequent and direct target of terrorist strikes are often persons, locations and installations of the NATO defence organization to which our countries belong. It was not by chance that the new terrorist phenomenon has been given the newly coined name of 'Euroterrorism'. In view of the fact that it is European terrorism that we are confronted with it is primarily to the European institutions that public opinion is looking in the hope of receiving a satisfactory response.

This is the essence of the questions I shall put to the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation, and to the Council and the Commission. My question to the representatives of the various Community institutions will be: what has been done to stem the tide of Euroterrorism and what do you intend to do to repress it?

That is my question, the question of the Political Committee which has given me the task of putting this question — the question that the European Parliament is putting and the question that European public opinion is putting. What has been done and what do you intend to do to contain the surge of Euroterrorism?

It is a question that we are putting unequivocally today since the European Parliament has repeatedly drawn your attention to this urgent problem over a long period.

The first resolution on this subject was adopted by the European Parliament on 27 September 1979, a date when the European Parliament elected on the basis of universal suffrage had just come into being. I should also like to remind you that over the past two years alone the European Parliament has voiced its opinion some 22 times with as many resolutions on the subject.

When the Political Affairs Committee gave me the task of tabling this question its intention was to demonstrate its continuing concern in the face of the violence which is attacking our countries and our people. With these measures the Political Affairs Committee and the European Parliament have done all that they can do. They have done their duty. Now is the time for all to do their duty as their powers allow in this delicate and important area.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it is my wish that your reply today should not be a formal reply nor a routine reply. This is an area which requires maximum commitment and maximum effort on the part of all. Obviously, and let me state the point quite clearly, it calls for a greater effort than that which has been in

evidence so far. I should like to voice my total dissatisfaction concerning the way in which the Member States of the European Community have over the past few years failed to develop an effective Community system to control terrorism and make some progress towards a European legal area.

I should like in particular to remind the House that the European Parliament has on many occasions sought closest possible cooperation between the Member States in this field. May I also point out that for its part the Council as early as April 1977 stressed the need to award top priority to greater cooperation between the Member States to protect our society from terrorist violence. Now, eight years after the signing of the Strasbourg Convention only four countries have ratified it and six of the 10 Member states of our Community have still not done so.

Mr President eight years in my opinion is more than enough time to reflect fully on the matter, provided, that is, that the reflection has not taken on the form of a deep sleep.

There is something else that I would like to stress. I should like to remind you that a Member State of the Community, Italy as it happens, has submitted to another Member State, France, some 120 requests for the extradition of persons charged with terrorist activities and, in many cases, persons who have already been convicted of common offences in the country seeking their extradition, in other words Italy. However, Italy has not received anything which could be called a reply from the other country which is also a member of the same Community. My question to you is how can such a state of affairs be tolerated?

Mr President, before I listen to the replies to my questions I should like to add a general point and will also put forward some firm proposals. The general point is the following one — I am convinced that the control of terrorism must not divert our attention from one of the principal elements of the Community which is the free movement of persons between the Member States and the stage-by-stage dismantling of barriers impeding that free movement. The point must be made here that the control of terrorism, far from representing a reason for restricting the principle of the free movement of persons, should be carried out in the form of coordinated action based on the knowledge that the process of integration between the 10 presupposes that the latter recognize that their various political structures are similar and that their values are identical. In other words, the control of terrorism must be seen in the broad context of the creation of a European legal area. The control of terrorism can therefore and must be pursued with tools which take full account of the philosophy on which the Community is based, in other words the territory of one Member State is not 'abroad' viewed from that of another.

It is in the context of this idea of a single area, which is the aim of the movement for uniting Europe that the

Formigoni

Member States should prepare the most suitable ways and means of combating terrorism and it is in this context that I should like to put forward the following five firm proposals. First: the ministers in the Member States who are responsible for controlling terrorism should meet at regular intervals like the Council of Ministers.

Second, I propose that the possibility of setting up a European court for terrorist crimes should be examined. The idea was put forward many years ago by the President of the French Republic and to me there is an urgent need for it.

Third, I propose that the possibility of setting up a European study and information centre with responsibility for the dissemination of technical information on terrorist crimes and studying the links between terrorist crimes and common crime, financial crimes and arms and drug trafficking. Such a centre could also ensure the European-level exchange of views and the coordination of information and cooperation.

Fourth, there is a need to stimulate a greater awareness in the people of the Community of the threat which terrorism poses to the freedom of the individual and to that of the people as a whole. The Commission could study a suitable information plan for this project.

Fifth: I propose that the Member States who have not yet done so should be invited to ratify the agreement signed by the Ministers of Justice on 4 December 1979 in Dublin to implement on Community territory the European convention on the control of terrorism signed in Strasbourg on 27 January 1977.

I should now like to address the President-in-Office and hope that he can, even today, if possible, let me hear his reply to these proposals. Or that before us here today he could at least give a formal undertaking that the issue and the proposals will be raised at the Council of Ministers meeting as part of the political cooperation programme. It may not be possible for him to give this assurance in his first reply but I hope as time progresses this will be possible.

(Applause)

Mr Forte, President-in-Office of the Council of Foreign Ministers. — *(IT)* In the context of European political cooperation it has been agreed that collaboration between the Ten concerning the control of terrorism and organized crime should be intensified, in particular in view of its recent resurgence in various European countries, which gives us grounds for concern. The subject was considered by the Ministers in Rome on 12 February last. After the debate and after having heard the Commission I shall provide further information and some points for consideration both with regard to the meeting of 12 February and on this subject in general.

Lord Cockfield, Vice-President of the Commission. — Mr President, this is a subject of immense importance. It has been introduced by Mr Formigoni in a speech of great power and sincerity. I have no doubt that many other important and notable contributions will be made. Indeed, the very fact that this debate is being held testifies to the strong feelings that we — all of us — have on this subject which poses so serious a threat, not just to us as individuals, but to the society in which we live.

However much we want to act and to act vigorously, we need to start by recognizing that the Commission, like Parliament, unfortunately has no specific powers of its own in this field. If we had power to act, we would act. It is not a lack of determination; it is a lack of the necessary legal powers. The powers and therefore the responsibilities rest with the individual Member States. The rôle we can play and have played is to press tirelessly upon the Member States the need to act, the duty to act. Parliament has played an important rôle in this field as your successive resolutions adopted on 9 July and 25 October 1982 and more recently on 16 September, as well as the present debate, amply testify.

Following the resolution of 9 July 1982 the Commission drew the attention of the meeting of Justice Ministers to the resolution adopted by Parliament, including Parliament's wish that the Dublin Agreement of 4 December 1979 on combating terrorism, should be ratified. Parliament's resolution of 9 July 1982 was comprehensive and farsighted and would have provided a sound basis for a common approach to these problems. Unfortunately, the Member States could not reach agreement, and as unanimity would be required for action under Article 235, the Commission did not feel that it could usefully pursue the matter further with the Member States.

The adoption of the Declaration on International Terrorism at the London Economic Summit on 9 June 1984, however, marked an important step forward. This referred to closer cooperation and coordination between police and security organizations, especially in the exchange of information, intelligence and technical knowledge, the use of powers under the Vienna Convention in relation to the potential abuse of diplomatic immunity, action to review the sale of weapons to States supporting terrorism and consultation and cooperation in dealing with known terrorists. This declaration was further reinforced by the conclusions of the European Council, adopted at Dublin on 4 December 1984, on terrorism and the abuse of diplomatic immunity.

The most recent development is the agreement reached between France and the Federal Republic of Germany on 5 February to set up an operational group to coordinate national efforts. A measure of this kind is a valuable means of combating terrorism at the European level. The Commission would express the

Lord Cockfield

hope that these arrangements could be extended rapidly to include other Member States. Indeed, European anti-terrorist measures of this kind are indispensable. Terrorism does not respect state borders and action, therefore, needs to be on a European level.

May I also pay tribute to the very active interest that the new Italian Presidency is taking in this subject. We as a Commission are very conscious of our own responsibilities where our actions may impinge on these matters. Thus, while we are all anxious to see free movement of our citizens in the Community, the new draft directive on facilitating cross-border movement does provide for special measures to deal with situations that could threaten public security.

It is not enough to deplore terrorism, as we all do. It is not enough just to condemn the outrages wherever they occur — in Brighton, Paris Munich and elsewhere. We need to be eternally vigilant. Where we have powers we should exercise them. Where we have no powers we should press upon those who do have the powers to act and to act vigorously and in cooperation. We need to recognize that terrorism strikes not just at individuals, but at the fabric of society itself, at the whole concept of democracy. Civilization depends upon the rule of law. Men can only be free under the law and under the protection of the law. Those who resort to violence have as their aim the destruction of the law, and with it our freedom.

Let us both, Parliament and Commission, continue to impress upon Member States our concern and our demand for action. We, the Commission, stand by ready to give whatever assistance we can in further work undertaken by the Member States.

Mr Amadei (S). — *(IT)* Mr President, the resurgence of terrorism in our countries and the imminent danger to our freedom, human dignity and democracy itself that it represents should prompt the European Parliament to devote due attention to this problem.

Terrorism in Europe is evidently becoming increasingly international in style so that the name Euroterrorism, that Mr Formigoni aptly gave it, is appropriate.

Now, more than ever, an effective European level reaction is called for. It must be a determined reaction, and geared, initially, to the protection of freedom and of the rights of the individual which represent the liberty and democracy that are our heritage.

Faced with the international character of terrorism and the resultant need for new forms of political, legal and judicial cooperation, decisive and concerted action at European level is called for. Terrorism benefits not only from the democratic freedom enjoyed in each Member State but also from the other Community achievements such as free movement of persons, the

increasingly infrequent checks at borders and, last but not least, that which in some cases and circumstances has been an enlightened spirit of openness towards political refugees. This tradition of open hospitality has marked and honoured the political history of a number of Member States. However, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like at this juncture to make two points. The first point concerns the fact that the combating of terrorism should not jeopardize that which has been achieved in the Community by effort and sacrifice. While accepting and recognizing the need for appropriate and urgent measures we must insist that the combating of terrorism does not call into question the reduction of the number of checks on persons at borders within the Community.

The second point concerns that which might constitute a distortion of a long and precious tradition of political tolerance and civilization. When it is considered that a Member State gave asylum to such people as the current President of the Italian Republic, Mr Pertini, to the former President of the Republic, Mr Saragat, to men such as Nenni and other great men of the Italian resistance during the struggle against Fascism, in the defence of liberty, this fact, I repeat, must not be exposed to the risk of debasement and misunderstanding. There are terrorists and common criminals who on occasions use the label of political struggle to escape justice and seek protection in other countries by abusing those countries' traditions of liberty and political tolerance.

It is all too clear that there is an indispensable need to respond in a united and coordinated manner, at European level, to this new form of international subversion which avails itself of the most recent and greatest achievements of liberty to develop and move freely and with impunity all over Italy. We call upon the ministers of the governments of the Member States meeting in the context of political cooperation to examine in consultation with the European Parliament, the problems of combating all forms of terrorism and serious criminal activities.

We must create common procedures for combating terrorism and organized crime and solve the problems of extradition both within and outside the Community. European level cooperation thus now becomes the only means of providing adequate and effective response to Euroterrorism. What has already been done elsewhere to combat terrorism, in particular by the Council of Europe, must also be borne in mind. Duplication of effort must be avoided and it will be necessary to organize coordinated plans to a common aim which are based on previous experience and we must ensure that any action in the Community on this problem is compatible with the terms of the Treaties.

On the basis of this recommendation we request that the Legal Affairs Committee should be given the task of entering into a dialogue with the appropriate parliamentary committees in the Member States and that it

Amadei

should seek to create a legal policy and establish a series of effective measures to combat terrorism and crime. The governments of the Member States are also requested to increase and deepen collaboration in the context of political cooperation. If the Council can act towards this end it will enjoy the support not only of the Socialist Group but the political support and understanding of the whole of the European Parliament.

President. — I have received six motions for resolutions to wind up the debate, with a request for an early vote:

- by Mrs Veil, on behalf of the Liberal Group (Doc. 2-1605/84),
- by Mr de la Malène and others (Doc. 2-1618/84),
- by Mr Didò and others, on behalf of the Socialist Group (Doc. 2-1641/84/rev.),
- by Mr Cassidy and others (Doc. 2-1643/84),
- by Mr Habsburg and others, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Doc. 2-1644/84), and
- by Mr Cervetti and others (Doc. 2-1650/84/rev.).

The vote on the requests for an early vote will be taken at the end of the debate.

Mr Habsburg (PPE). — (*DE*) Mr President, the Commission representative has given us a positively moving account of the position which we have adopted with regard to terrorism. The most important part of the motion for a resolution tabled by the European People's Party — more important even than the practical section — is the explanatory statement, since this explains Parliament's thinking and suggestions over the past six years to combat terrorism effectively.

These earlier documents are very illuminating. If the national governments of six years ago had shouldered their responsibilities, we would not have needed to hold this debate. The incident at Brighton, the murders in Paris, the explosions in Italy and the murders in Munich would not have happened.

This is a further demonstration of the fact that Parliament focuses attention on matters of real concern, whereas the national governments — though I do not in fact wish to express any severe criticism here — are slow to take action once the initial excitement has died down, and then again nothing gets done.

There is one thing, however, which we must be clear about. It is no longer possible to tackle terrorism on a national scale, just as it is becoming impossible to discuss environmental protection in a purely national

context, since all these problems are now international. I feel it is our duty to emphasize again and again how important it is to consider this problem in European terms, to remind the national governments constantly of their responsibilities and, in particular, to put greater pressure on bureaucracies. Anyone who has ever had anything to do with the machinery of national government knows very well that governments have relatively little to do with such decisions. It is the bureaucracies which are attached to the governments and prevent them from taking action, though I do not want this to be interpreted as a criticism of our police forces, which have on the whole made a serious effort to combat terrorism.

The terrorists have long been living in the 20th and 21st centuries. As their latest declaration shows, they are the first to achieve unity on a European scale, while we are still using the machinery of the 19th century, that is of our grandparents, to tackle something which has slipped through our grasp.

I therefore feel it is very important, especially now that time is running out — international terrorist rings have become a reality — to remind the national governments as forcefully as possible of their responsibilities in this matter and tell them that the people whom we are proud to represent here will call them to account if they shun them.

The fact that all our resolutions have the same fundamental objective shows that there is agreement among the democrats here, and it is high time we forced the bureaucratic administrations and governments to follow them through!

(*Applause*)

Mr Prag (ED). — You might ask, if you were so inclined, whether, in present circumstances, it would be better to be a distinguished politician, a businessman, a member of the security forces or a terrorist. As we are law-abiding citizens, you and I would choose to be on the side of law and order and democracy. However, I am not sure that, morality aside, the odds at the moment are not with the terrorists.

We learned from the *Agence France Presse* this morning rather more of what the Foreign Office Ministers of the Ten agreed yesterday in Rome than we heard from the President-in-Office a few moments ago. They adopted no texts or formal motions and they gave us the same old pledge. There are, however, to be further meetings of the Ministers of the Interior and Home Affairs Departments, of the Justice Ministers and of the specialized security services. So far, so good. It may mean something or it may mean nothing. Hope springs eternal in the human breast and perhaps the Member States really are going to do something.

It was in January 1977 that the Council of Europe, including all the present Member States of the Euro-

Prag

pean Community, signed here in Strasbourg the European Convention on the Suppression of Terrorism. Some of them have still not ratified it. Others subjected their ratification to stultifying conditions, notably on the extradition of terrorists. At least the Federal Republic of Germany and my own country, the United Kingdom, were among those who ratified it unconditionally, but they were exceptions.

Following the international agreement on terrorism in December 1979, as Lord Cockfield has said, we had the Dublin Agreement between the Member States of which there were then nine. If one is to sum it up succinctly, the effect of that agreement also was virtually nil. Of course, if you read it you can understand why. I doubt whether anybody in any of the Member States understood it, so contorted and complex is the text. Perhaps the only thing in it that was readily comprehensible was that there was a let out somewhere for everybody.

Since then there has been resolution after resolution from this House on the need for joint action. In November last year we regretted the slow progress being made etc., etc. Two years earlier in September 1982, this Parliament called on the police authorities of the Member States to set up an effective mutual information network and asked for cooperation, in particular on strengthening controls at external frontiers. We asked for the creation of a European centre for information, research and intelligence but without executive powers as we did not want to go too far. If you go back to the July 1982 part-session of Parliament there is yet another motion urging effective cooperation and specialized European structures to centralize confidential information, etc.

Each of these resolutions by this House and each statement of good intention by the governments followed a series of quite hideous acts of terrorism in the Member States. It is very instructive to look at what happened. The more numerous the intentions and the stronger the expressions of good intention by the governments, the less the Member States have actually achieved. Since 1980 the number of incidents and the number of deaths in Western Europe has been rising inexorably. In 1983 there were more victims than ever before — 1 925 — double the 1982 figure, and more than half of the attacks were on diplomats. The number of those who die from terrorism in Western Europe is rising by 13% each year. The leading assassins included the Palestine Liberation Organization, the Armenian Secret Army, the Irish Republican Army and the so-called Irish National Liberation Army and the Basque Separatist Group (ETA). How long will it take our governments actually to do something effective together? It is this appalling rise in terrorism which casts the most serious doubts on the efficacy of inter-governmental cooperation. Surely the time has come to give the fight for internal security a Community dimension. It does not require a genius to see what needs to be done. We need a joint anti-terrorist staff at

European Community level which should be entitled to communicate directly with the national anti-terrorist staffs in each Member State. We need a much better exchange of information. The diplomatic black-list is, of course, useful, but it is not enough. We need automatic and immediate, if selective, exchange of information between the security authorities of each Member State.

The question of political asylum must be resolved once and for all. No one who uses or advocates or organizes violence with the aim of overthrowing a democratically elected government should be given political asylum or protected from extradition. In this connection one welcomes the statement yesterday by Mr Dumas in which he promised, in particular regarding the presence of Italian terrorists on French soil, that links between France and Italy would be tightened. They need to be. None of us has forgotten how easy it was for an Italian terrorist sentenced to 36 years imprisonment, moving freely about France, to get into this House. Although the tradition of my own country is against it, I personally believe that we shall have to come to compulsory identity cards throughout the Community.

I have poked fun at the governments, and they deserve it. They have talked big and acted small. I understand as well as anyone the difficult problem of preserving the freedom and democratic way of life of our Member States. We do not want to destroy by our action against terrorism the very freedom we seek to preserve. Nevertheless, the time has come for the governments to act to protect those democratic systems which have produced them and of which they are the guardians. Action, as Lord Cockfield said, needs to be on a European level to be effective. It also needs to be *action*. Dare we hope that this time the governments really mean business?

Mr Barzanti (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the series of terrorist acts which has caused bloodshed and provoked a reaction of horror in various countries in Europe, being directed of late against persons, installations and locations of the NATO, has demonstrated an unscrupulous and disconcerting ability for coordination, a renewed determination coupled with a marked deterioration of the situation.

Against this background of an international scale of connections, which is not new by any means but without doubt today more widespread than in the past, of a phenomenon which this Parliament has also often debated in order to determine effective channels for action, the need for the Community to achieve real and effective tools to tackle the problem becomes a particularly important aspect of the issue as a whole.

Simplistic or tendentious interpretations, delivered possibly to discredit unilaterally the pacifist voices are,

Barzanti

in our opinion, to be ignored: they serve no useful purpose. What really is needed in the view of the Italian Communists is willpower, methods, principles and practical tools which can oppose this new force which the terrorists' destructive plans for destabilization are aimed at achieving while all the time negotiations are about to commence which we all hope mark the start of a new era of international detente.

There is no lack of resolutions or documents — and they have been mentioned here — which have concerned this subject. As an example let me quote the resolution of 9 July 1982 on the European Legal Area adopted by this Parliament and the European Convention on the combating of terrorism signed in Strasbourg in 1977.

In addition to these documents we believe that certain articles of the Treaties, for example Article 220 of the EEC Treaty among others, could be used as a basis for providing effective powers to the Community institutions to take direct action in this field.

The question is typically a political one. The very international nature of the terrorism calls for the effective and coherent coordination of measures between the Member States and this coordination cannot merely consist in a general proclamation of willingness for informal contacts between administrations for the exchange of information at intervals. We need something more. In order to oppose terrorism and new organized crime, drugs and arms trafficking we have to create a European legal area modelled on many of the points made in the resolution approved by Parliament on 9 July 1982. We will need precise and detailed guidelines, specific and clear-cut for all and equally binding on all with regard to the observance of the European convention on human rights, the sovereignty of the States, which are not prejudicial to the provisions for free movement which constitute the very essence of the European Community.

On the other hand a number of standards and principles can be reviewed today in the light of experience or historical changes. We feel for example that the requests for extradition for terrorist acts submitted by individual countries on the basis of appropriate and manifestly conclusive documents must prompt a positive reaction as today terrorism, given its predominantly and obviously criminal nature and given its aim of spreading insecurity and threatening the lives of citizens on a ever-increasing scale cannot seek cover behind any political justification, whatever. And, while on this point, in other words extradition, I should merely like to make a reference to the provisions of Article 7 of the European convention on combating terrorism to which we lend our wholehearted support.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, experience in Italy shows that by a mass reaffirmation of the principles of democracy and liberty terrorism can and must

be combatted. Two other basic elements are also necessary, however: an upgrading of the security services within the State and their total reliability from the point of view of democracy. Finally, the full independence of the services with a view to an effective defence of liberty in the countries of Europe and in general of democracy.

We welcome what we have heard on the agreement reached in Rome yesterday concerning the plans for an intensification of measures to coordinate at political and operational level activities in the Member States to combat organized crime and it is our hope that words will become deeds.

Mrs Veil (L). — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, when we condemned terrorism once again at a previous part-session and called on the Council and our governments to take firm action and make a determined effort to combat this problem more effectively, we scarcely imagined that we would be debating the subject again today in such an alarming context.

In the past few weeks, terrorists have struck again and killed in France, Germany, Belgium, Italy, Portugal and other non-EEC countries. This time, however, the murderers showed themselves in their true colours. They made no attempt to hide the fact that they were attacking our democratic structures, combating imperialism, as they called it, with the aim of destabilizing the Western defence system. To achieve this, they do not hesitate to kill, destroy buildings and equipment considered to be symbols of our determination to shoulder our responsibilities.

They showed themselves in their true colours by claiming joint responsibility for their crimes and revealing the links that exist between terrorist organizations in our different countries.

Finally, they proved that the real aim of their prison hunger strikes is not to secure more humane conditions but simply to wage a political campaign as part of their general struggle.

As Members of the European Parliament, we have a duty to express the anxiety felt by the citizens of Europe, whom we represent, in the face of this threat to their safety and, above all, to our democratic regimes. We must once again draw our governments' attention to the gravity of the situation and the need to take effective counter-measures.

We must therefore put forward clear proposals. However, we should also be aware of the perversity of terrorists: their aim in killing is not only to destabilize the system but also to provoke our democratic regimes and draw them into a cycle of violence in order to force us to act against our own principles.

Hence our response must have a dual objective:

Veil

- to take more vigorous and more effective action against terrorism;
- to guarantee individual rights in accordance with the European Convention on Human Rights, which all our countries have signed and to which, may I remind you, we suggested the Community as such should accede.

In its motion for a resolution, the Liberal and Democratic Group has therefore called on the Ministers of the Interior and of Justice of the Community to meet as a special Council as a matter of urgency in order to decide what common judicial and police measures should be taken in the circumstances.

The Ministers must agree to common extradition regulations because it is quite unacceptable that the Member States, which are all democracies, should be able to invoke the right of asylum as a reason for refusing to extradite persons charged with or convicted of terrorist acts within the Community.

However, this is not sufficient. Let us face the facts. Our countries are slow to act and often do not even know how to act. Some, in trying to be effective and to counter the threat, are tempted to neglect basic rights, or at least certain humanitarian principles. Others, influenced by ideas that are totally irrelevant to the situation of those who are attacking our democracies, hide behind lofty principles and refuse to take the necessary measures.

A European approach is the only means of dealing with organized international terrorism. Our democracies must support one another, act jointly and follow, identical rules.

We therefore hope that Parliament's Legal Affairs Committee will give very careful consideration to the introduction of exceptional provisions to combat terrorism, aware that these must conform to the rule of law if they are to achieve our dual objective: to save democracy, our action must both be effective and remain democratic. On the basis of the Legal Affairs Committee's report to Parliament, specific suggestions can then be put forward to serve as a model for the Council.

Mr Baudoin (RDE). — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, European governments are having increasing difficulty in keeping tabs on terrorism and all its ramifications, for it is becoming part of the stock in trade of those minorities prepared to use violence in order to make its point, to destabilize governments or even assume power in the long term.

In the realization of the danger, the governments of Europe have been trying since 1970 to find an answer to the problem and establish ways of dealing with the danger. The uncommitted observer is inevitably struck by the inadequacy of the present arrangements, how

weak and behind the times they are, when compared with terrorism which has resolutely adapted to late twentieth-century civilization.

We repeat that only cooperation at regional level — and by regional I mean European — has any chance of success because it is only at such a level that it can adapt to the specific types of terrorism we have in our countries. It is for that reason that the European Convention on the repression of terrorism, usually known as the Strasbourg convention, laid down the main points which would serve as a cornerstone of a common anti-terrorist policy. There are four main points: the use of extradition, the scope of anti-terrorism, respect for human rights — there is to be no extradition in cases primarily of political opinion, and its application between the member states of the Council of Europe. Fourteen of the 21 member states accepted, there were arguments for and against. And when the Dublin agreement appeared taking up much the same ideas, a number of our Member States, including France in particular, rejected it. France's reasons were first that the crimes were not closely enough defined, secondly that the heterogeneous membership of the Council of Europe did not permit France to abandon her freedom of decision as regards extradition, thirdly that the right of political asylum is imperilled by virtually automatic extradition, and finally that application of the principle of transfer or pursuit, which obliges a state to judge if it is not willing to pursue, would pose virtually insoluble constitutional problems for certain Community Member States.

Bearing these difficulties in mind, we must review what the Dublin agreement and the Strasbourg Convention provide for, and resolve the problems of extradition so as to ensure that the right of asylum is not, as Mrs Veil said, used abusively.

In addition, we have the idea of the European jurisdiction, launched by the former President of France, who proposed that we adopt a convention which provided for automatic extradition, with appropriate guarantees in the case of particularly serious crimes, regardless of the motive, with the Community Member States setting up the first elements of what would be a jurisdiction unique in the world. A number of problems has arisen here, too, and we must look at the problem again, otherwise there will be no end to it.

Finally, we need action with the police. Meetings between ministers of justice, ministers of home affairs and foreign ministers must become more frequent.

If we are to have real cooperation we must overcome our nationalistic attitudes, and, as far as extradition is concerned, we must rule out any abusive or systematic use of the notion of political crime, and encourage people to come together at last to consider and evaluate jointly the problems of terrorism in all our democracies. We must be fully aware that if we continue to act as individuals, and not as a community, then ter-

Baudoin

rorism can only increase, whereas if we act together, then we can find the way to beat it.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

President

President. — The debate will now be adjourned until after the vote.

10. VOTES

Motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-1640/84), tabled by the Committee on Budgets to wind up the debate on oral question with debate (Doc. 2-1304/84, on the 1984 budget expenditure

Mr Arndt (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, would it not be possible to vote on the De Pasquale report before we vote on the budgetary matters, since there is then sure to be a majority?

Mr Fich (S), rapporteur. — *(DA)* Mr President, without any coordination with my group chairman I would have proposed exactly the same thing. I think it would be a good idea to take first of all the report by Mr De Pasquale, then the motion to wind up the budget date, and lastly the Curry and Fich report.

President. — But coordination does not shock anyone if it exists.

Mr Arndt, Mr Fich, we are not yet dealing with the provisional twelfth budget. We are dealing with the motion for a resolution by the Committee on Budgets, where there is no problem of a majority.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)

Mr Sutra (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, could we not take advantage of the vote which has just taken place to use the electronic system to check the number of Members present in the Chamber.

President. — No, Mr Sutra, I do not think it is either necessary or desirable.

*
* *

Report (Doc. 2-1544(84) drawn up by Mr De Pasquale on behalf of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning on the results of the conciliation with the Council on the proposal from the Commission to the Council for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 724/75 establishing a European Regional Development Fund.

After the adoption of the first eight indents of the preamble

Mr Fich (S). — *(DA)* Mr President, I should like to request a roll-call vote for the first vote on the De Pasquale report.

President. — Mr Fich, the request must be in writing or from a group.

Mr Fich (S). — *(DA)* In that case, I would only ask for an electronic check. I think it would be nice to know how many Members are actually present.

President. — Very well, Mr Fich, we shall have an electronic check at the next vote.

After the eighth indent of the preamble — Amendment No 1

Mr De Pasquale (COM), rapporteur. — *(IT)* Mr President, to save time I should like to comment on all the amendments tabled by Mr Vandemeulebroucke.

I should like to point out that the motion for a resolution was unanimously adopted by the Committee on Regional Policy, and that also means by Mr Vandemeulebroucke, who subsequently decided to table amendments. Although I appreciate their content, some of them repeat ideas which are already in the motion for a resolution, while others refer to various aspects of the organization of the Regional Fund and will thus be incorporated into another report which is being drawn up by Mr Newman.

I would thus ask Mr Vandemeulebroucke to withdraw these amendments, but if he insists on upholding them, my view is that, although I appreciate their content, they should be rejected.

Explanations of vote

Mr Hutton (ED). — My group will be supporting this report. Although we are fed up with the cynical way in which the Council approached the conciliation on the new regulation, we believe that the new regulation represents a step forward in forming a Community regional policy. It represents a move towards making

Hutton

regional policy better value and more effective. And certainly with the expansion of European regional assistance in my own country to cover substantially more people than before, the European Community will be giving real help where it will be well spent. Simply spending money is not enough, it must be well spent, and that is what the changes both in this regulation and in my own country will mean.

I might add that attacks on the United Kingdom over additionality from honourable Members from other Member States are misplaced since all 10 governments operate the European Regional Development Fund in the same way, and honourable Members would do better to examine the practices of their own governments than throw up the smokescreen of attacking somebody else. Regional funding from Europe began when the United Kingdom joined the Community. We want to see it continue and improve so as to bite effectively into the problems which follow from regional imbalances. That is why my group will be supporting this report.

Mr Sakellariou (S). — (DE) Mr President, on behalf of the Socialist Group I should like to state that we are in favour of the De Pasquale report. We voted against the amendments because we consider that the report already contains the necessary criticism of the Commission and Council.

Mr Filinis (COM), in writing. — (GR) We will vote in favour of the excellent report by our colleague Mr De Pasquale, because we wish to underscore the importance of the conciliation procedure which the three institutions have undertaken, so that the Community can acquire a sound legal basis for exercising its regional policy. We believe that from now on the fundamental institutions of the Community will have to resort increasingly often to this conciliation procedure, in order to eliminate possible contradictions and conflicts of responsibility and to arrive at a convergence of views, to ensure timely legal coverage of the common policies and to ensure that the Community can advance towards European integration with the greatest possible unanimity.

We also believe that the Council will respect the Joint Declaration and that, accordingly, each year, when the principles of the new Regulation are being evaluated, it will be able to readapt it in line with the proposals made by Parliament, which unfortunately were not accepted by the Council, so that the Fund can play its role as a means towards ensuring balanced regional development.

We are voting in favour of this report and we are satisfied with the Joint Declaration, which inter alia calls for examination of the impact of the other common policies on regional development, for special endeavours to ensure employment for young people and

women and, likewise, for recognition of the role played by the local authorities in regional development.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)

*
* *

Report (Doc. 2-1559/84) drawn up by Mr Curry and Mr Fich on behalf of the Committee on Budgets embodying the second decision to authorize additional provisional twelfths for the 1985 financial year (non-compulsory expenditure)

Mr Cot (S), Chairman of the Committee on Budgets. — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, now that we are going to vote on the Curry-Fich report on provisional twelfths, I should like to remind the House of the statement made by Mr Christophersen a few minutes ago on the next item. I am referring to the amendment submitted by the Committee on Budgets which calls for a reduction from 11 provisional twelfths to two-twelfths in advance for the appropriations relating to the Members of the Commission. A few moments ago Mr Christophersen indicated his agreement with the view of the Committee on Budgets. He was not able to present a new proposal, but he did affirm that two twelfths would be enough to cover any problems until June, that the Commission did not intend to release any further appropriations, and that in any event if the situation changed he would return to Parliament to report and ask for fresh guidelines.

I should be grateful, Mr President, if Mr Christophersen could confirm what he said just now, so that Parliament fully understands the significance of the coming vote.

Mr Christophersen, Vice-President of the Commission. — (DA) Yes.

(Parliament adopted the motion for resolution)

Mr Ford (S). — On a point of order, Mr President. I did want the opportunity this afternoon to say that the French and English press has contained some quite shocking allegations with regard to the activities of a Member of this Assembly — namely, Mr Le Pen — claiming he was a torturer during the Algerian war. Those allegations bring dishonour upon this Parliament and its Members, and I would suggest to Parliament that we ask Mr Le Pen to make a personal statement as soon as possible . . .

(Mixed reactions)

President. — Mr Ford, this is not a point of order and so you may not continue speaking!

Mr d'Ormesson (DR). — *(FR)* Mr President, Jean-Marie Le Pen has taken legal action against these vile and disgraceful accusations. He has never tortured anyone at all. He even saved the life of one of those terrorists. We do not accept your intemperate, untruthful and criminal accusations. Jean-Marie Le Pen is struggling to achieve a free world and the defence of Europe and his country, and he will treat your accusations with scorn.

(Protests from the left — Applause from the right)

President. — Mr d'Ormesson, we shall now continue our proceedings.

11. Combating terrorism (contd)

Mr Van der Lek (ARC). — *(NL)* Mr President, we consider this debate's approach to terrorism incorrect, superficial and dangerous. Parliament's role should be to make a sober analysis of what is actually going on, but now people are acting as if there is only a single form of violence — that being politically motivated murders and attacks. We do, of course, completely condemn such acts. They can only hinder the peaceful and non-violent struggle that is our aim. By demanding an over-reaction in this way, as in almost all motions, Parliament is merely making these crimes more significant and is even increasing the likelihood that more will occur. Without any proof, the assumption has been made that these attacks are linked and form some kind of conspiracy. It is known, however, that many experts in the combating of crime say that this is not the case and even that there is less such conspiracy than in the past.

Mr President, we also oppose the belief that only one kind of violence — so-called terrorism — exists. There is violence instituted by the state, there are wars, there is structural violence and repression. Or isn't it violence when tens of thousands of soldiers clear 150 people from their peace camp so that a military base can be sited there? Is there no violence involved when peaceful demonstrations are forcibly dispersed? Is violence absent when governments are not prepared to discuss regional autonomy and repress those aspirations with violence? And is it not a form of violence when unjust structures maintain the existence of hunger in the world.

Mr President, we are the representatives here of non-violent parties. We reject the use of any form of violence to achieve our aims, but I nevertheless want to echo the words of Mr Amadei when he pointed out that we must be careful not to endanger the freedom of citizens, their freedom to move about and their safety by the kind of over-reaction we are now proposing. For this reason, we oppose a European legal area, integration of the police organizations within Europe,

teams with international powers of arrest and all laws that would clearly limit the rights and freedom of movement of all citizens. That is a poor cure since it is worse than the disease.

Mr President, we are very concerned at the much-too-wide definition of terrorism applied in some countries and about the consequences of the abolition of the right to political asylum. Of course, good cooperation is essential and we do not object to it. An exchange of information is obviously required and we are very happy to listen to the Council's proposals in this field. We are not against the exchange of information but we do believe that it is essential — and I would like to stress the point — that this should occur under effective democratic control whereas this is not possible under the current plans for a European legal area. The spirit of exaggeration apparent in most of the motions is unacceptable to us and we cannot therefore support them. What we expect from the national governments is a subtler approach which also pays attention to the causes. What is now happening is an over-reaction, an exaggerated reaction and we are not in favour of merely attacking the symptoms. We believe that there must be a really thorough examination of the situation and that what is required is an improvement and strengthening of democratic standards in our society in order to achieve a civilization which protects both man and the environment, in which states can live together in peace and security, where disarmament is given the highest priority and in which we can live together as human beings.

Terrorism is no isolated phenomenon. It is a symptom of desperate people carrying on a struggle in the wrong way. We condemn their methods but we cannot accept the kind of measures being demanded here since they conflict with the end in view. One must use methods in keeping with the intended aim. We wish to achieve our goal of peaceful society by using non-violent methods and oppose the further escalation being proposed here.

Mr Romualdi (DR). — *(IT)* Mr President, in this climate of intimidation and witch hunts, which is unworthy of any Parliament and should not be tolerated in this one, I should like on behalf of the group of the European Right and in particular of the Italian members of the old non-attached group, to remind the House in connection with the questions put by Mr Formigoni, of the many times that we have tried to convince the European Parliament and the public opinion that it represents to consider terrorism as a general phenomenon, a great sickness to which no country can remain immune. Parliament should also be convinced that terrorism, like urban guerilla warfare, is not merely common delinquency but a different, brutal and merciless way of conducting a political struggle on the part of forces, organizations and political powers bent on destabilizing the society and civilization of the Western world.

Romualdi

I fully realize that stating this risks exposing many of the falsehoods on which the groupings of the left, and in particular international Communism, have based and continue to base their propaganda. However, if it is our intention to get to the root of terrorism and, cost what it may, establish its underlying causes, within what sort of culture it has arisen, what it has fed on and can feed on in the future, it would be tantamount to continuing to say that it has no aims and that, as the saying goes, it didn't pay and doesn't pay. In this sorrowful postwar period — forty years of so-called liberation, revolts, guerilla warfare or national or pseudonational revolutions, stretching from the shores of the Mediterranean to the Middle and Far East, from Africa to South America the facts have unfortunately demonstrated the opposite. Now terrorism is attacking Europe and within Europe in particular its industrial and technological fabric, the nerve centres of its defence and its political and military forces representing that defence during the bleak period of terrorist activities, particularly in Italy and in Germany. This explains the need to tackle it on a general scale uniting forces and genuinely creating, not only in words but also in deeds and in — by now everybody seems to be convinced to judge by the documents which we are discussing — the much-desired European legal area. While we are waiting for the European legal area to be set up, which is not a matter for which an easy and rapid solution can be found, an immediate step which should be taken is the continued closer coordination of the police forces in all the various countries so that a single force operating on the basis of a common strategy, with common methods and equipment and primarily with a common political will can be set up. Exactly that which is not being done, in France for example, in the name of the principles of liberty and asylum which are as noble, when they are sincere, as they are destructive for the purposes of a struggle which has neither rules nor principles save for those of terror and destruction. The steps we should be taking are the very opposite of what was agreed at the meeting in Rome of the foreign ministers to which Mr Forte today referred which again ended with an irresponsible procrastination which further demonstrates our weakness and our lack of substantial agreement. Ladies and gentlemen, it is discouraging and depressingly so.

Mr Tortora (NI). — (*IT*) Mr President, on behalf of the radicals I feel I must point out how some of the stances adopted with regard to terrorism — or Euro-terrorism as it is normally called now given the fad for labelling things, drift off into the empyrean firmament of good intentions never to be the seen again.

Without a shadow of a doubt nobody can fail to see in this abominable resurgence of violence a threat to democracy and to the way in which we understand the concept of democracy in a non-totalitarian Europe.

For my first point, Mr President, I would start by taking this Parliament. Here — and I hope the questors

will forgive me — I have the impression that it is incredibly easy to come and go. We had a taste of it not too long ago. We are a long way from Mr Le Pen but we are also a long way from sanctioning certain methods which are no longer used, even in small rural councils.

I see, or at least I saw, today in this House some demonstrations which if they must be held at all should be held outside rather than inside the building. I would also like to ask if there is any truth in the rumour currently circulating that in Luxembourg all the NATO dynamite stocks have disappeared under mysterious circumstances. It is our duty to ask this question and our duty to find the answer.

Lastly the struggle against terrorism, and it is without doubt a relentless struggle, should not close our minds to the other struggle, which is sacrosanct for the protection of the individual, and that is the protection and the guaranteeing of human rights for all.

In my country and in the name of the struggle against terrorism or other emergencies there have been cases where unfortunately the law has been distorted and offence caused to the very nature of a State based on law and order. Moreover, like in the period of the crusades the Catholic Church wrote what may have been its most obscure tracts in the name of those very crusades.

Nevertheless we approve the motion for a resolution from the Socialists because we feel that it is the one most suited to the need for a fight against terrorism which guarantees the protection of the freedom of the individual. No end, no matter how lofty, can justify certain means and certain methods. In the country of Machiavelli the *Prince* has often shown how a threat, which is vile to many, can be used to further disgraceful power struggles which concern and dishonour a few.

Mrs Fuillet (S). — (*FR*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to take this opportunity of placing on record our homage to the memory of General René Audran and of Mr Ernst Zimmerman, President of the Federal Republic's aerospace industry, both of whom were basely struck down by the shadowy figures who dream of building a new Europe upon the ruins of our democracies: the Europe of terror.

With this new wave of terrorism I should like to speak in support of the motion for resolution tabled by the Socialist Group. Our countries, faced with the very small minorities who seek their aims through bloodshed and hatred, must unite in their unceasing efforts to defeat terrorism. The police must do its work, and I note that cooperation between countries and more frequent meetings are improving efficiency; alas, not yet by enough.

Fuillet

The French Government has taken all necessary steps to rule out any compromise, and I can only repeat the words of President Mitterrand: France is, and will remain, united with her European partners in respecting principles and law. France will remain united in refusing any direct or indirect protection to true, active, blood-letting terrorism. A number of speakers, Mr President, are in no position to lecture the present French Government. The President in power before 1981 did not shine by his firmness at the time of the bomb in the rue Copernic. And I recall the words of the Prime Minister of the time, Mr Raymond Barre, who said of the bomb that it was — and I quote — aimed at Jews going to their synagogue, and that its victims included innocent Frenchmen out in the street. What is the difference between Jews going to their devotions and innocent Frenchmen, then? Such words are intolerable, and those who wish to fight terrorism effectively must have the political credibility to do it. Such credibility was eminently lacking in certain politicians.

In conclusion, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it is the task of the Legal Affairs Committee, under the chairmanship of my colleague Mrs Vayssade, to carry out a programme of strengthening the links of European cooperation against terrorism.

(Applause from the left)

Mr Lecanuet (PPE). — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, my speech will be in a tone rather different from that you have just been hearing, and will deal with the motion for a resolution submitted by, amongst others, my friends and colleagues Mr Habsburg and Mr Formigoni.

We live, alas, in a Europe of terrorism. We do not as yet have a Europe of security. The cause of this lies with those forces which are hostile to our kind of civilization and democracy, but the fault also lies with those Member States which have given in to the illusion of laxity. The resurgence of terrorism is nothing less than an attack on European democracy, and it is our democracies which are the targets of the long series of attacks which we have heard described this afternoon.

It is essential that the originators and the conspirators are known. Need I remind the House that as far back as the attempt on the life of Pope John-Paul II we were able to see the scale of the backing and the networks reaching in from outside the European Community, and able to perceive their origins?

In the face of such aggression, vigilance is more than ever required from all the governments concerned. Our own wish is never again to see the thoughtless release of accredited terrorists such as we had to lament in France in July 1981.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

We now learn that in Rome yesterday our governments' diplomatic leaders agreed — finally, I might almost add — to strengthen and coordinate government action in the fight against terrorism.

Time is against me, Mr President, so I shall limit my comments on this to saying that it is not much, but that it is better than nothing and we must go further, faster. Vigilance will be worthless unless we provide systematic strengthening of cooperation between police forces. This was proposed as long ago as 1975 at a meeting of the Ministers of Justice of the Council of Europe held at Obernai, not far from here. I stressed to that meeting, as I now stress to this House, that since the authors of these terrorist acts profit from the existence of frontiers within the Community to escape the consequence of their acts, and conceal their criminality behind our democratic liberties, we must strengthen the international aspects of the prevention of terrorism.

That is still true today. That is why we are calling for a series of measures which will contribute to greater security throughout the Community. Such measures must define the conditions under which hot pursuit may continue beyond frontiers, set up an international network for wanted criminals, and provide for some acceleration of the extradition procedure. Cooperation between Member States must reflect the serious threat which terrorism represents. It must therefore stem from the highest levels, without, of course, in any way prejudicing the human rights and freedoms which are the shared heritage of European democracy.

It is our hope that the forthcoming meeting of Ministers of Home Affairs will decide in favour of some speedy initiatives along these lines. The many resolutions approved in the past by the European Parliament already demonstrate our overwhelming determination to uphold public peace and avoid the trap set by these terrorist splinter groups. That trap is to disorganize public authority, and it is aimed quite simply at opening up the risks of either anarchy or of totalitarianism. I make bold to think that the dangers of this are clear to everybody. Times have changed since the not-so-distant days when those — including ourselves — who raised their voices against the terrorist threat were accused of nervous reactions compounding unjustified fears.

What we must do, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, is to convince the governments of our Member States that they must now — quickly — set in motion the processes of close collaboration which have just been outlined. That should be the purpose of today's debate, and I trust that it will also be its outcome.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

Mr Ulburghs (NI). — *(NL)* In the first place, Mr President, I would like to stress that I specifically

Ulburghs

reject any form of terrorism. Terrorism is a hopeless act of desperation.

I question whether the proposals put forward by the authors of this motion for a resolution are sufficient to tackle the problem. Repressive measures alone cannot be expected to give any hope to those rejected, in all kinds of ways, by society. As long as people suffer the hopeless oppression of such situations as unemployment, poverty, the nuclear arms race, hunger and fear of the future, the ground will always be prepared for acts of desperation.

We should not forget this when debating terrorism and, linked with this, the establishment of a European legal area. Let us work to renew Europe with an economy designed for the welfare of everyone, real needs and a redistribution of wealth, and work to achieve a just and peaceful Europe that identifies with the very poorest both here and in the third world. I would also urge a public enquiry into certain practices by secret services for which so-called terrorist groups are often used as a smoke screen. In this context, I would note as regards my own country the infiltration of the peace movement with the aim of bringing discredit on it.

It is important to keep one's head during this debate and to act with enough discrimination so that the correct measures are taken to protect the safety of citizens and of society as a whole.

Mr Penders (PPE). — (NL) Mr President, Europe has a new and unwelcome catchword. After 'Euro-pessimism' with its sombre expectations for the future and 'Euro-sclerosis' painting a picture of paralysis and decline, comes 'Euro-terrorism'. Euro-terrorism refers to the wave of violence and killings which is sweeping Europe. But Euro-terrorism has more than just a geographical meaning; it implies that the instigators are organized on a Europe-wide level, their lessons learnt, no doubt, from the crushing, to some extent, of terrorism at national level. We are, regrettably, coming up against European coordination and cooperation in terrorism. This is the inevitable other side of the coin of a growing Europe. Hard to accept, but a fact of life.

We must match this, Mr President, with a European approach to combating it, with free citizens reacting as and when required. Modern information and communication methods should not serve only the criminals and gangsters but all those who stand on the right side of the law. May I add here that my own country, the Netherlands, intends to ratify the two conventions at the Council of Europe meeting next week.

A recurrent target of the wave of attacks has been NATO installations of personnel. That leads me to ask one question. Could it be — and this is only conjecture — that the terrorists are trying to cash in on and exploit the frustration felt by many who have opposed,

without success, the implementation of the two-fold NATO decision on the siting of cruise missiles in a number of West European countries? If this is the terrorists' game, then we are dealing with a very serious form of brainwashing and degeneration. The magazine 'Agence Europe' coined the term 'pacifist terrorism'. I think I am right in supposing that there is no one in this House who would not condemn such a monstrous association. I believe we must take a firm line, Mr President, first and foremost through the police forces. Exchanges of data between the police and security forces, coordination of search activities; all excellent ideas and I would add that I am also in favour of more judicial coordination with a view to achieving a European legal Community. Many problems lie ahead, particularly in the field of the harmonization of extradition regulations, and great care must be given to the protection of citizens' rights. All the motions for a resolution before us show the necessary caution in this respect.

But we should also remember, Mr President, that Article 46 of the draft Treaty on European Unity, the Spinelli Treaty, deals with a European legal area. Repression, yes, Mr President, but that is not enough, we must look into the causes of the violence and choose which path to take on the basis of our findings. The threat of terrorism is just as great as the threat of world war. Terrorism threatens the rule of law. It attacks the state system by which our world is governed.

IN THE CHAIR: MRS PÉRY

Vice-President

Mr Cassidy (ED). — Madam President, Euroterrorism is a growing threat. The activities of unpleasant groups like the Red Brigade, the Red Army Faction, *Action Directe* and Communist Combatant Cells used to be confined within national boundaries. There is now well-developed cross-frontier cooperation between these groups. Terrorism has become a multinational business with branch offices throughout the Community and in Spain and Portugal.

In the last few weeks we have had a series of premeditated and well-planned outrages. The assassination of General Audran in France was apparently carried out as a joint operation by *Action Directe* and the Red Army Faction. There was the murder of Mr Ernst Zimmermann in Munich by the Red Army Faction. Dynamite stolen in Belgium has apparently been used in bombings carried out by *Action Directe* and the Red Army Faction. In Belgium itself there has been a series of bombings carried out by a shadowy group calling itself Communist Combatant Cells. The violence has even spread to Portugal with the recent mortar attack

Cassidy

on NATO ships in Lisbon harbour. A group known as the Popular Forces of 25 April claimed responsibility. Fortunately, in that incident no one was hurt.

There are a number of factors in common in all these attacks. The two assassinations, of General Audran and of Mr Zimmermann, were of people prominent in the defence industries of their respective countries. The Red Army Faction was involved in both. All the recent bombings in Germany and Belgium and the attack in Lisbon Harbour were on targets associated with NATO. All the groups appear, from what little is known about them, to be made up of well-educated young people from privileged backgrounds. They are all extreme left-wingers.

That terrorism is international is not new. What is new in the present wave is the sign of international coordination. Are we in the Community prepared to respond to this international threat? The evidence so far is that we are not. Only now have Interior Ministers of Member States begun to address themselves to the problem. Yet the links between the Red Brigade, the Red Army Faction and *Action Directe* have been known since 1981. In 1983 two members of an *Action Directe* squad involved in a shoot-out with the police in Paris turned out to be Italians. Last year bank notes from a robbery in France carried out by *Action Directe* were found in Milan.

Understandably, the governments of Member States do not wish to be accused of over-reaction or of being alarmist. Equally, they should be prepared to coordinate all their anti-terrorist activities. I emphasize the phrase *all anti-terrorist activities*. That means against right-wing as well as left-wing terrorists and against groups such as the IRA and ETA. With Spain about to join the Community, we cannot continue to give sanctuary to ETA terrorists within our frontiers.

Mr Estgen (PPE). — (DE) Madam President, there are those who label politicians who advocate firm anti-terrorist measures as fascists and describe their actions as attacks on democracy and freedom.

Let us take a lesson from history! Terrorism creates an ideal breeding ground for fascism. So let us nip the problem in the bud! We have set up a committee of enquiry this problem, but the best way of preventing its spread is to combat terrorism. For this we need a genuine alliance of all free and democratic forces in Europe.

We must all stand together in defence of our freedom and safety, but we must also preserve basic ethical values in our society, for it is appalling how human life is being abused in our age, whether by genetic manipulation of other biological experiments, brutal destruction in the case of terrorism, torture or the increasingly widespread practice of abortion.

Even though the terrorists have achieved no success so far, the effects of terrorism make it a political and spiritual challenge to us all. The widespread accusation that our democracies exist only in name has alienated young people and makes any refusal to accept our systems of government justified in their eyes. It is particularly distressing that various elements in the media and schools are blurring the distinction between what is and is not acceptable as regards the use of violence. Attempts are often made to justify violence as a means of opposing violence. We have even heard arguments to that effect here, the effect of which is to break down the philosophical, moral and political inhibitions against violence.

To combat terrorism we must discuss in the Council a broad, European-scale offensive with proposals on the philosophical and political question, on legislation and on European cooperation between our security forces. The campaign should then be launched in the Member States. This is the only way to prevent the slide into violence.

Mr Forte, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — (IT) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, my reply to this important and rich debate will comprise 5 points:

1) We share the view of the Committee and appreciate the need for joint effort as expressed in that view.

2) It has been the wish of the Italian Presidency during its turn to include in the internal market agenda the free movement of persons across Community frontiers. We share the conviction that anti-terrorist measures should not involve restrictions or delays in the process of opening up the frontiers so that the rights of the European citizen as a citizen of Europe in the truest sense can be safeguarded.

3) At the meeting of Ministers for political cooperation 12 February 1985 a number of different points were clarified or decided about which I can now provide some information with the condition that there are also some specific confidential items about which I cannot say anything lest their effectiveness be jeopardized. It was decided to take measures on a broad front within the terms of European political cooperation, making full use of all the tools available, in other words the 'Trevi group', covering such areas as cooperation on legal matters, joint measures for the safety of embassies and for putting a stop to any abuse of diplomatic immunity for terrorist purposes and also some *ad hoc* cooperation for the safeguarding of communications.

It was also decided to hold, under the Italian Presidency, an informal meeting to be attended by the Ministers of the Interior or the Ministers of Justice depending on the portfolios in the various Member States, to draw up a common strategy to tackle terror-

Forte

ism. It was also decided by the Ministers meeting in political cooperation on 12 February to revive for the purposes of the European legal area the 1977 Convention of the Council of Europe, which has been ratified by only five States and which it had been decided to apply informally between the nine Member States in 1979.

4) Each motion tabled in Parliament would be given careful consideration by the Council if it served the common efforts to combat terrorism.

5) As a member of the Italian Government I should like to add that it is our wish to see fast and effective extradition procedures established.

(Applause)

President. — We shall now vote on the requests for an early vote.

(Parliament agreed to an early vote)

The debate is closed.

The vote on the motions for resolutions will be held at the next voting time.

(The sitting was closed at 7.05 p.m.)¹

¹ *Agenda for the next sitting: see Minutes.*

ANNEX

I. *Questions to the Commission**Question No 12, by Mr Wolff (H-374/84)*

Subject: Ban on books encouraging suicide in the Community

Is the Commission aware that in some Member States, legislation has been proposed which is aimed at preventing the distribution of literature which encourages suicide and at punishing the authors; if so, in view of the fact that the Treaty of Rome makes provision for the free movement of goods, does not the Commission consider that measures in this field should be harmonized at Community level so as to prevent the circumvention of the ban on the distribution of these publications?

Answer

The Commission has no official intimation that Member States are considering the introduction of legislation aimed at prohibiting the distribution of books inciting people to take their own lives and of prosecuting the authors of such books.

If a Member State were to introduce such a ban, it would of necessity cover similar literature imported from other Member States.

National provisions restricting the free movement of goods within the Community would need to be justified by reference to the public interest or on one of the grounds mentioned in Article 36 of the Treaty. Article 36 permits Member States to take appropriate steps, including steps, which would inhibit the free movement of goods within the Community, where this is necessary to protect any of the values there specified, for example, public morality, public policy or public security.

As long as there are no specific Community rules on this matter, it is open to Member States to take whatever measures they consider necessary. The resultant barriers to trade could then be eliminated only through the approximation of the laws of the Member States.

*
* *

Question No 13, by Mrs Tove Nielsen (H-433/84)

Subject: Increased opportunities for consumers to buy cheap butter

Consumers cannot understand why they cannot for instance buy cakes in which butter is used at the same price from their local baker as from really large-scale producers, who are able to buy five tonnes of butter at a time at a very low price.

Will the Commission take steps to set up wholesale societies so that consumers in the Community can jointly buy butter in bulk and to ensure that the five tonne limit does not remain in force, since a smaller quantity available to more people will mean that more butter can be sold than hitherto, to the advantage of consumers and therefore of the Community?

Answer

Since 1979, the Commission has sold — to the benefit of the producers and sales of butter — butter from intervention stocks, to be used for production of, for example, confectionery. Since 1981 aid has been awarded for butter and butter concentrates to be used for the same purpose but purchased at the free market.

At present a minimum purchase of five tonnes of butter is required because of administrative and control reasons and an acceptance of wholesale societies for redistribution of butter would only increase the administrative difficulties. However, I draw your attention to the possibilities for smaller bakeries — without any minimum requirements — to purchase butter concentrates for confectionery. Also — in order to limit the administrative and control difficulties — the Commission is in the process of examining the possibilities for adding tracers also to butter. When the results of these examinations are known the Commission will be able to consider a change of the existing minimum requirement for purchase of butter.

*
* *

Question No 15, by Mr Habsburg (H-454/84)

Subject: Safety provisions in air transport

Despite current provisions restricting hand luggage on passenger aircraft, some European airlines are again allowing passengers to carry numerous and excessively large pieces of luggage.

These could endanger all passengers by obstructing movement in the event of emergency landing.

What does the Commission intend to do to ensure that the safety provisions are observed?

Answer

The honourable Member raises an important question of aircraft safety. As he will know, there are both national and international regulations restricting hand luggage in the interests of the security of passengers. The enforcement of these regulations lies, of course, with the Member States and the airlines.

The Commission takes this opportunity to emphasize that there are indeed risks in allowing passengers to carry excessive hand luggage on board aircraft and I urge all concerned to ensure that rules which have been formed in the interests of passenger safety are observed.

*
* *

Question Nr 19, by Sir James Scott-Hopkins (H-480/84)

Subject: Proposals for an overall reduction in the cost of support for cereals in 1985

Would the European Commission state, bearing in mind the bumper harvest in most cereal crops in the Community this year, whether its proposed budget, as amended, contains implicit proposals for an overall reduction in the cost of support for cereals in 1985.

Answer

As has been the practice for the various financial years, the preliminary draft budget for 1985, EAGGF Guarantee Section, was drawn up according to established procedure, i.e. on the basis of the procedure followed for the 1984/85 year and which, unless new decisions are taken and certain provisions subject to a time-limit and still currently in force are extended, would normally be applied in 1985/86.

Consequently, this preliminary draft did not contain any savings under the heading of possible special provisions which might be proposed as a means of reducing the overall cost of support for the cereals sector in 1985.

However, the draft budget adopted by the Council includes, in respect of the cereals sector, a reduction of 190 m ECU, or 6.4% of the original amount. This reduction, though, is simply the share borne by the chapter on cereals of the across-the-board reduction of 6.4% which the Council has made in all EAGGF Guarantee Section appropriations in order to remain within the 1% VAT limit. The 1985 draft budget, as amended, therefore contains no implicit proposals for a reduction in the overall cost of support for the cereals market this year.

*
* *

Question No 22, by Mr Deprez (H-542/84)

Subject: Milk quotas

Belgian farmers, who are adhering strictly to their milk quotas, are worried that certain Member States are not taking the necessary steps to introduce quotas, either for dairies or for individual farms, and intend to pay the additional levy on milk production themselves.

Can the Commission outline the way in which the various Member States have implemented the milk quotas and say whether payment of the additional levies by the Member States would be compatible with Community regulations?

Answer

The great majority of Member States have taken the necessary steps to implement the superlevy system and the national legislative measures which have been adopted are the subject of a careful examination by the Commission in order to verify their conformity with the Community regulations concerned. The Commission has decided that infringement proceedings may be opened in respect of any Member State which fails to implement the levy system or which does not apply the regulations correctly.

For the first year of application, most Member States have chosen to implement the levy system in accordance with formula B but Belgium, Germany, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom in respect of Northern Ireland only have opted for formula A. With the exception of legislation for the introduction of a scheme for the cessation of milk production, Italy has not yet taken the required measures for the implementation of the levy system. A letter has therefore been addressed to the Italian authorities under Article 169 of the Treaty regarding Italy's failure to implement the levy system. Letters have also been addressed to a number of other Member States under Article 169 of the Treaty regarding their failure to collect the levy amounts, due for the first two quarters of application, within the time limit laid down of 15 December 1984.

*
* *

Question No 30, by Mr Adam (H-467/84)

Subject: Advanced communication technologies in Europe (Race)

Can the Commission indicate when they expect to publish their proposals for shared research and development work in this field?

Answer

In close cooperation with the telecommunications authorities and the telecommunications industry, the Commission has carried out a detailed study of the possibilities for European

cooperation on development work in the field of telecommunication technologies. This work has led to the establishment of a comprehensive strategic working programme.

This working programme provides for shared development work on wide band technology, which will be introduced from 1995 onwards.

On the basis of this expert report, in which more than 80 leading engineers were involved, the Commission has been holding detailed discussions since last autumn with the authorities and the industry. These talks are extremely complex, not only because substantial budgetary resources are concerned, but also because the industry is only willing to put in the requisite stake if the telecommunications authorities also contribute to the programme.

I am pleased to be able to inform you that following the most recent discussions with the Working Party of Senior Officials on Telecommunications on 7 February 1985, it is very likely that the Member States will give the go-ahead for a RACE initial phase.

The Commission will probably submit a proposal for the *RACE definition phase* on 15 March 1985.

This initial phase in 1985 will prepare the way for the main programme, which still has to be submitted in good time for 1986. Some of you will recall that the ESPRIT programme also started with a one-year pilot phase.

The RACE definition phase will cost 22 m ECU (of which 15 m ECU is already included in the 1985 budget) and will be financed by a supplement to the 1986 budget. It will operate in the same way as the ESPRIT programme, i.e. as a rule, the Community's contribution will be less than 50%.

With support from Parliament and the Council of Ministers, we hope to obtain a decision in June, i.e. at the Council of Research Ministers which is scheduled for 4 June 1985.

*
* *

Question No 31, by Mr Hughes (H-476/84)

Subject: European Communities assistance to Consett a former steel town in County Durham

What steps has the Commission taken to inform itself of the effectiveness of European Communities assistance granted to the Consett area in the four years following the closure of the steel works there?

Answer

The Commission does not undertake a case-by-case evaluation of the effectiveness of all the projects and programmes cofinanced by the Community. The national administrations have the greater responsibilities in the execution and evaluation of the programmes and projects. The Commission's control is mainly limited to verifying that the projects and programmes have been carried out in accordance with the conditions agreed by the Commission and that the expenditure declared by the Member States is justified.

Officials of the Commission have visited the Consett area on several occasions and maintain contacts with the representatives of the various interests involved. The information available through these contacts and provided by the on-the-spot checks of operations revealed that, despite the difficulties still existing in the area, progress has been made both in the provision of new or improved infrastructures and in the provision of jobs by EEC grant-aided industrial projects.

*
* *

Question No 32, by Mr Vandemeulebroucke (H-493/84)

Subject: Customs regulations for works of art

Artists maintain that the present customs regulations seriously handicap artists in the Community.

Is the Commission also of this opinion and, if so, what proposals is it considering to improve the situation?

Answer

Yes, the Commission is aware that due to different fiscal regimes in the Member States, movement from one State to another by artists can be hindered. We have been trying to improve the situation for artists and other professions who need to move within the Community. As recently as November 1984 the Commission service met representatives of the professional artists concerned to obtain first-hand information.

Certain limited improvements have been made, Regulation (EEC) No 3/84 adopted in December 1983 allows articles for exhibitions by official bodies to be transported without tax.

Certain other improvements have been proposed. The Commission's proposal for a seventh VAT Directive¹ provides that works of art supplied and imported by the artist himself should be exempted from tax. This text has not been accepted by the Council, but the Commission has returned to the same suggestion in its proposal for a 19th VAT Directive² which would exempt from tax numerous categories of works of art supplied by the artist who created them. Furthermore, the recent proposal for a 17th VAT Directive³, dealing with temporarily imported goods, envisages a derogation from the usual principles of temporary importation by providing tax-relief on works of art imported for the purposes of exhibition with a view to possible sale.

*
* *

Question No 33, by Mr Christopher Jackson (H-606/84)⁴

Subject: Common market in motor vehicles

In order to ensure proper implementation of the proposed regulation on block exemption for motor vehicle distribution, will the Commission ensure a complaints procedure is available to solve quickly difficulties experienced by consumers in exercising their fundamental right to buy cars anywhere in the European Community?

Answer

The Regulation on the block exemption of motor vehicle distribution agreements adopted by the Commission on 12 December 1984 and entering into force on 1 July 1985 was accompanied by a Commission notice which lays down in advance certain important administrative principles. This notice lays great stress on the right of European consumers, first, to purchase cars wherever the common market prices and terms are most favourable, secondly to order a car with the specifications required for their country of residence in another Member State, and thirdly to complain to the Commission should they be obstructed in so doing.

¹ COM(77) 735 final, 6. 1. 1978.

² COM(84) 648 final, 22. 11. 1984.

³ COM(74) 412 final, 10. 8. 1984.

⁴ Former oral question without debate (0-87/84), converted into a question for Question Time.

Complaints will be dealt with under the ordinary procedure, particularly as regards the arrangements for giving all sides a hearing. It is impossible to say as yet whether obstruction will in fact occur on a large scale when the Regulation comes into force. In dealing with any cases that do occur, the Commission will apply the current procedure with the utmost dispatch before taking the necessary steps to bring the obstruction speedily to an end. A special procedure for complaints about obstruction of motor vehicle imports does not appear necessary — at least not at present.

The honourable Member's question provides an opportunity to correct a widespread misunderstanding. The Commission cannot, of course, intervene directly to help consumers to buy cars outside their home countries. It can only put an end to restrictive practices which make such purchases difficult or impossible, such as contractual export bans or refusals to supply right-hand-drive vehicles which amount to export bans. The Regulation does not impose on authorized dealers in the common market an obligation to supply vehicles to consumers. If a dealer can readily obtain such cars, there is no reason why he should not deal with consumers from other countries; accordingly, the Regulation only lays the obligation on the manufacturer or importer to meet orders from authorized dealers.

*
* *

Question No 34, by Mr McMahon (H-684/84)¹

Subject: EAGGF grants

Recently S.K. Meats, a subsidiary of W. Forrest & Sons, Paisley, closed its factory in Saltcoats, Ayrshire. In the light of considerable EAGGF grants which this firm received, has the Commission any mechanism to reclaim all or part of the European Community's investment; has the Commission any mechanism for dealing with companies that receive EEC assistance and within a short period of time close their doors causing considerable hardship, unemployment and poverty to the local community and has the Commission any proposals to safeguard EEC funds from being used for 'asset stripping'?

Answer

- (a) The firm in question received an EAGGF Guidance Section grant on 29 July 1976 to modernize its plant in Saltcoats. The recipient carried out the proposed work as stipulated. According to information received from the competent authorities, negotiations are under way to keep the production unit intact. In the case in point, therefore, the Commission is not currently in possession of any facts which would warrant action to recover the aid.
- (b) The legal basis currently in force for aid of this type, Regulation (EEC) No 355/77², has recently been amended by Regulation (EEC) No 1932/84³ in order, among other things, to prevent possible future abuses. Thus, a provision has been added Article 19(2), (second subparagraph, sixth indent) expressly stipulating that a grant may be recovered

'if the beneficiary sells equipment or buildings having received aid from the Fund within six or 10 years respectively of the date of their acquisition or of the completion of the work, without prior authorization from the Commission.'

Aid may also be recovered where there are irregularities. However, as the system for selecting and monitoring the projects is very strict, such cases are extremely rare.

*
* *

¹ Former oral question without debate (0-94/84) converted into a question for Question Time.

² OJ L 51, 23. 2. 1977, p. 1.

³ OJ L 180, 7. 7. 1984, p. 1.

Question No 35, by Mrs Van Hemeldonck (H-573/84)

Subject: Price increase for polyamides

Is the Commission aware that Imperial Chemical Industries, Fibres Division, has increased the price of various polyamide fibres by 7% with effect from 1 January, and further that last year this division of ICI announced profits of roughly £16 million; and does it not believe that the exempted multifibre agreement of 4 July 1984 between the 10 companies, including ICI, which together cover 85% of the market, no longer has any *raison d'être* and is threatening to degenerate into a price cartel?

Answer

- The Commission is monitoring the prices of man-made fibres.
- The Commission is aware of the financial results of ICI.
- The agreement between the producers of synthetic fibres is concerned solely with reducing overcapacity and is limited in duration.

The Commission has no evidence that it is used for fixing prices.

*
* *

Question No 36, by Mr Cassidy (H-575/84)

Subject: Incident by the Shaftesbury Town Twinning Association

The following incident has been brought to my attention by the Shaftesbury Town Twinning Association: On a town twinning trip to Lindlar, Federal Republic of Germany, a group from Shaftesbury in my constituency encountered a series of problems. The first was on Thursday 28 August 1984 when arriving at the German border at Aachen at about 7.30 pm. The group was held up for 45 minutes while the two coach drivers filled in a series of forms concerning the fuel tax estimated by the distance to be covered in Germany during the visit. The forms were far from explicit in the English language and both drivers had to re-write their forms which created a delay coupled with the slowness of the frontier control staff in calculating the amount of tax to be paid on the fuel in the two vehicles. On Monday 27 August, a delay was again experienced at Aachen once again because of the calculation of distance travelled and fuel used. These resulted in a demand for excess payment. At the Belgian/French frontier at Veurnes, due to insufficient space, the coaches could not be parked in the allocated park as it was full of lorries awaiting clearance. The frontier officials punished the coach drivers by making them wait an extremely long time to deal with fuel tax.

What action can the Commission take to ensure that such hindrances to free travel for Community citizens travelling by coach are eliminated forthwith?

Answer

The Commission deplores delays occurring at frontiers. Such delays are particularly unfortunate in a case such as this where the organization in question is intended as a bridge between citizens across national frontiers.

Nevertheless under Community law as it stands at present the taxation of occasional passenger transport services and of quantities of fuel in excess of 200 litres in the tanks of motor vehicles is lawful. The Commission has however proposed the abolition of all restrictions at intra-Community boundaries on the amount of fuel contained in the normal tanks of commercial motor vehicles (including buses and coaches) which may be admitted free of tax and duty.

So far as the VAT charged on the services is concerned, both the Member States in question apply VAT to their own national passenger transport services of a similar nature. There is therefore no element of discrimination against foreign coaches. I am however sensitive to the unsatisfactory nature of a system which requires frontier stops to collect VAT on such services. The Commission will be considering whether it could make recommendations for improvement in the system of taxing passenger transport when it presents its report on the subject under Article 28 of the sixth VAT Directive.

*
* *

Question No 37, by Mrs Crawley (H-582/84)

Subject: Product liability

Can the Commission indicate whether or not there was a December meeting of the Council of Consumer Ministers, and if so, what the outcome of that meeting was regarding the issue of the eight-year old Community draft directive on product liability?

If there was not a December meeting, can the Commission indicate the latest decision on this subject?

Answer

- There was no December meeting of the Council of Consumer Ministers.
- The proposal for a directive concerning liability for defective products was discussed at the 'Internal Market' Council on 11 February.

*
* *

Question No 38, by Mrs Banotti (H-586/84)

Subject: Sport and the Community

In April 1984 the European Parliament adopted a resolution on sport and the Community. What action has the Commission taken in response to paragraph XI of the resolution which requests the Commission to contact the federations, the Member State sports authorities and the youth forum with a view to launching 'Community games' at junior, intermediate, school and university level?

Answer

As the honourable Member is aware, the Treaties do not provide for any specific Community powers in the field of sport.

Nevertheless, the Commission *has recently begun to consider the question of sport and the Community*. The matters under consideration include the fields in which the Community has jurisdiction, such as freedom of movement for sportsmen and women. They will, of course, also include the moves made by Parliament in its resolution of 13 April 1984, such as that referred to in your question.

The Commission is in favour of sporting events being organized on a European scale. It hopes that the work of the *ad hoc* Committee for a Citizens' Europe chaired by Mr Adonino, on which the Commission is represented, will enable specific steps to be taken.

The fact remains that for a variety of reasons — particularly problems of dates — the organization of European games must be carried out in close cooperation with the national sports federations, which takes time.

In the short term, the Commission, within the limits of its resources, has given its backing to the first European sporting fixture: the Round Europe Yacht Race.

It encourages Parliament to do likewise.

*
* *

Question No 39, by Mr Selva (H-591/84)

Subject: World hunger

In his radio and television broadcast the President of the Italian Republic, Mr Sandro Pertini, speaking about the problem of world hunger, asked where aid was going and whether it was really being given to the people who were starving.

Could the Commission give precise answers to these questions with regard to Community aid that has been provided to Ethiopia in the last few months to relieve the effects of famine?

Answer

The problem of delivering food aid to those most in need is extremely difficult because of poor communications over the vast distances involved. It is made worse in some areas of Ethiopia by the civil war in northern areas of the country which effectively cuts off Eritrea from the main points of supply.

From time to time the Commission receives reports — usually from journalists — of our food aid being misappropriated and sold by unscrupulous traders, but we have been unable to substantiate any such claims. It would be unrealistic to exclude however, that in any emergency operations as widespread and complex as now being undertaken, small amounts of food do not reach those most in need.

The Commission will continue to do all in its power to ensure delivery of food to those starving people most in need by cooperating with governments as well as with non-governmental organizations and volunteer bodies alike who are making heroic efforts to relieve the suffering of their fellow men.

*
* *

Question No 40, by Mr Van Aerssen (H-593/84)

Subject: Negotiations with Egypt

What is the situation in the Commission's negotiations with Egypt, bearing in mind that the Council of Ministers wishes to step up cooperation with the Mediterranean countries in parallel with the enlargement of the Community to include Spain and Portugal?

Answer

Following the decision of the Council of 25 January 1983, the Commission has held exploratory conversations with Mediterranean countries associated to the Community by Cooperation Agreements. The purpose of these conversations, which were conducted in parallel with the negotiations on enlargement with the two candidate countries, was to examine with our Mediterranean partners the possible difficulties that could arise for them as a result of enlargement and thus provide the Community with a basis to formulate possible solutions appropriate for dealing with these difficulties. As a result of the first series

of these exploratory conversations, the Commission made certain proposals to the Council on 29 March 1984, which are presently under examination.

In this context exploratory conversations with Egypt took place in May 1983, and the Commission took due account of the concerns expressed by its delegations on the subject of enlargement when formulating the above proposals.

*
* *

Question No 41, by Mr Seefeld (H-595/84)

Subject: Purchase of duty-free goods

What is the Commission's reaction to the frequently heard view that the availability of duty-free goods constitutes an obstacle to achievement of a genuine internal market in the European Community?

Answer

The Commission considers that, in the longer term, tax-free purchases made by intra-Community travellers are incompatible with the creation of a true internal market. Meantime, they need to be maintained at a reasonable level, not least to avoid increased border controls by Member States. The Commission has proposed, in the Seventh Traveller's Allowances Directive, that Member States should continue to allow intra-Community travellers to make tax-free purchases, up to the value and quantity limits applied to travellers coming from third countries, on condition that control of such sales is exercised at the point of sale, thereby avoiding the need for additional controls at importation.

*
* *

Question No 44, by Mr Elliott (H-599/84)

Subject: Sale of EEC subsidized butter in the UK

Is the Commission aware of the gross disparity between the price of EEC subsidized butter to the consumer in the UK and that in other Member States. Whereas in Ireland this butter is on sale at only 22p per 250 gram pack and some has been offered free in Germany, the UK Government has fixed a maximum retail price of 42p. This is artificially high and is only slightly lower than the normal retail price as shown by the Government's own prices survey. It seems the main beneficiaries in the UK will be the packers and distributors, not the ordinary consumers. Is the Commission also aware that the UK Government delayed the sale of EEC subsidized butter by 4-6 weeks so that it was not available before Christmas as in most other member countries and in view of this totally unfair and unjustified discrimination against consumers in the UK will the Commission make strong representation to the UK Government to modify its current policy?

Answer

The subsidy on intervention butter sold as special sale butter in the UK is 147.25 ECU per 100 kg which corresponds to 23p per 250 g. The UK Government has deducted this subsidy from the current statutory maximum price for normal butter supplies to arrive at the maximum price of 42p per 250 g for the special sale butter.

In fixing this maximum price, the UK authorities are concerned to provide for sales by small retail outlets and those in remote areas who may be obliged to set higher than aver-

age prices because of great costs. It is indeed important that the widest possible distribution of special sale butter is ensured.

It should further be noted that market prices for butter in the UK are below intervention price and that additional costs for packaging and promotion for special sale butter should be included in the retail prices. Prices in the larger supermarkets should be considerably below these maximum prices.

As far as the timing of the special sale is concerned, it was the opinion of the UK authorities as well as of packers and retailers that the operation would be more efficient after Christmas than before. The relevant Regulation left a large degree of freedom as to the exact timing of the operation: all special sale butter must be packed before 15 March. The choice of the UK operators to sell the biggest quantity of butter after Christmas should not constitute a discrimination against UK consumers given the fact that the timing has no impact on the level of subsidy nor on the quantity subsidized.

*
* *

Question No 45, by Mr Morris (H-602/84)

Subject: Lead in water intended for human consumption

Five million people in Britain live in houses in which it is reliably reported the tap water contains more lead than is permitted by the EEC Directive 80/778/EEC. The danger in Wales is more widespread and more serious because of the very large numbers of older houses or properties with lead piping and the action of a soft, acid water supply in dissolving lead from lead piping. In view of the dangers from lead in water, what action is the Commission taking to ensure that Directive 80/778/EEC is fully implemented; can the Commission give an assurance that if the UK Government makes a request under Article 20 of the Directive for permission to waive compliance for a further four years that it will be rejected?

Answer

The Commission is well aware of the facts mentioned by the honourable Member.

The Directive 80/778/EEC regulates amongst other parameters the lead content of water, and is applicable in particular to the use of lead pipes. In that case suitable measures must be taken by the Member States concerned to reduce the exposure to lead on the part of the consumer.

Article 20 of the Directive stipulates that Member States may, in exceptional cases and for geographically defined population groups submit a special request to the Commission for a longer period for complying with Annex I.

The Commission has not received up to now any request for a derogation from any Member State.

If the United Kingdom authorities were to present such a request, the Commission would examine it taking into account the conditions laid down by this article i.e. the grounds upon which the request is based, the difficulties experienced by the UK authorities, as well as the action programme including timetable proposed which ought to be presented to improve the quality of water for human consumption. The Commission would examine the request and in the event of disagreement with the Member States concerned it would submit appropriate proposals to the Council.

*
* *

Question No 46, by Sir Peter Vanneck (H-604/84)

Subject: Suspension of duties for certain products intended for use in the construction, maintenance and repair of aircraft¹

Have the governments of those States, which supply the products listed in Council Regulation (EEC) No 3384/84 of 27 November 1984, agreed to suspend tariffs on Community-manufactured parts and components for aircraft, assembled in their own territory?

Answer

The suspension of these duties was for the benefit of the Community's industry. There was no requirement for reciprocal suspension of duties by supplying countries which are signatories of the International Agreement relating to the trade in civil aircraft concluded within GATT, to which the Community is also a signatory. This agreement provides for measures of exemption of customs duties for certain important products destined for the construction, repair, maintenance, rebuilding, modification or transformation of civil aircraft. The exports from the Community to other signatory countries of the agreement benefit from these measures.

*
* *

Question No 47, by Mr Gerontopoulos (H-612/84)

Subject: Community policy for young people

The United Nations has declared 1985 International Youth Year. Various events for young people will be held throughout the year at both international and European level.

In the context of its policy for young people, does the Commission share the view that the opportunity offered by International Youth Year should be used to improve and step up Community policies for young people and, if so, what action does it intend to take as a means of helping to achieve this aim? What resources and what specific measures has it decided to implement in support of these events?

Answer

As explained by President Thorn in his discussion of International Youth Year (IYY) on 24 January 1984 with Parliament's Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport, the Commission takes the view that IYY should be an occasion for a review of policy affecting young people, rather than for a series of festivals and celebrations.

The Commission is therefore reviewing the ensemble of its policies towards young people, particularly in the general area of the progression from education to training to employment, and will be submitting a memorandum on this subject in due course. In addition to these broad subjects, the Commission will be examining various other activities specifically related to young people, and expects (for example) to produce a Communication on the exchange of young people within the next few months.

In view of the fact that the Commission does not regard IYY as an occasion for festivities and celebrations, and that no specific budgetary line for IYY is at present available, the Commission has no specific scheme for supporting IYY-related events. However, it is giving priority in 1985 to matters related to the three IYY themes (participation, development, peace) within the more limited context of its existing activities. It is also supporting a week on 'Young people and new technologies', organized within the framework of the

¹ OJ L 317, 6. 12. 1984.

Council Resolution of 19. 9. 1983 on the introduction of new information technology into education.

*
* *

Question No 52, by Mr Griffiths (H-622/84)

Subject: Food aid

Is the Commission satisfied that food aid deliveries are being made on time to the proper recipients?

Answer

The deliveries of food aid products are carried out as soon as all the necessary steps prior to the mobilization, i.e. allocation decision, contractual supply conditions, request for mobilization by the recipient, have been undertaken.

After that stage the tendering procedure under the common agricultural policy, will be launched so that a period of six to 10 weeks will elapse before the goods are shipped.

*
* *

Question No 54, by Mr Le Chevallier (H-626/84)

Subject: The destabilization of Europe

The Commission has stated (Social Europe, September 1984 — No 2/84) that 'the increasing politicization of the whole issue of migration' is one of the forces destabilizing Community policy. Can the Commission explain why it does not consider this issue to be political?

Answer

The words quoted by the honourable Member must be understood in the context of the article in which they appear, which was entitled 'Not just workers but people: migrant workers in the European Community'. The reference follows a résumé of past trends in Community policy, which favoured equal treatment and social integration of third country workers. Perhaps it is best if the Commission quotes the paragraph concerned in its entirety.

'The stabilization of the migrant workforce would seem to justify a more of the same approach to Community policy. There are, however, destabilizing forces at work — on the one hand, an increasing politicization of the whole issue of migration, including vocal demands for their 'return' on the false assumption that natives can simply take over their jobs: on the other hand, a rejection of social integration in certain migrant circles'.

The author's intention ought now to be clearer. In the first place, it is nowhere said that Community policy is being destabilized. There are, rather, factors at work which tend to have a destabilizing effect on the situation of migrants generally. In the second place, it is nowhere said that the question of migrants is not political. The issue of migration is in fact becoming increasingly politicized, that is to say, being deliberately and unnecessarily made a major issue in the contest for popular support, and ultimately political power, between contending parties and groups. Indeed, the present question could well be judged to fall within this context. This politicization is a factor tending to create instability and insecurity in an otherwise stable situation, when the migrant population is becoming

increasingly settled in character, stable in numbers and balanced in its composition, and no longer subject to dramatic additions through new migration.

To summarize, the question of migrant workers has become 'political' in the worst sense, and that is a sad fact of life. The Commission's opinion is that calm, reason, a sense of proportion and fidelity to moral values are the best prescription for approaching these problems.

*
* *

Question No 55, by Ms Quin (H-628/84)

Subject: British nationality and immigration rules

What action, if any, did the Commission take concerning British nationality and immigration rules following the adoption by the European Parliament of the Malangré report¹ and in particular has the Commission looked at these rules from the angle of discrimination against women, given the commitment to equality of treatment between men and women contained in Article 119 of the Treaty of Rome?

Answer

For many years, the Community has been endeavouring to reduce and remove discrimination against women, wherever this falls within its terms of reference. In this context, it is also concerned with the rights of women immigrants. In point 14 of the new Community action programme on the promotion of equal opportunities for women (1982-1985)², for example, it set itself the aim of implementing the principle of the right of immigrant women to equal access to employment and vocational training.

Legislation on equal treatment as regards employment, however, is inapplicable to the issue raised by the honourable Member. Article 119 of the EEC Treaty, which is referred to here, is exclusively concerned with the obligation to provide equal pay for equal work.

With regard to the British nationality rules, the Commission is unable to take any action, because as my colleague Mr Narjes stated before Parliament on 17 September 1984, during the debate on the Malangré report, legislation on nationality continues to be the exclusive province of the Member States.

On the other hand, following consultations with the Commission, the British immigration rules have been changed for Community nationals so that they comply in full with the provisions of the EEC Treaty on freedom of movement for workers.

*
* *

Question No 56, by Mrs Lehideux (H-632/84)

Subject: Provision of information for the foreign population in the Community

The Commission thinks that to provide better information for the foreign population living in the Community a programme to provide cheaper or free legal advice should be promoted in each Member State (cf. Social Europe, September 1984 — No 2/84, p. 25). Can the Commission indicate how much such an operation would cost and how it would be funded?

¹ Doc. 1-254/81.

² COM(81) 758 final.

Answer

The reference quoted by the honourable Member indicates that the Commission is conscious of the fact that many immigrants are not capable of expressing their needs, of understanding and defending their rights, often because of language problems, or of making use of remedies provided by the law. Experiments have been carried out by voluntary associations in providing free legal aid and information on rights.

The Commission follows these initiatives with great interest, hopes that they will multiply and is willing, in case of need, to provide some financial support, not in the framework of an all-embracing, continuing operation, but rather of sporadic nature. It rests with the associations wishing to enlarge the scope of their activities in the field of legal aid to meet the bulk of the cost falling from their normal operational budgets. The Commission has already allocated in the past financial assistance to organizations which provide free legal aid and information to the immigrant population.

*
* *

Question No 57, by Mr Stirbois (H-634/84)

Subject: Impact of immigration on the European employment market

On what evidence does the Commission base its opinion that foreigners do *not* share responsibility for the high level of unemployment in the Community, when the Herman report suggests the opposite conclusion for some countries? Is the Commission's opinion the same when it comes to a long-term assessment?

Answer

The Commission has been concerned for a long time at the level of unemployment in the Community and has therefore examined in its communications to the Council what factors might be at the root of this problem. However, there is no evidence that migrant workers in particular are responsible for the present level of unemployment. It is true that unemployment among migrant workers is higher than the Community average, but it is also a fact that unemployment among young people in the Community is twice the average. However, the Commission regards both as consequences of far-reaching economic problems which must be overcome in order to secure economic recovery and increased employment.

*
* *

Question No 58, by Mr Collinot (H-636/84)

Subject: Wives of migrant workers from third countries

Does the Commission think that it is desirable and possible to encourage the social and professional integration of the wives of migrant workers from third countries, while at the same time seeking to preserve their linguistic and cultural links with their country of origin; how does it intend to achieve these contradictory objectives?

Answer

The Commission does not believe there to be a contradiction between the dual objectives of promoting the social and occupational integration of migrant workers and their spouses and children, while at the same time encouraging them to maintain their linguistic and cultural links with their countries of origin.

It is convinced that the maintenance of such linguistic and cultural links is necessary for the psychological well-being which is an essential element in bringing about the integration of the migrant workers in their host countries.

*
* *

Question No 59, by Mr Mouchel (H-638/84)

Subject: EAGGF

Has the Commission taken the necessary steps to reduce the delays in clearing EAGGF accounts, as recommended by Parliament, and to prevent the recurrence of situations like the Milk Marketing Boards affair?

Answer

Considerable progress has been made towards making up the delay which affected the clearing of accounts up to 1981.

In fact, the audit of expenditure has been carried out up to and including 1982. This means that the decisions on the clearing of accounts for 1980 and 1981 can be taken during the second quarter of 1985, and for 1982 during the third quarter of 1985.

In the meantime the departments concerned have already begun the audit of expenditure for 1983, and thus the delay in carrying out the audits has been made up.

In addition to the measures taken to make up the delay, the Commission has adopted measures to improve, on the one hand, the clearing procedure and, on the other hand, the auditing system.

More particularly, this move seeks to reinforce the preventive measures to ensure that the Community rules are properly applied and that the auditing techniques, based on systems audit, are improved. To this end it has used systems audit to check expenditure on refunds from 1982 on.

These measures adopted by the Commission make it easier to apply Community provisions and also reduce the time between the checking of an expenditure item by the Commission and the moment when it is actually incurred in the Member States.

*
* *

Question No 63, by Mrs Castle (H-645/84)

Subject: European card for the elderly

In the reply on 9 October 1984 to question No 1 Mr Wijsenbeek (H-107/84)¹, Mr Richard said the first phase of collection of relevant data on benefits granted to the elderly in the individual Member States was under way. Will the Commissioner give an indication as to when the analysis of this information will be completed and what action he then proposes to take?

Answer

The question put by the honourable Member refers to the creation of a European 'card' for the elderly. This card is intended to enable elderly persons travelling in another Mem-

¹ Debates 2-317 of 9. 10. 1984.

ber State to benefit from certain advantages available to the residents of that State, such as reduced fare on public transport, museums, cinemas, etc. . .

As Mr Richard announced at this Assembly on 9 October 1984, research has been initiated with a view to collecting the relevant data on this subject and of obtaining an idea about the advisability or otherwise of purchasing our activities in this field. This information will be available at the end of October 1985 and will be analysed immediately so as to decide on the next step to take.

This time period is not as large as it perhaps appears to be. In fact, as indicated by the Commission in its reply to a written question of Mrs Chouraqui, the study is not limited to this sole purpose. It has another and more general object, which is to obtain a general view of the concessions available to the elderly in the individual Member States.

By enlarging the scope of this research, better knowledge will be available on the situation of the elderly in the Community and we will be in a position to provide the more specific data required by Mrs Banotti, Mrs Chouraqui, Mrs Castle herself, and indirectly by Mrs Lemass by way of written and oral questions put to the Commission during the last four months.¹

*
* *

Question No 64, by Dame Shelagh Roberts (H-646/84)

Subject: Equal treatment for men and women in the income tax systems

Will the Commission give an assurance that they will continue the study commenced by the previous Commission into the possibilities of implementing equal treatment for men and women in the income tax systems and can the Commission state what stage this study has reached?

Answer

In 1982, the Commission did indeed carry out a study into the problem of applying the principle of equal treatment in the taxation of earned income throughout the European Community. The findings of the study were that only separate taxation will have a 'neutral' effect on female employment.

Further to this study and to the report produced by Parliament's Committee of Inquiry into the Situation of Women in Europe, chaired by the honourable Member, the Commission sent the Council of Ministers and Parliament a 'Memorandum on Income Taxation and Equal Treatment for Men and Women'. This memorandum is mainly intended to serve as a basis for discussion of this subject at European level. It describes the present situation, analyses the problems associated with equal treatment and points to the principal areas for corrective action. It comes to the conclusion that 'a system of totally independent taxation is to be recommended from the point of view of achieving equal treatment and thus at least an option of separate taxation should be available to couples'.

*
* *

Question No 65, by Mrs Dury (H-652/84)

Subject: International Code on breast milk substitutes

The Commission has drawn up a directive on the quality and labelling of formula milk for new-born babies and milk foods for older babies. This directive, introduced as an applica-

¹ See Annex I: verbatim reports of proceedings — 9. 10. 1984.

tion of the code on the marketing of breast milk substitutes, does not take into account all the aspects of commercial practices in this field or all the methods of promoting baby foods, which is the principal concern of the WHO and Unicef Code.

For what reasons exactly has the Commission not taken account of the conclusions contained in the two resolutions (October 1982 and April 1983) adopted in plenary session by the European Parliament, and why has the Commission, in drawing up this directive, given preference to the voluntary code submitted by the Association of Dietetic Foods Industries of the EEC (IDACE) instead of the International Code of the WHO?

Answer

The Commission supports the WHO Code on 'The marketing of infant formula and other products used as breast-milk substitutes'. We have put forward a package of proposals to implement the objectives of the Code. These proposals were submitted to the Council and Parliament on 4 January 1985 and consist of the following:

1) *A proposal for a Council directive to implement the objectives set out in the Code.*

The directive seeks to legislate on composition, labelling and certain aspects of advertising. Under the terms of the directive Member States will be responsible for information and education for the public, the conduct of health care systems and health workers, as well as relations between manufacturers and their personnel.

2) *A voluntary code on marketing of infant formula.*

The WHO Code also covers the marketing practices of manufacturers and recommends a total ban on advertising. This would be contrary to the constitution of several Member States. It is therefore proposed that marketing practices be covered by voluntary agreements with the manufacturers. This approach is in conformity with the WHO Code.

3) *A Council resolution on marketing practices of Community-based manufacturers in developing countries.*

Parliament's resolution of October 1981 sought Community action on the sale of infant formula foods to developing countries. The Community does not have competence to legislate on sales and marketing in third countries. The Commission is therefore proposing the adoption of a Council resolution which pledges that Commission delegations in developing countries will be ready to examine any complaints raised by third country governments on the marketing practices of a Community-based manufacturer.

I regret that it has taken so long to prepare these proposals but the Community can take pride in being amongst the first in preparing such comprehensive proposals to implement the Code. The Commission would be happy to discuss the proposals in greater detail with the competent committee.

*
* *

Question No 67, by Mr Ephremidis (H-658/84)

Subject: Textile imports into Greece

There has recently been an extremely sharp rise in imports from EEC countries (UK, France, the Netherlands, etc.) onto the markets in Thessaloniki, Athens and other parts of Greece, of textiles and knitted goods (lining, towels, sheets, cloth, socks, knitwear etc.) which were in fact manufactured in third countries (Singapore, Taiwan, etc.) but which nevertheless benefited from the favourable tariffs applied to EEC countries. These imports have created fresh problems for Greek workers in the textile industry, which has seen a vast wave of redundancies in recent years.

Would the Commission state why it does not take steps to stop this illegal trading, what practical measures it intends to take against Member States that serve as transit stations for products, principally from countries in South-East Asia, which compete unfairly with domestic products and are able to do so because the workers there are paid a pittance and ruthlessly exploited, and to what extent does the Commission agree that Article 130 of the agreement with the EEC must be enforced in order to restrict imports of textiles and knitted goods, sectors which are in severe crisis in Greece?

Answer

1. The Commission would point out to the honourable Member that trade in products originating in third countries and released for free circulation in the Community cannot be classed as an illegal practice. Indeed, Article 9(2) of the EEC Treaty stipulates that the principle of the free movement of goods within the Community applies equally to products originating in the Member States and to products coming from third countries.

However, Article 115 of the EEC Treaty allows exemptions from this principle and empowers the Commission to authorize the Member States to take protective measures with regard to products originating in third countries and released for free circulation in another Member State. In this regard, the Commission, by its Decision 80/47/EEC, laid down the criteria applicable in this field, together with the procedures which the Member States must follow in order to invoke such measures. In particular, such measures are authorized by the Commission on a case-by-case basis in the light of a detailed economic report on the difficulties affecting the national production sector concerned.

The Commission informs the honourable Member that on several occasions it has already authorized Greece to take such protective measures.¹

The Commission is willing to examine any request for protective measures which the Greek Government might present concerning the textile products referred to by the honourable Member.

2. The Commission has no information which would lead it to conclude that Article 130 of the Act of Accession can be applied in this case.

*
* *

Question No 68, by Mr Adamou (H-662/84)

Subject: Greek subsidies for cherry production referred to the European Court of Justice

According to a report in Agence Europe No 28 of 29 December 1984, the Commission has initiated an examination procedure for the purpose of taking Greece to the European Court of Justice for providing subsidies for cherry production.

Would the Commission state whether these reports of legal proceedings are correct, whether it intends obstructing cherry production in Greece, a sector which provides a livelihood for whole farming areas (Tripoli, etc.,) and thousands of farming families, what the level of cherry imports from non-Community countries was in 1984 in relation to sales of Community cherries and finally, why it does not apply the principle of Community preference?

Answer

Greece notified to the Commission on 26 January 1984, in accordance with Article 93(3) of the EEC Treaty, a proposed aid measure to producers of cherries in the prefectures

¹ Commission Decision 83/326/EEC of 28 June 1983 (OJ L 175, 30. 6. 1983, p. 15)
Commission Decision of 21 December 1984 (OJ C 5, 8. 1. 1985, amended by OJ C 14, 16. 1. 1985)

Pella, Imathia, Arkadia, Larissa, Pieria, Magnisia and Rethymno, whose produce suffered damage by rain during the spring of 1983.

The Commission, after the exchange of further communications with the Greek authorities on the same subject, decided to accept the aid given to producers of cherries in the prefecture of Pella on the basis of Article 92(2)(b) of the Treaty and to initiate the procedure laid down in Article 93(2) of the Treaty with respect to the other part of the proposed aid measure in question which concerned the remaining prefectures.

When the Commission examines projects of national aids, in the light of Articles 92-93 of the Treaty it normally considers that losses occurring through rainfall do not constitute damage caused by natural disasters within the meaning of Article 92(2)(b) of the Treaty, unless the damage suffered exceeds a certain part of the average annual production of the three previous years. This part was not reached in the case in question. Therefore, the Commission refused to accept the aid with regard to all prefectures and decided to initiate the procedure provided for in Article 93(2) of the Treaty.

However, the initiation of the above procedure does not necessarily imply that Greece will necessarily be taken before the Court of Justice, if its reply to the Commission's letter is considered to be satisfactory.

*
* *

Question No 69, by Mr Iversen (H-667/84)

Subject: Prohibition of the use of Tylan

Until recently, feedingstuff companies and agricultural organizations in Denmark had agreed not to use Tylan in feedingstuffs since it was feared that it could harm Danish exports of pigmeat. This agreement has however been terminated and the Danish authorities are now unable to legislate on the subject since Tylan is permitted in the other Community countries. In October 1984, however, the English periodical 'Science' published a recent scientific study of the possible harmful effects of antibiotics in feedingstuffs. In view of this study, will the Commission give an assurance that Denmark, which exports large quantities of pigmeat to *inter alia* Japan and the USA, may adopt national legislation prohibiting the use of Tylan, and can the Commission state how serious the effects of Tylan will have to be before the Community will propose prohibiting its use?

Answer

Before replying in detail to the honourable Member's questions on Tylan, I should like to point out that the use of antibiotics in animal feedingstuffs is governed by Council Directive 70/524/EEC.¹ This Directive lays down uniform rules to be applied throughout the Community for the authorization of additives and stipulates how the authorized substances may be added to animal feedingstuffs.

It should be stressed that, as far as the particular case of antibiotics is concerned, only those products are authorized which, when used properly, meet in every way the requirements ensuring that they are not harmful to human and animal health, and which must not be confined to therapeutic uses.

As regards the specific case of Tylan, which is authorized in the Community under the generic name 'Tylosine', I can assure the honourable Member that prior to the authorization of this antibiotic exhaustive scientific examinations were carried out which proved that it was not harmful if properly used.

¹ OJ L 270, 14. 12. 1970, p. 1.

To my knowledge, all the Member States — and so Denmark also — authorize the use of Tylan in pig feed in accordance with the provisions of the Commission Directive of 16 November 1978.¹

At present the Commission is not aware of any facts which might call into question the free movement of this product in the Community.

Nevertheless, it is certain that if Denmark or any other Member State were able to prove on the basis of new scientific data that this product or its residues in meat constitute a health risk, the Commission would immediately use the procedure provided for in order to have the authorization withdrawn.

It is worth noting that this is the reason why, as long ago as 1976, the Commission banned a whole series of antibiotics, among which are the penicillins and tetracyclines whose safety was questioned by *Science*, the journal referred to by the honourable Member, and by other scientific journals.

*
* *

Question No 70, by Mr Giummarra (H-668/84)

Subject: Sicilian citrus fruit producers' associations

How, in view of the moves to cover up responsibility in the management of Sicilian citrus fruit producers' associations, does the Commission intend to substantiate the serious accusations levelled at the Communist-inspired AIPAO (Citrus fruit and vegetables producers' association) to which the Community does not intend to grant a discharge for some 7 000 million paid in advance by the AIMA? Does the Commission consider it has an obligation to make clear that a case (No 129/84) is pending before the European Court of Justice over the facts of which the AIPAO has been accused, and that on no occasion have any accusations been levelled at the APAS (Sicilian citrus fruit producers' association, whose headquarters are in Catania) concerning the use of Community funds?

Answer

The Commission informs the honourable Member that the AIPAO (Inter-Professional Association of Fruit, Vegetable and Citrus Fruit Producers) is one of the group of four fruit and vegetable producers' associations in respect of which the Commission refused to grant a discharge under the EAGGF Guarantee Section, under the refund of expenditure incurred by the Italian intervention body (AIMA), for the refunds granted to the four producers' associations in question, which amount to a total of approximately Lit 12 700 million.

This measure affecting the four producers' associations in question, and not only the AIPAO, was taken after the Commission and the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry noticed that the operation of the four producers' associations was not in accordance with the provisions of Regulation (EEC) No 1035/72, and not on the basis of any political considerations.

As regards the Catania-based APAS (Sicilian Citrus Fruit Producers' Association), the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry in Rome has informed the Commission that it has approached the legal authorities in Catania (Public Prosecutor) to find out whether there were any accusations against the APAS for fraud and corruption in connection with the withdrawal of citrus fruits.

The arrest of the sales manager of the APAS is the result of improper financial relations between that producers' association and a former director of the agricultural consortium.

¹ OJ L 330, 25. 11. 1978, p. 30.

The Public Prosecutor is still investigating the case.

*
* *

Question No 71, by Mrs Lizin (H-670/84)

Subject: Integrated operations in Liège and Charleroi

Can the Commission comment on the progress, the substance and the financial aspects of these two experiments?

Answer

The Commission has granted aid for the drawing up of a programme for the creation of new activities in Liège, a programme which is based on the setting up and funding of an information centre for small and medium-sized undertakings engaged in innovation. The work was carried out in the period April 1983 to February 1984 and cost Bfrs 57 million. The Commission's contribution amounted to Bfrs 34 million. The work produced positive results in that it led to the creation of the Socran (Société pour la création d'activités nouvelles) in Liège. The Socran administers the SMU information centre and has already boosted local potential for regional development, has set up a number of new undertakings since its foundation in May 1984, and intends to set up others in the immediate future.

Since October 1984 the ADEC (Association Intercommunale pour l'Aménagement du territoire et le développement économique et social des régions de l'est et du sud du Hainaut) has been promoting similar action in Charleroi with a view to preparing for the setting up of two information centres for industrial and non-industrial small and medium-sized undertakings. The preparatory work is expected to cost approximately Bfrs 41.25 million, the Commission's contribution being Bfrs 22 million.

The preparatory work for setting up the information centres will be completed in April 1985.

*
* *

Question No 73, by Mr De Vries (H-674/84)

Subject: Abuse of psychiatry in the Soviet Union

On 11 October 1984 the European Parliament adopted a resolution tabled by Mr De Vries, Mrs Veil, Mr von Habsburg, Mr Dankert and Sir Henry Plumb on the abuse of psychiatry in the Soviet Union and the persecution of those who have dared to denounce it.

In the resolution Parliament urged the Soviet Government to grant permission to a member of the Moscow Working Commission to Investigate The Use of Psychiatry for Political Purposes, Mrs Irina Grivnina, to emigrate to the Netherlands with her family.

Is the Commission prepared to lend its support to this call made by the Parliament to the Soviet authorities?

Answer

The Commission fully acknowledges the importance of Parliament's appeal on behalf of Mrs Irina Grivnina, who has been refused permission to leave the Soviet Union to go to the Netherlands with her family.

On other occasions the Commission has expressed its concern at the psychiatric practices used in the USSR for political purposes and gives its full backing to the initiatives by the European Parliament to condemn any violation of the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act.

The Commission will continue to do everything within the powers conferred upon it by the Treaty to promote any measure likely to bring about the full application of this Act.

*
* *

Question No 74, by Mr Hutton (H-675/84)

Subject: Revision of regional aid ceilings

The Commission's communication on regional aid systems¹ is clearly out of date as demonstrated by Table 7.1.1. in the Second Periodic Report on the Social and Economic Situation and Development of the Regions of the Community in which areas with relatively low grant ceilings are now shown to be as badly off as those allowed higher ceilings. By what date does the Commission intend to bring forward proposals for its revision?

Answer

The Communication on regional aid systems sets out the principles which the Commission applies to Member States' regional aid systems in assessing their compatibility with the common market under Articles 92-94 EEC. The principles provide that maximum aid intensities be differentiated according to the nature and gravity of regional problems. The ceilings given in the principles are in general for broad categories of regions. The ceilings to be observed in practice are fixed in greater detail by the Commission, both as regards geographic scope and aid-intensity, in its constant review of existing aid systems, as required by Article 93(1) and in the examination of plans for aid systems notified to it by the Member States under Article 93(3). Major reviews and examinations of aid systems have now been carried out for Belgium, France, Germany, Denmark, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and Greece. The decisions for Belgium and Denmark were finalized in 1982 and for the other countries in 1984 and took account of the most recent socio-economic data available for the regions concerned. The level of aid accepted by the Commission in the aided regions of these Member States therefore reflects their actual socio-economic situation relative to both national and Community averages.

In comparing Table 7.1.1. of the Second Periodic Report with the Commission's aidceilings under Articles 92-94 EEC it should in any event be remembered that the former is based on an index which utilises only two elements — gross domestic products and rate of unemployment. As is pointed out in paragraph 7.1.6. the ranking of regions on the basis of that index is to be used only in the framework of Community Regional Policy (and, even in that area, this does not imply that no account should be taken of other indicators, as is mentioned in paragraph 7.1.1.). It is specifically stated that the ranking is not meant to be used for the evaluation of national regional policies. More complex criteria are used by the Member States in preparing their proposals for national regional aid systems and by the Commission in deciding on the compatibility of those systems, including the intensity of the aids, with the common market under Articles 92-94.

In view of the above mentioned points the Commission is of the opinion that there is no pressing need to revise the aid ceilings provided for the Commission's Communication of 1979.

*
* *

¹ OJ C 31, 3. 2. 1979, pp. 9-15.

Question No 76, by Mr Avgerinos (H-690/84)

Subject: Community food aid strategy

Whereas a considerable number (75) of developing countries are covered by the regulation on the Community's food aid policy and administration;

whereas it should therefore be recalled that the Commission's proposals for the total quantities of food aid entered in the preliminary draft budget for 1985 are extremely meagre and therefore unacceptable, given the problems and needs of many of the regions in question;

will the Commission inform Parliament to what degree it is prepared to make a more rational distribution of food aid to countries facing the most acute survival problems; whether it proposes to increase the relevant appropriations, at the same time incorporating food aid into the total range of operations connected with the development programmes for non-Community countries, and whether it proposes to extend the food strategy programmes to cover other developing countries?

Answer

— Those countries most seriously affected by food shortages such as Ethiopia, Sudan and the Sahel will receive additional quantities of cereals (+/- 400 000 t) in 1985 over and above the normal food aid of the Community to those regions (+/- 400 000 t), following the Dublin decision of the European Council 3/4 December 1984 to supply 1 200 000 t to these countries before next harvest (+/- 400 000 t to be supplied by EC Member States).

— The Commission's preliminary draft budget each year contains the quantities it considers necessary for a reasonable food aid programme. The Commission's proposal for 1985 of 672 m ECU has been reduced to 560 m ECU following the first reading in the Parliament. Food aid is wherever possible being integrated in the development process, especially into food production through multiannual allocations (e.g. Operation Flood in India), and investment of counterpart funds (from sale of food) into food sector projects etc.

— The Community supplies its food aid to those countries on the list of eligible countries annexed to the food aid regulation¹ and intends to continue the concentration of its aid on the least developed of the low income food deficit countries. Developing countries not on the list can be assisted in special circumstances via the international and non-governmental organizations.

*
* *

Question No 77, by Mrs Lenz (H-683/84)

Subject: Commission data banks

Will the Commission confirm that it has set up the data banks ECO 1, Persé, Actu, Celex, Asmodée, IFC and Ceres and, if so, what was the legal basis for setting up these data banks, which functions do they fulfil and what area of documentation do they cover, who is responsible for them, who has access to them, what systems do they use (manufacturer, type, etc.,) and in what languages can they be interrogated?

Answer

Celex is a data base covering Community law. Its inter-institutional character and its public accessibility stem from the Council resolution of 26 November 1974.

¹ OJ L 124, 11. 5. 1984, p. 5.

The other bases referred to are above all working tools for internal Commission use, intended as a working aid for the institution or its departments.

The data bases currently operate on Bull DPS 7 hardware with Mistral V4 software. A conversion program is under way to transfer them to the Luxembourg Computer Centre.

Furthermore, in the next few days the Commission will forward its reply to Written Question No 784/84 by the honourable Member, which deals with the same subject.

*
* *

Question No 78, by Mrs Van den Heuvel (H-686/84)

Subject: Discrimination against homosexuals

In answer to earlier questions, the Commission has expressed unacceptable views on the fact that sexual disposition may constitute grounds for dismissal and that conditions of appointment and employment discriminate against homosexuals, since both matters are incompatible with the Treaty.

Is the Commission prepared to give serious consideration to the complaints lodged by individual citizens and organizations in the Member States on account of the views it has expressed on this subject?

Answer

As the Commission indicated during the Parliamentary Debate on the 13 March 1984¹ on Sexual Discrimination at the Work Place, the Treaty does not contain any provision which specifically protects homosexuals. Furthermore, there is no question of unlawful discrimination on the grounds of nationality contrary to the principle of Free Movement of Workers (Articles 48-49 of the Treaty).

In this context, the Commission takes the view that complaints by homosexuals or their organisations should properly be addressed by the authorities in Strasbourg charged with the protection of human rights.

*
* *

Question No 79, by Mrs Squarcialupi (H-688/84)

Subject: Italian compliance with Directive No 79/409 EEC on the conservation of wild birds

In a draft law before the Senate of the Italian Republic, intended to implement Directive No 79/409/EEC² on the conservation of wild birds, it is proposed to incorporate — albeit by way of experiment for a two-year period — the whole range of derogations permitted under Article 9 of the aforementioned directive, although these should in fact be made only in exceptional circumstances.

Furthermore, the draft law in question does not prohibit the hunting of many protected species and takes no account of the international conventions to which Italy is party, such as those of Washington, Paris, Bonn and Berne.

¹ Declaration by Mr Richard, EP Debates No 1-311-17 of 13. 3. 1984.

² OJ L 103, 25. 4. 1979, p. 1.

Does not the Commission believe that, since the derogations provided for under Directive No 79/409/EEC, are supposed to form an exception, a law which allows constant derogations cannot be considered to be an enactment of the directive in question?

Answer

From a strictly legal point of view the Commission has no competence of interfering with draft legislation; as long as the Italian Republic will not have adopted formally its birds legislation which is now under discussion in the Italian Senate, the Commission cannot take any legal steps. However, on a non-legal basis, the Commission has expressed its concern to the Italian authorities about the draft in question. More over, the Commission has opened infringement procedures against all Member States, including Italy, on grounds of actual incorrect implementation of the birds conservation Directive 79/409/EEC.

*
* *

Question No 80, by Mr Clinton (H-689/84)

Subject: Distortions in the EEC market for soft fruit

Can the Commission please say whether they have conducted an inquiry into the effects of recent dumping of soft fruit (strawberries, raspberries, etc..) onto the EEC market by State-trading countries at prices which do not reflect cost of production and what it intends to do to protect the EEC soft fruit industry from the distortion of the market caused by insufficiently controlled imports from State-trading countries?

Answer

The Commission has not received any complaint from Community producers alleging or proving dumping by the State-trading countries which export fresh or semi-processed soft fruit to the Community in the form laid down by the procedure designed to protect the Community market against imports at dumping prices.

As regards soft-fruit-based semi-processed products, the Commission's attention has frequently been drawn to the problem of imports from State-trading countries at prices which are too low in relation to Community costs. For several years, a system of import certificates has been brought back into use so that such imports can be closely monitored. In addition, since May 1984, the Commission has agreed an arrangement with the Polish authorities whereby a check can be kept on movements in the prices of Polish products exported to the Community.

As regards developments in Community imports of fresh soft fruit, imports from the State-trading countries have remained stable since 1982. The preliminary indications available for 1984 confirm this trend. Strawberry imports are actually rising, but they are from Spain.

*
* *

Question No 81, by Mrs Jepsen (H-696/84)

Subject: Uniform rules governing the construction of cages for egg-laying hens

What information can the Commission provide on the progress of efforts to introduce uniform rules laying down minimum standards for cages in which egg-laying hens are kept?

Answer

Over the last year the Commission has made a further investigation into the scientific aspects of the welfare of egg-laying hens in cages. At the same time, an economic analysis of the consequences of establishing minimum criteria for cages for egg-laying hens has been carried out.

In general the studies confirm the general orientations taken by the Commission with the proposals it has already made to the Council. We shall certainly be inviting the Council to take a rapid action on this matter which has been without a decision for too long.

*
* *

*II. Questions to the Council**Question No 89, by Mrs Fanton (H-529/84)*

Subject: Milk quotas

At the meeting of the Committee on Agriculture in Ireland at the end of November 1984, the President-in-Office of the Council said that the system of milk quotas as originally envisaged should allow each Member State to propose its own methods for operating the system, for instance by proposing transfers of milk quotas from one region to another according to the specific needs of each region.

Can the Council say what proposals have been made by the Member States and what decisions they have taken?

Answer

It is for the Member States to implement the quota system in the milk sector and for the Commission to ensure that the system is properly applied. The Council for its own part continues to pay very close attention to any developments in the situation. On five occasions — in September, October, November and December 1984 and again at the beginning of this year — the Council held detailed discussions, on the basis of oral reports from the Commission, on the operation of the new system. It noted the encouraging results obtained so far in reducing overall milk production in the Community. It reaffirmed the need for the Member States to continue their efforts to achieve the aims which have been set. As there remained a number of specific problems in several Member States regarding the application of the new system, the Council called on the Commission to examine them closely and submit any necessary proposals for overcoming them. In response to this request the Commission submitted a number of technical adjustments at the Council meeting on 14 and 15 January 1985 and these are currently being studied. The proposed adjustments include the possibility, as a transitional measure and only for the current milk year, of transferring unused quantities of milk between regions. There was a move in the Council in favour of asking the Commission, within its sphere of competence, to put back the date of 15 November 1984 which had been set for collecting the first advances due from producers for the production period 2 April to 30 September 1984. The Commission initially responded to this request by making 15 December 1984 the new date for the payments. However, most of the Member States want more time for the payment of the advances and the payment of the total amount to be deferred until the end of the 1984/1985 milk year. To date the Commission has opposed this request.

*
* *

Question No 96, by Mr von Wogau (H-607/84)

Subject: Abolition of capital duty and stock exchange turnover tax to make it easier for small and medium-sized undertakings to be admitted to the stock exchange

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany wishes to abolish capital duty and stock exchange turnover tax and not replace them, in order to make it easier for small and medium-sized undertakings to be admitted to the stock exchange. The 1969 directive concerning indirect taxes on the raising of capital, however, which makes the levying of capital duty compulsory, must first be suitably amended.

What or who is preventing the immediate amendment of the 1969 directive so that the Member States may abolish their capital transaction taxes in order to make it easier for small and medium-sized undertakings to be admitted to the stock exchange?

Answer

The honourable Member will remember that capital duty, which is a direct tax on capital formation, was harmonized at Community level in 1969 and that since 1973 the rates of that duty have been 1% (normal rate) and between 0 and 0,5% in the event of company mergers.

Last September the Commission proposed to the Council an optional reduction in the rate of duty and total exemption in the event of company mergers. The Commission envisaged abolishing capital duty as indicated in the explanatory memorandum to its proposal and this remains its medium-term objective. It took account, however, of the objections of certain Member States and did not propose the straightforward abolition of the duty.

The European Parliament delivered its opinion in January and supported the Commission's position, namely proceeding a step now in order to move towards the final abolition of capital duty. The European Parliament's opinion on the Commission proposal was therefore favourable.

Having received the Parliament's opinion the Council began its examination of the proposal at the beginning of this month. It intends to continue that examination with despatch as in the present economic situation it is important to improve the tax climate for undertakings, and in particular access to stock-exchange operations for small and medium-sized undertakings.

*
* *

Question No 97, by Mr Deprez (H-609/84)

Subject: Second European programme to combat poverty

Despite weaknesses and gaps, the first programme (1975-1980) created hopes that resources could be amassed, combined or boosted at European level to support or direct measures and resources to combat poverty in the Member States. Unfortunately, the limited resources available (44 million ECU over five years) restricted the scope of the measures and projects undertaken.

With the second programme the Commission considered that the sum of 35 million ECU over five years (i.e. an average of 7 million ECU per annum) was a minimum for carrying out a programme with even a little impact. On 13 December 1984 the Council of Ministers of Employment and Social Affairs adopted the second programme to combat poverty but restricted it to 25 million ECU over four years (or 6.25 million ECU per annum), i.e. 10 million ECU less than the Commission's proposal and 19 million ECU less than the first programme.

How can the Council of Ministers, by restricting the resources of the second programme to combat poverty in this way, ignore the problems being faced by an increasing number of Europeans? Does it not believe that the fight against poverty should be a priority?

Answer

The Council is particularly sensitive to the problems of poverty as they exist at present in all the Member States. It therefore feels that the fight against poverty is one of the priorities on which attention should be concentrated in the Community as a whole.

However, it stresses that such action is for the most part covered by national policies. In its first and second programmes the Community simply promotes these policies and exploits and exchanges useful experience.

In adopting the second programme on 13 December 1984, the Council had to take account of budgetary constraints affecting the Community's budget as a whole. Nonetheless, as the duration of the programme has been reduced to four years, the result is an annual figure (an average of 6.25 million ECU) fairly close to that proposed by the Commission (7 million ECU).

The first programme served mainly to finance studies. The major part of the resources of the second programme is focussed on research actions in the form of pilot projects designed to indicate practical ways and means of overcoming this serious social handicap. This qualitative improvement specifically desired by the Council should help to offset the slight reduction in budget resources.

*
* *

Question No 99, by Mrs Castle (H-617/84)

Subject: Oils and fats tax

To ask the Council whether the question of an oils and fats tax is still under consideration, or whether it has been dropped?

Answer

In the communication on the adjustment of the common agricultural policy which it submitted to the Council in July 1983 the Commission announced its intention of proposing the introduction of a non-discriminatory tax on oils and fats other than butter. The relevant proposal was submitted to the Council in October 1983 and was discussed at Council meetings and at the European Council at the end of 1983. Given the differences of views which emerged on this issue, no decision was taken on the proposal, which remains pending before the Council; the latter could, if it deems it appropriate, decide to take up the matter again in an appropriate framework. This specific proposal is not however part of the package of Commission proposals on agricultural prices and related measures for the 1985/1986 marketing year.

*
* *

Question No 100, by Mr Le Chevallier (H-627/84)

Subject: Clandestine immigration in Europe

Can the Council state why it decided not to adopt the proposal for a directive on clandestine immigration and illegal employment in 1976?

Question No 104, by Mr Stirbois (H-635/84)

Subject: Illegal immigration in Europe

How does the Council intend to stem and eventually halt the flow of illegal immigrant workers at the Community's frontiers?

Question No 105, by Mr Collinot (H-637/84)

Subject: Illegal immigration in Europe

Does the Council think that European employers are to blame for illegal immigration or does it not consider that the true culprits are the countries of origin, which encourage these workers to leave their country without a contract of employment?

Joint Answer

The Treaty and the legal acts adopted in implementation thereof give Community citizens the right to move freely together with their families within the Community for the purposes of taking up employment. In certain conditions migrant workers from third countries also admitted into the territory of the Member States may qualify for certain rights granted to Community workers and their families.

On the other hand, migration policies of the Member States are not expressly covered by the Treaty. However, this does not rule out cooperation between Member States in this connection, with the aim of facilitating the adoption of a joint position.

In its resolution of 9 February 1976 the Council in fact stated that it was in favour of such cooperation. Moreover, it further examined questions concerning migration policy in 1979 and 1984.

While it is aware that there are increasingly common aspects to the way in which the problem arises in the Member States — albeit still with notable differences and peculiarities — the Council attaches great importance to the Commission communication which is awaited shortly and which deals with methods of cooperation in the field of immigration policy, with particular reference to illegal immigration. As soon as this communication has been forwarded to the Council, the Presidency will without fail put it before the Council to enable it to examine the problem from all angles, including that of measures to combat illegal immigration and illegal employment.

*
* *

Question No 101, by Ms Quin (H-629/84)

Subject: British nationality and immigration rules

What action, if any, did the Council take concerning British nationality and immigration rules following the adoption by the European Parliament of the Malangré report¹ and in particular has the Council looked at these rules from the angle of discrimination against women, given the commitment to equality of treatment between men and women contained in Article 119 of the Treaty of Rome?

Answer

It is for the Commission and not for the Council to look into any alleged breaches of Treaty provisions or of acts adopted in implementation thereof.

*
* *

¹ Doc. 1-254/81.

Question No 102, by Mr Elliott (H-631/84)

Subject: Definition of minority groups in the Community

In view of the growing numbers of second and third generation immigrants making up the increasingly multi-racial society of many Member States would the Council accept that the current definition of migrants, designed to cover those groups whose special needs are assisted by certain specific provisions made by Community institutions, is now inadequate and, if so, would the Council be prepared to widen the definition of minority groups eligible for specific help and consideration, to include all those of different ethnic origins to the host communities in which they live, even if they have legal citizenship of the countries concerned?

*
* *

Answer

The problem raised by the honourable Member is a complex one which arises in different guises in the various Member States. It is for the Commission to study this problem, the importance of which the Council is well aware, and, in due course, to make any proposals which it deems necessary and which the Council will not fail to examine with the utmost attention.

*
* *

Question No 103, by Mrs Lehideux (H-633/84)

Subject: Protection of the peoples of the Community

The Commission would like all European institutions to join in a declaration of principle condemning racism and xenophobia. Does the Commission also intend, in the discussion of this issue, to defend the right of the peoples of the Community to be protected from racism directed against them by foreigners?

Answer

The draft declaration to which the honourable Member refers has not been submitted to the Council, which therefore cannot state what its position on the matter might be.

*
* *

Question No 106, by Mr Alavanos (H-656/84)

Subject: Greek steel exports to the USA

Would the Council state why the Committee of Representatives' meeting on 21 December 1984 decided to reduce the Greek share of exports of steel tubes to the USA to 0.51% of Community exports (when the meeting on 22 November 1984 had decided on 0.55%, itself an unacceptable figure) given that this will have a particularly detrimental effect on the Greek steel industry?

Answer

At its meeting on 22 November 1984 the Council authorized the Commission to negotiate a pipes and tubes arrangement with the US authorities. The Greek share of the US market was fixed at 0.55% out of a proposed total Community quota of 7.6%.

As the honourable Member will be aware these negotiations failed.

Subsequently — in mid-December — the US authorities indicated that they would be prepared to resume negotiations with the Community but on a modified basis. Exceptions to the quota, which the Community had hoped to negotiate, had been rejected by the American party. In the new negotiating directives for the Commission, which it adopted on 29 December 1984, the Council was obliged to adjust Member States' shares of the proposed Community quota to take account of reduced export possibilities. In this way it was decided to allocate to Greece 0.52% of US apparent consumption.

On the basis of these directives, the Community was able to conclude on 9 January 1985 the pipes and tubes arrangement with the US, which guarantees Community exporters, in addition to 7.6% of US apparent consumption, further export possibilities under a short supply clause, allowing Community producers to respond to US market demands for products which US industry either produces in insufficient quantity or not at all.

*
* *

Question No 108, by Mr Adamou (H-663/84)

Subject: Participation of EEC countries in the militarization of space

At the end of January 1985, Ministers from 11 West European countries are meeting in Rome, the capital of the country holding the presidency of the European Communities, to decide upon a European space strategy. The subjects for discussion are the construction of Columbus, a spaceship which will link up with the American space station, Ariane 5, an advanced version of the West European Ariane missile, and of Hermes, a space shuttle modelled on its American counterpart. The cost of the first two is estimated at 1 700 million dollars each over the next ten years and the third at 1 300 million dollars.

Would the Council state whether the subject of a space arms policy has been discussed in Council, why the Member States of the Community are participating in the militarization of space, which threatens to escalate the arms race to incalculable levels, and how such enormous sums of money are found for the militarization of space but not for combating unemployment, for example?

Answer

The programme of the European Space Agency, to which the oral question refers, is not the subject of action by the Community.

In consequence the subject of the honourable Member's question has not been discussed in the Council.

*
* *

Question No 110, by Mr Wedekind (H-672/84)

Subject: Community driving licence

Under the first Council directive of 4 December 1980 on the introduction of a Community driving licence Member States are obliged to exchange the licences issued by other Member States within a year of the holders taking up residence in the state. In practice most people are unaware of the rule that licences must be exchanged within a year and this has frequently given rise to justified complaints when Community citizens who have been driving for years move to another Community country and have to sit a costly and time-consuming driving test again.

In the light of the poor record to date of the application of the first directive on the introduction of a Community driving licence, does the Council not consider that it would be better, rather than requiring the exchange of licences within a very short space to time, simply to make provision for the mutual recognition of driving licenses properly acquired in a Community Member State?

Answer

1. The Council would confirm to the honourable Member that the first Council directive of 4 December 1980 on the introduction of a Community driving licence provides, in Article 8, for driving licences to be exchanged within one year of the holder of a driving licence issued by a Member State taking up normal residence in another.

2. As far as reciprocal recognition of national driving licences is concerned, Article 10 of the same directive provides for the Council, acting on a proposal from the Commission, to carry out as soon as possible a more detailed harmonization of the standards for driving tests and licensing.

However, it should be noted in this connection that, since the adoption of the first Council directive on 4 December 1980, the Council has not received any further proposals from the Commission permitting more detailed harmonization to be carried out.

*
* *

Question No 111, by Mrs Van Hemeldonck (H-682/84)

Subject: Council meeting specially devoted to Women's Questions

Will the Council state whether it intends to follow the precedent created by the French Presidency, to hold a special Council meeting on 8th March 1985 to deal with women's questions?

Answer

The Italian Presidency is intending to hold a ministerial meeting devoted to matters of particular relevance to women in early March in Rome, on the occasion of International Women's Day.

This meeting is scheduled for 7 March and will be the second devoted to women's problems. The first, which dealt mainly with the employment problems facing women, took place in Paris on 8 March 1984 on the initiative of the French Presidency.

*
* *

Question No 113, by Mrs Boserup (H-685/84)

Subject: Involvement of the 'Spinelli report' in a forthcoming summit conference

In his declaration upon assuming office and his closing speech in Strasbourg on 16 January 1985, the Italian Foreign Minister, Giulio Andreotti, maintained that the mandate for the summit conference should be very close to the European Parliament's proposal for a treaty which is known as the 'Spinelli report'.

Does the Council not consider that involving the European Parliament's proposal for a treaty in this way is an invitation to pay particular attention to this draft treaty and will thereby hamper the conference's potential?

Answer

As indicated in the reply to H-563/84 on 16 January, the Presidency will examine the initiatives to be taken with reference to calling an intergovernmental conference to negotiate a Treaty of European Union (and to the other proposals from the *ad hoc* Committee on Institutional Affairs) in the light of the Committee's final report and the discussions of the European Council in June 1985.

I can confirm that it is the Italian Presidency's profound conviction, as expressed by the President of the Council in the debate following the presentation of his programme speech to the European Parliament last month, that it is necessary to work towards drawing up a Treaty of European Union which should be politically as close as possible to that approved by the European Parliament itself.

*
* *

III. Questions to the Foreign Ministers

Question No 115, by Mr Ephremidis (H-336/84)

Subject: Community measures against the Turkish Government

What measures has the Community taken against the Turkish Government in view of the latter's massive campaign to exterminate the Kurds through military operations, the formation of paramilitary units, etc.?

Answer

The question raised by the honourable Member has not been discussed specifically by the Ten meeting in political cooperation.

However, I can assure the honourable Member that the Ten are following events in Turkey closely, particularly the situation as regards the respect of human rights, and have not failed to make their concern known to the Turkish Government.

*
* *

Question No 120, by Mr Deprez (H-590/84)

Subject: Hostilities in Ethiopia

At its December 1984 part-session the European Parliament passed an urgent resolution calling on the Ministers of Foreign Affairs to use their good offices to bring about a cease-fire that would end the hostilities in Ethiopia.

What action have the Ministers of Foreign Affairs taken since December to bring about a cease-fire and should they not have made the granting of additional aid to Ethiopia by the European Community conditional on prompt introduction of such a cease-fire?

Answer

The Ten are very anxious to see the restoration of peace in Northern Ethiopia by political methods, based on the respect of territorial integrity and the principle of non-interference in internal affairs, and respecting the identities of the peoples of those regions. Aid has been granted on humanitarian grounds to combat the crisis and is intended for all the peo-

ple of the country affected by the famine. The Ten consider that to attach political conditions to aid granted on strictly humanitarian grounds would be wrong.

*
* *

Question No 121, by Mr. Cot (H-598/84)

Subject: Ratification of the International Convention against Torture

Could the Ministers of Foreign Affairs meeting in political cooperation state whether measures have been taken to promote ratification by all the Member States of the International Convention against Torture, which was unanimously adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 10 December 1984?

Answer

The International Convention against Torture, adopted unanimously by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 10 December 1984, was open for signature from 4 February, the date of the opening of the 41st session of the Commission on Human Rights.

It was agreed by the Ten meeting in political cooperation that the Convention should be signed as quickly as possible. However, some Member States will take longer to ratify it than others, in view of the different national parliaments' examination procedures and because, before they can ratify, the signatory States are obliged to introduce a number of regulations into their national legislation.

*
* *

Question No 122, by Mrs Castle (H-603/84)

Subject: The persecution of the Tamil minority in Sri Lanka

Bearing in mind the continuing murders and persecution of Tamils in Sri Lanka, and disturbing reports of the involvement of the Sri Lankan Army in some of these acts which are giving rise to widespread concern, will the Foreign Ministers raise the question of human rights with the government of Sri Lanka and press for: permission for access for the foreign press to go into Jaffna, the Tamils' homeland; to allow foreign government delegates to inspect the camps where thousands of Tamil youths are being kept; to allow food and medical supplies to reach Tamil areas?

Answer

The Ten are closely following developments in the situation in Sri Lanka, where a state of emergency has been proclaimed in the northern part of the island following acts of terrorism committed by extremist Tamil groups which, especially recently, have claimed many victims and caused great damage. This situation affects the civilian population in that area because the establishment of an 'exclusive coastal zone' and the sometimes uncontrolled reactions of the forces of law and order have created a climate of insecurity and economic difficulties.

Nevertheless, the Ten have noted the repeated attempts by the Government in Colombo to restore national unity. In the present circumstances, they can only hope that a political solution will be reached which will enable the various communities in Sri Lanka to live

together in peace and harmony, with human rights and the pluralist and democratic traditions of that country being fully respected.

*
* *

Question No 123, by Mr Elliot (H-630/84)

Subject: Chemical weapons

Bearing in mind that the use of sophisticated modern chemical weapons could present almost as great a threat to the life and future health of humanity as the use of nuclear weapons, and noting recent well-founded reports that the British Government is seriously considering adding chemical weapons to its military arsenal, would the Foreign Ministers agree as a matter of urgency to issue a statement condemning the development or stockpiling of chemical weapons by any nation anywhere in the world, in particular to make the strongest representations to the government of any nation in the European Community known to possess or to be considering acquiring chemical weapons?

Answer

The newspaper reports referred to in the question — which have, however, been denied by the Member State concerned — relate to defence matters which, as such, are not dealt with in the context of European political cooperation.

The great importance which the Ten attach to the conclusion of a convention banning chemical weapons is, however, well-known and was referred to in the address given on behalf of the Ten during the plenary session of the United Nations General Assembly on 25 September 1984.

*
* *

Question No 124, by Mrs Dury (H-653/84)

Subject: Human rights and fundamental freedoms in Chile

Have the Ministers for Foreign Affairs put pressure on the Chilean Government with a view to obtaining that human rights and fundamental freedoms are at last respected and, if so, how exactly have they done this and what measures have they taken to bring round the Chilean Government to restoring freedom of the press and trade union rights in Chile?

Answer

The Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Ten meeting in political cooperation are watching the situation in Chile closely and have on several occasions made representations to the Santiago Government in defence of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

They have also declared publicly on several occasions, and this has received ample coverage in the press, their strong concern at the situation in Chile, deploring the current repressions. I refer in particular to the statements made on 9 April and 11 September 1984.

Recently, on 12 November last year, the Minister for Foreign Affairs issued a public statement deploring the continued existence of martial law and the consequent violation of human rights and calling for a renewal of dialogue for the restoration of democracy and the return of the political exiles to Chile.

*
* *

Question No 125, by Mr Alavanos (H-657/84)

Subject: Acts of provocation by the USA against Nicaragua

The United States of America has stepped up its terrorist activities against Nicaragua in recent times by withdrawing from the International Court of Justice at The Hague, deploying warships off the coast of Nicaragua, continuing to supply military aid to the counter-revolutionary mercenaries, etc. Would the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation state what action they have taken or intend to take against the US Government on the basis of the San José Declaration?

Answer

The honourable Member is referred to the reply to his oral question No-H330/84.

*
* *

Question No 126, by Mr Iversen (H-666/84)

Subject: Arms sales from EPC countries to South Africa

Have the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation (EPC) discussed the rumours that individual countries participating in EPC are selling arms to South Africa in defiance of the UN's arms embargo and, if this is so, would they indicate which countries are involved and the quantity of arms sold to South Africa?

Answer

The question of the implementation of Resolution No 418 (1977) of the United Nations Security Council on the embargo on the sale of arms to South Africa was examined by the Ten meeting in political cooperation. Every one of the Ten, acting in accordance with its own national legislation on arms sales, is adhering strictly to the provisions of the Resolution.

*
* *

Question No 128, by Mr Pearce (H-680/84)

Subject: Relations between EEC countries and Libya

Have the Ministers meeting in political cooperation now considered relations between Community countries and Libya, as referred to in Question Time in the January session of the European Parliament?

Answer

The Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation have not discussed the matter to which the honourable Member refers.

*
* *

Question No 129, by Mrs Van den Heuvel (H-687/84)

Subject: Suspension of talks between the Governments of Nicaragua and the United States

In view of the tense political and military situation in Central America, are the Foreign Ministers prepared to act as mediators to ensure that these extremely important talks are resumed as soon as possible?

Answer

The Ten have on several occasions expressed their full support for the Contadora Group initiative to find a peaceful and global solution to this area's problems

The temporary suspension of the meetings between the United States and Nicaragua has occurred at a time when relations between a number of the countries of the region are delicate. The Ten are convinced that this can only be overcome by a return to constructive dialogue between the Central American states, within the framework of the Contadora initiative.

The Ten has therefore sent a message of encouragement to the Foreign Ministers of the Contadora Group at Panama.

SITTING OF THURSDAY, 14 FEBRUARY 1983

Contents

Mr d'Ormesson; Mr Schwalba-Hoth			
1. <i>Approval of the Minutes</i>			
Mr Cryer	183		
2. <i>Decision on urgency</i>			
Mrs Focke	183		
3. <i>Topical and urgent debate</i>			
• <i>40th anniversary of peace in Europe — Motions for resolutions (Doc. 2-1599/84/rev.) by Mr Tzounis and others; (Doc. 2-1623/84) by Mr Ford and others; (Doc. 2-1647/84) by Mr Chambeiron and others and (Doc. 2-1629/84) by Mr Selva and others</i>			
Mr Tzounis; Mr Ford; Mr Chambeiron; Mr Selva; Mr Hänsch; Mr Croux; Lord Bethell; Mr Cervetti; Mrs Veil; Mr Coste-Floret; Mr Roelants du Vivier; Mr Pordea; Mr Ulburghs; Mrs Wieczorek Zeul; Mr Habsburg; Mr Møller; Mr Adamou; Mr Beyer de Ryke; Mr Pelikan	184		
• <i>Election of Members of the EP — Motions for resolutions (Doc. 2-1619/84) by Mr de La Malène and others</i>			
Mr de la Malène; Mr von der Vring; Mr Bocklet; Lord Douro; Mrs Barbarella; Mr Kuijpers; Lord Cockfield (Commission); Mr Elliot	192		
• <i>International Women's Day — Motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-1600/84/rev. II) by Mrs Van den Heuvel; Mrs De Backer-Van Ocken; Mrs Veil and Mrs Larive-Groenendaal; Mr Battersby; Mrs Cinciari Rodano; Mr de la Malène</i>			
Mrs Van den Heuvel; Mrs Lenz; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mrs Veil; Mrs Heinrich; Mrs Squarcialupi	195		
• <i>EAGGF — Motions for resolutions (Doc. 2-1596/84) by Mr Provan and (Doc. 2-1638/84) by Mr De Pasquale and others</i>			
Mr Provan; Mr De Pasquale; Mr Gautier; Mr Costanzo; Mr Maher; Mr Guarraci; Mrs Castle; Mr Aigner; Mr Andriessen (Commission)	197		
4. <i>Market in wine — Second report (Doc. 2-1575/84) by Mr Gatti</i>			
Mr Gatti; Mrs Guarraci; Mr F. Pisoni; Mr Provan; Mr De Pasquale; Mr de Cameret; Mr Sutra; Mr Mühlen; Mr P. Beazley; Mr Maffre-Baugé; Mr Musso; Mr Sutra; Mr Graefe zu Baringdorf; Mr Musso; Mr Gautier; Mr Adamou; Mr Abens; Ms Tongue; Mr Andriessen (Commission) Mr Graefe zu Baringdorf	202		
5. <i>Customs debt — Report (Doc. 2-1590/84) by Dame Shelagh Roberts</i>			
Dame Shelagh Roberts; Mr Fich	215		
6. <i>Adoption of the Protocol extending to Brunei-Darussalam the Cooperation Agreement between the EEC, Indonesia and other members of ASEAN — Report (Doc. 2-1529/84) by Mr Seeler</i>			
Mr Seeler; Mr Zaborka; Mr Chanterie; Mrs Heinrich; Mr Mosar (Commission)	215		
7. <i>Ratification of Torremolinos Convention — Report (Doc. 2-1569/84) by Mr Provan</i>			
Mr Provan; Mr Klinkenborg; Mr Ebel; Mr Guerneur; Mr Sutherland (Commission)	219		
8. <i>Milk and milk products — Report (Doc. 2-1563/84) by Mrs Caroline Jackson</i>			
Mrs Caroline Jackson; Ms Tongue; Mr Mertens; Mr Sherlock; Mr Maher; Mr Tolman	223		
9. <i>Votes</i>			
Mr Avgerinos; Mr Musso; Mr Kolokontronis; Mr Lambrias; Mrs Péry; Mr Iversen; Mr Raftery; Mr Alavanos; Mrs Dury; Mr Tripodi; Mrs Péry; Mrs Hammerich; Mr Musso; Sir Peter Vanneck; Mr Graefe zu Baringdorf; Mr Provan; Mr Spinelli; Mr von der Vring; Mr Woltjer; Mr Graefe zu Baringdorf	227		
10. <i>Milk and milk products (continuation)</i>			
Mr Guerneur; Mr Andriessen (Commission); Mr Sherlock; Mr Andriessen	233		
11. <i>Protection of workers — Report (Doc. 2-1567/84) by Mrs Squarcialupi</i>			
Mrs Squarcialupi; Mr Hughes; Mrs Schleicher; Mrs Squarcialupi; Mr Folinis; Mr Roelants du Vivier; Mr Sutherland (Commission); Mr Sherlock; Mrs Lenz-Cornette; Mr Rogalla	234		

IN THE CHAIR : MR ALBER

Vice-President

The sitting opened at 10 a.m.

Mr d'Ormesson (DR). — (FR) Two particularly unpleasant things happened during yesterday afternoon's session.

One after the other, Mr Ford and Mr Jean-Pierre Cot cast doubt on the honour of the Chairman of our Group. To Mr Ford, I shall say no more than that Jean-Marie Le Pen has brought an action for libel against these accusations that are as untrue as they are unpleasant.

(Protest from the left)

Let justice take its course, Sir. You are not presiding a kangaroo court yet!

To Mr Jean-Pierre Cot, I shall say that he has stooped low enough to get accusations from the gutter press that are so calumnious that they will turn like a boom-rang against their authors.

I should add that a French Socialist is the last person to make such accusations. Do I need to remind you that, on 1 November 1955, François Mitterand, then Minister of the Interior, had dozens of men who were using terrorist methods to get their way in Algeria liquidated without trial. You, Jean-Pierre Cot, thought you could overstep the bounds of your authority and attack one of the representatives of France.

The response of our Chairman and his Group will match your felony!

(Applause from the extreme right)

President. — We shall bear that in mind. The Minutes record that you made a similar statement yesterday. I shall not allow any more interventions on this topic. The matter has been referred to the relevant committee.

Mr Schwalba-Hoth (ARC). — (DE) I would like to raise a point of order regarding reports in this morning's newspapers. I was informed this morning that the American President is apparently to visit the European Parliament on 8 May. In my opinion, this cannot be true and I would ask you to censure the Press for publishing such inaccurate information on the European Parliament. This announcement cannot be accurate for who could have made this decision yesterday evening? We were all in the Chamber until approximately 19.00 and no meeting, either of the Enlarged Bureau

or the Bureau, took place afterwards. The Rules of Procedure — Articles 24 (2) and (3) — make it quite clear that the Enlarged Bureau alone is responsible for relations with institutions and organisations outside the Community or with other Community bodies and institutions.

It is therefore obvious that — firstly — no such decision can have been made yesterday evening and that — secondly — the reports of a Reagan visit are fictitious and therefore inaccurate. Hence my request for censure of the Press for publishing such inaccurate information.

President. — Thank you, Mr Schwalba-Hoth, for valuing so highly the duties of the Chair.

1. *Approval of the Minutes*

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

Are there any objections?

Mr Cryer (S). — Mr President, I was not able to hear Mr Ford's point of order mentioned on page 26 of the Minutes. I wonder, Mr President, if you have had any statement in reply from Mr Le Pen rather than from one of his henchmen. It was not possible for us to know what was being said earlier, because for half of Mr d'Ormesson's statement there was no interpretation from French into English.

President. — No, we have now finished with this item. The Minutes never contain what speakers actually say. This you will find later on in the verbatim report of proceedings. The Minutes only indicate the individual speakers.

(Parliament approved the Minutes)¹

2. *Decision on urgency*

Proposal from the Commission to the Council for a regulation concerning the arrangements applicable to agricultural products and certain goods resulting from the processing of agricultural products originating in the African, Caribbean and Pacific States or the overseas countries and territories (COM(84) 768 final)

Mrs Focke (S), chairman of the Committee on Development and Cooperation. — (DE) The com-

¹ Documents received: see Minutes.

Focke

mittee has discussed this matter and supports the request for urgent debate.

(Parliament agreed to urgent procedure)

President. — The item will be placed on the agenda for Friday.

*
* *

Proposal from the Commission to the Council for a regulation laying down implementing rules for Regulation (EEC) No 3331/82 on food aid policy and food aid management (Doc. 2-628/84 — COM(84) 481 final).

Mrs Focke (S), chairman of the Committee on Development and Cooperation. — (DE) The committee also recommends accepting this request for urgent debate.

(Parliament agreed to urgent procedure)

President. — The Galland report (Doc. 2-1708/84) could also be placed on the agenda for Friday. The deadline for tabling amendments is 12 noon today.

*
* *

President. — I would just point out that it has been decided, pursuant to Rule 48, to discuss jointly the four urgent Procedures on famine in the Sahel with the Council's motion for a resolution just adopted. However, under Rule 48 motions for urgent procedure cannot be linked with a point on the agenda. I would therefore suggest that these motions for urgent procedure be converted into normal motions according to Rule 47.

Mrs Focke (S), chairman of the Committee on Development and Cooperation. — (DE) I would like to support your suggestion and comment as follows: in this case my committee would discuss this motion for a resolution pursuant to Rule 47 at its next meeting and would endeavour to formulate it as a motion for a resolution for urgent and topical debate incorporating any other aspects that seem relevant so that we have a joint submission for the next urgent and topical debate at the March part session.

(Parliament adopted the President's proposal)

3. Topical and urgent debate

40th anniversary of peace in Europe

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

- the motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-1599/84/rev.) by Mr Tzounis and others, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, Mrs Veil on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, Sir Henry Plumb on behalf of the European Democratic Group, Mr de la Malène on behalf of the Group of the European Progressive Democrats, on the commemoration of the 40th anniversary of cessation of hostilities in Europe,
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-1623/84) by Mr Ford and others, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the 40th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz,
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-1647/84) by Mr Chambeiron and others, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, on the commemoration of the victory over Nazism,
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-1629/84) by Mr Selva and others, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, on the 40th anniversary of the Yalta agreement.

Mr Tzounis (PPE). — (GR) Mr President, the fortieth anniversary of the cessation of hostilities in the 2nd World War in Europe cannot be allowed to pass without comment.

However, it should not be taken as an opportunity for sterile dwelling in the past, but rather as an occasion for collecting our thoughts, putting together what we have learned and reexamining our collective conscience and the choices open to us for the future.

Mr President, historical studies are only useful when peoples prove that they are both willing and able to grasp what history teaches, and to be guided by it. And I think we have to accept that one of history's most important lessons is that peace can only be safeguarded within the framework of a democratic situation in which the free operation of parliamentary institutions guarantees the unimpeded expression of the will of sovereign peoples. A will which, by definition, cannot be other than peace-loving and opposed to any form of violence and suppression of opinion.

Mr President, I am convinced that the free democratic peoples of Europe have learned that lesson, and that from the ruins and misery piled up by the cataclysm of the second World War there has arisen a firm and irrevocable determination on the part of our peoples not to allow a repetition of the mistakes, weaknesses and crimes of the past. To build a new economic and

Tzounis

political landscape in Europe, which will allow the creative potentials of man's spirit to flower in all their breadth and grandeur. The proof of this is that just five years after the guns fell silent, we heard the clarion-call by the unforgettable Robert Schuman, exhorting our peoples to brotherhood, obliteration of the past and creative contemplation of the future. Mr President, our peoples responded to that invitation as one and with enthusiasm, because it was a call for renewal and change, the greatest change in our century.

That is why I believe that notwithstanding the nature that some National Governments may wish to impose upon this commemorative anniversary, the European Parliament's message to the generation of those who are building Europe and to coming generations cannot, and must not be other than a message of exaltation and a cry of hope.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

Mr Ford (S). — Mr President, on behalf of my group I wish to say it is vital that this Parliament and the people of Europe should remember all those who lost their lives as victims of Nazism and Fascism in Europe.

It is not enough merely to remember the victims. We must also remember that if the democratic parties of Europe had been alert and strongwilled, then this sacrifice by so many people might well have not been necessary. If, when the Nazis and the Fascists came for the Jews, for the homosexuals, for the trade unionists, for the Communists and for the travellers, the democratic parties of Europe and the governments of Europe had said 'No' and expressed solidarity with those individuals who were being oppressed, then we might not have had the situation arise that did. We might not have had the crimes against humanity of people like Reder, and the Reder case might not have been with us. We might not have had the sinister Mengele, whose pseudo-scientific experiments reached the depths of man's inhumanity to man and woman.

Because they, the democratic parties and the governments in Europe, failed to speak out in the 1930s, we must all share some of the responsibility. This failure and its lessons must be remembered. We must not allow those lessons to be forgotten for the future, because those lessons were learnt at the cost of so much suffering to so many people.

Yet in parts of Europe the forgetting has already started. We have the release of Reder, we have the re-emergence of anti-Semitism into acceptable discourse in some countries of Europe, and we have new scapegoats being created: we have the Turks, we have the Arabs, we have the Pakistanis, we have the West Indians and in Britain we even have the Irish. We must continue to be vigilant. We must continue to remember and, of course, Nazism and Fascism will not

re-emerge in the same clothes but their potential horrors remain the same, even if they are dressed up in a very different way.

I ask you to support this resolution, because we must remember all of those tortured, all of those killed, by Nazis and Fascists yesterday and today. Support the resolution!

(Applause from the left)

Mr Chambeiron (COM). — *(FR)* Mr President, like many of the institutions that emerged just after World War II, the European Communities have always stated their attachment to those fundamental values that the overthrowing of the oppressive régimes 40 years ago made it possible to restore.

It is the duty of the European Parliament, as the expression of the free will of the peoples of the Community, to see that these values are preserved. Its vigilance in this area largely gets the attention it sometimes lacks — which is to say that we must not remain indifferent to certain decisions, taken within the Community, which offend democratic sensibility, which are such as to gloss over crimes which made the universal conscience bridle with horror and which were rightly condemned by the international community.

We cannot, when the opportunity arises, not use the coincidences of the calendar for a very special evocation of events which, because they constitute an example, should be firmly rooted in the collective memory of our peoples.

It is because our Parliament has been concerned with the resurgence of Nazism and Facism that we should question anything that might help fire the campaigns which, even today, are still trying to justify the past and unjustifiable behaviour. Public opinion was indignant at the way Walter Reder, the war criminal responsible for the massacre of almost 2 000 innocent civilians, was released and welcomed. We share this indignation — which is even more understandable given that the freeing of this criminal comes at a time when several of the governments of the Community are preparing to celebrate the victory over Fascism and Nazism of 8 May 1945.

If it is true, as the press agencies tell us, that Reder is to get a combatant's pension backdated to 1964, then this is not just indulgence. It is an intolerable attack on the memory of the victims. I should add that, in the case in point, there is no humanitarian motive, no solidarity and no reason of State that can prevail in a matter of public morality. Since the end of World War II, new generations have appeared. They want to live in a world free of the miasma that poisoned Europe in the 30s. It is not by being silent or forgetting the past, but by teaching them about Nazism and Facism, that we can hope to get these generations to avoid the mis-

Chambeiron

takes that were almost fatal to my generation. Far from generating mistrust and incomprehension, a reminder of what was behind the hatred, the oppression and the racialism is a salutary exercise. It is vital therapy. It is only through unequivocal condemnation of what Nazism and Facism were that true reconciliation between the peoples can be achieved.

We strongly hope that Parliament's May part-session will be an opportunity for this House to assert its desire to be a vigilant defender of the democratic values of which the allied victory on 8 May 1945 marked the return.

Mr President, I should like to add that I have never thought that the diversity of opinions that reflect the reality of our democratic societies would be a stumbling block to broad agreement on the content of a resolution that has no other aim than to translate what should be the general feeling of the House.

(Applause)

Mr Selva (PPE). — *(IT)* Mr President, a conference of three heads of Government, which never produced a treaty, still less a peace treaty, was the political act that determined the greatest territorial changes, the greatest forced movement of people, the greatest influence of Communist ideology, and the greatest violations of human rights that have been recorded in the last forty years of the history of our continent; the people of the German nation divided into two states, the ideological frontiers of Soviet Communism shifted westwards so as to engulf countries such as Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria and Rumania, in which the seeds of political and social freedom have been destroyed, suppressed by the Soviet Union with force, even, when necessary, whether Stalin, Krushchev or Breznev was at the top. Let us leave it to the historians to discuss whether at Yalta Roosevelt was taken for a ride by Stalin, and Churchill was more far-sighted than the American President. These reflections on Yalta started off from the point that the people were never asked about their destiny, because they were deprived of the freedom to do so. We have this freedom, and, following the moral and political call of our duty as members of the European Parliament, we must act also for them. We know we cannot ask for a revision of the frontiers drawn by the treaty that was never put in writing, but we have to be honest and recognise that, with that treaty, the West surrendered to the Soviet Union and allowed it to corner half of Europe, crushing those freedoms; to defend which the West took up arms against Nazism and Fascism.

The European Parliament must not refuse to admit the existence of Yalta, which is a reality, but must ask the Soviet Union to apply it in accordance with that spirit that was not Stalin's, but was certainly Roosevelt's and Churchill's, as it was the spirit of the West. I mean the spirit of the defence of the values of freedom, democ-

racy, and self-determination. We can ask this in the name of the peoples that we represent here. We can ask it in the name of those peoples of the East who cannot speak, and who ask us to speak for them. We can ask it in the name of the historical, cultural and religious unity that the unnatural division in the heart of our continent cannot cancel. We can ask it, rejecting the Soviet blackmail which claims that, by doing so, we should endanger peace. Peace is in danger when peoples are forced to live in slavery, when they cannot choose their own government, when they are deprived of the possibility of building their own future. Saying this may mean hoping, making wishes, and hoping again. We want to do something more as well, and we must.

In the light of the facts, the Final Act of Helsinki has proved to be the legitimisation without treaty of the territorial and political positions gained by the Russians. The committees in defence of Helsinki in the USSR and Eastern Europe, which called for its application, have been destroyed, and we cannot therefore celebrate Yalta only with words; we wish to remember this date with a precise request, which is summed up in the motto 'Let us apply Yalta and Helsinki' as they are both understood by free peoples, freedom fighters such as Sakharov, who ask, through us, for self-determination and the freedom to choose their way of life and their political system.

I think, Mr President, that certain dissidents may be right when they affirm that we should ask the Soviet Union for discussions on a real peace treaty, a legal instrument that could give people a greater guarantee than has been given by the Final Act of Helsinki.

For us Members of the European Parliament this cannot be solely a routine commemoration; it must be a commitment by all free men to help those who are not free today to become so, those who still hope and believe in our political and moral courage.

(Applause from the centre and right)

Mr Hänsch (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, what Mr Selva has just said about the fortieth anniversary of the Yalta conference is historically and politically wrong. The Soviet Union did not achieve domination over Central Europe and bring Poland and Hungary and other central and east European nations under its yoke because of a conference but because of the Second World War which was irresponsibly and criminally unleashed by the Nazis.

(Applause from the Socialist Group)

The Socialist Group reaffirms its conviction that we must face up to reality as the basis for any policies to improve the lives of peoples in Europe, strengthen freedom, open up frontiers and extend economic and political liberties in both parts of our continent.

Hänsch

The Socialist Group believes that the unification of Western Europe successfully demonstrates that ever closer cooperation between peoples and nations can restrain nationalist self-interest and banish armed conflict. This is also the way increased efforts must be made with the Eastern part of our continent to achieve cooperation throughout Europe to arrive at more and more agreements with Eastern European countries and to open up new areas for collaboration, for example environmental protection or confidence-building measures.

We have been told that we can learn from history. Unfortunately, history has many lessons to teach us and we must be careful to choose the right ones. The 8 May is not a date for celebrations but an occasion for all of us to turn our thoughts to the history of Europe.

(Applause from the Socialist Group)

Mr Croux (PPE). — *(NL)* Mr President, we wish to highlight two points. Firstly we remember the tragedies of the first world war with the horrifying excesses and crimes against humanity and human beings. We realise that we must never forget them for as we look about the world around us — whether in Europe or, and especially, outside our continent — we see that these destructive tendencies are constantly present in human nature. There is a price to be paid for everything; the fight for humanity and human rights has to be fought every day.

But there is also a second point we wish to stress. It is not sufficient to make declarations, we must create the necessary structures, we must campaign politically to bring about a framework for a humane society better able to maintain peace, ensure the common welfare and have human rights respected. And this is the place to say so, we must do this here in Europe, we must improve our structures to this end. We must meet Robert Schuman's challenge and that contained in the text of the preamble to the Treaty of Rome and strive towards greater unity.

We now have an excellent opportunity for doing so in the next few months, with the Brussels summit when the report from the Dooge committee will be presented, and with the Milan summit where the report on the future of Europe will be the most important item on the agenda. Well, we must inform the Council that organising a solemn commemoration on 8 May is just not sufficient. We want the Council to act in accordance with its responsibility to the peoples of Europe. And in that same spirit we also want to say in this House that it is not sufficient to look back, we must prepare the way forward, and there is no better place in Europe to do so than here in the European Parliament. There are important weeks and months ahead of us; we must work together to bring about a European Union. Only then can the political frame-

work be created in which we can stand up with strength against all those who want to perpetuate the other forces of oppression and slavery in the world. That is our duty and our message for 8 May 1985.

(Applause from the centre)

Lord Bethell (ED). — Forty years ago, Mr President, there took place a moment that was described by Winston Churchill as 'a time of triumph and tragedy'. It was the triumph not of one nation over another nation but of democratic values over dictatorship, Fascism and the evils of Hitler. It was a time of tragedy though because it meant the collapse of democracy in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and in a large part of Germany. While democracy was restored to many of our Member States, including Denmark and Germany, democracy was lost for forty years in large parts of Europe. It was a time of glory for the people who fought in order to conquer Hitler, including many Russians, tens of millions of whom perished in that terrible war. It was a time of shame though for those who did not speak out and I am glad that Mr Ford referred to those who did not speak out against the evils of dictatorship. He had in mind, I think, those who did not speak out against the rise of Hitler. He should also, I think, have mentioned those who did not speak out against the evils of Stalin's system which killed probably as many Russians as did Hitler and many others in many other countries. He should have mentioned the evil men who did not speak out, the Molotovs of this world, who took part in the destruction of millions and the destruction of countries, a man who has just been admitted again to the Soviet Communist Party.

So while we honour those Russians who fought against Fascism, we have to bear in mind the fact that they have enslaved other nations and show no sign of ceasing to do so.

It was a time of greatness and joy for the oppressed people of Europe, and the liberation of Auschwitz Concentration Camp is mentioned in one resolution. It was a time of shame though for those on the western side who condemned several million people from the Soviet Union in Allied hands to the fate of being sent back by force against their will to the Soviet dictators from whom they had fled. And while the concentration camps of Hitler were being emptied in 1945 the concentration camps of Stalin were being filled to the tune of more than 10 million. And where are those who speak out against that? I see the only beacon of hope in order to turn the tragedy of that time into some sort of triumph as being our own European Parliament which embodies the democratic values for which we fought and for which we won 40 years ago.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

Mr Cervetti (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, there is no need for me to recall our agreement and our hopes

Cervetti

for the commemoration of 8 May, or why this commemoration should be held independently by this Parliament so that here, on that day, the voices of the peoples of Europe and their representative parties can be heard freely, pluralistically and together, emphasising the will for peace and for the independence of Europe. And amongst these voices we shall then have the honour of making our own voice heard, the voice of those who, together with others, fought in the front line for freedom and democracy.

But I am speaking now on another question that has been put to us. Obviously, we are in favour of genuine detailed discussions on the Yalta Conference and its consequences. Indeed, we already do discuss it, whenever an opportunity of a historical, cultural, political, scientific or celebrative nature presents itself. The event was a decisive one for the defeat of Fascism and Nazism, and for the victorious conclusion of the war by the anti-fascist alliance of nations and the resistance of all the peoples of Europe, including the German Resistance.

But apart from its importance in this way, it was quite a complex event, and it is still a controversial one.

There are those who consider it the cause of all evil, while, for others, it is the starting point of forty years of peace on our continent. It is right that we should discuss it and express our own opinions and our own judgements. But what leaves us surprised, doubtful and even put out is that anyone should want to express a judgement by means of resolutions, and no doubt, majority verdicts. The events of history, all the events of history, especially those of great significance, are not to be treated in this way. And it is because of the high regard we have for them, for the cultural debate that must take place about them, and for the regard that we have for our Assembly, that we do not feel we can support such a practice. For this reason, Mr President, we shall not vote for — indeed, quite apart from its content, we shall vote against, the document that has been presented to us.

Mrs Veil (L). — (*FR*) Mr President, I am pleased that these various resolutions are being discussed together, as there is an important link between the Anniversary of the Yalta Agreement and the celebration of 8 May.

I hope that our Parliament will give an important place to this celebration because we cannot forget that this is the date of the victory over Fascism — and the date from which we can consider that Europe wanted to live in freedom and independence and to say no to war, to those fratricidal wars we waged. We should mark this clearly together, so that no such a thing can ever happen among Europeans again.

But when we celebrate the victory of freedom, we must not forget that there are Europeans who are not free. And since we are talking about the Yalta Agree-

ments, we ought to underline the fact that they are not agreements — or that these agreements have been violated, that we in no way subscribed to a division of Europe or accepted that some people should be oppressed. That we can never accept. What we want today, as we are about to commemorate the end of the War and the victory of freedom, is to give a message of hope to all those who, one day, aspire to have the right to vote freely and be able to join us in this freedom celebration.

I should also like to say that our Group does not understand why the Yalta resolution contains a reference to the Helsinki Agreements. We know the Helsinki Agreements have not been respected and that, while they sanctified certain frontiers, of course, they did not sanctify the divisions at the same time. In exchange for this, we hoped for the free movement of people and ideas throughout Europe. But that we did not get. It has not happened. We know there are whole peoples which do not have freedom of thought or the possibility of leaving their countries. We hear about individual cases every day. We cannot accept it and we have to admit that Helsinki has been flouted.

On 8 May, when we celebrate the victory of peace and liberty, let us remember that freedom is everyone's right and that, although we are privileged, we must not forget those who have no freedom today.

(*Applause*)

Mr Coste-Floret (RDE). — (*FR*) Mr President, Honorable Members, my Group will be voting for the Tzounis motion which our Chairman has counter-signed.

The third of the European civil wars to shed blood in our countries in three quarters of a century ended on 8 May 1945. This date marked the victory of democracy over the Nazi ideology and the victory of democracy over racialism and nationalism and the totalitarian state and, five years later, Robert Schuman drew conclusions from this and gave his message on unity in Europe and Franco-German reconciliation. His aim when he proposed the Treaty that I had the honour of reporting on to the French national assembly was the end of European civil war and the establishment of a European entity that was to expand and become a large unit in keeping with the modern world.

Now, 35 years on, before this Parliament elected by universal suffrage, which represents the unity and fraternity of our peoples, we should be pleased to see that these aims have been achieved. But we also have to say that not all the ground has been covered. Far from it, because Europe is stagnating. It is marking time and we are seeing national egoism emerge again here and there. That is something we do not want. We want a Europe that is more united and has more solidarity and we think that 8 May 1945 should be celebrated with this in mind.

Coste-Floret

Europe's past is European civil war. Europe's present is the reconciled European Community. The future is more unity, more solidarity and more Europe. By voting the joint motion for a resolution, the House will signal our firm desire to go further along this path.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

Mr Roelants du Vivier (ARC). — (FR) Mr President, Honorable Members, the 40th anniversary of the end of the War is a time for remembering that Nazism was the cause of a war outside Germany. But it is a time to remember too that Nazism also ran a pitiless domestic war against any opposition inside Germany, where racialism was raised to the ranks of dominant ideology.

We are here to bear witness to the fact that this will never happen again, to keep alive those democratic traditions that must be Europe's. Mr President, Honorable Members, we must insist on the names of the people responsible for this tragedy who have not yet been punished — I am thinking particularly of Mengele here. I also think we have to insist on those who have not only not been properly punished but have, in a way, been rewarded — criminal Reder, for example.

We — and I am thinking particularly of my generation here, one which did not live through the War — are all responsible for seeing that this never happens again, that Facism and Nazism never recur in another guise. We must be constantly on our guard. It is not just the institutions that can save us. The mind of every citizen must be permanently alert.

Lastly, the commemoration of the end of this War should be the occasion to fight against any escalation in the West or the East, by the USSR or the USA. And here, the presence of Mr Reagan, which the press talks about with such insistence but which this House has not yet decided on, could well divide our Parliament.

We have a European tradition of justice, freedom and democracy to defend. Crossing the Atlantic to reduce the chances of understanding between the two parts of Europe will not help the cause of peace we are determined to defend.

(Applause from the extreme left)

Mr Pordea (DR). — (FR) Mr President, Ladies and Gentlemen, about Yalta, everything, or nearly everything, has been said — about the doubtful conditions in which the 1945 agreements were concluded, about the stupefying shortcomings of the great Western powers in face of the Soviet Union's desires and about the extremely serious consequences of the occupation of eastern Europe that followed. I think it would have been right, when commemorating the 40th anniversary of Yalta, for the European Community, and this

House, as representative of the free world, in particular, to take up position firmly, officially and explicitly on the fundamental problem of the modern world.

The plain fact of the matter, to my mind, is that we have a *de facto* situation, the division of the continent of Europe and the suppression of freedom and individual and national rights on an increasingly large part of the planet. We have a continual ideological, political and military threat from the Soviet Union to our free world and its civilization, the prospect of this scandalous state of affairs being stabilized for a period of time and, finally, the possibility of nuclear combat, star wars even, as they can very well now be called, the sort of conflict that will bring devastation on an apocalyptic scale.

That is the deadlock in which we are now trapped, reduced to two divergent interpretations of life itself, of moral values and of the aim of socio-political institutions.

How can we attain the *modus vivendi* we need? The free world does not seem sufficiently prepared to cope with a challenge of what is now gigantic proportions. Negotiations are held and here and there documents are initialled, but we still have not got to the heart of the matter. The approach to it is still being falsified, because the stamp of Yalta is still on the most basic aspects of international politics. Yalta was present in Helsinki, in Belgrade and Madrid. Yalta is present in Stockholm and Geneva. The Yalta spirit is only partially hidden in the marasma of the free world. If we are to break with this immobilism — and it is tantamount to indifference — we should denounce Yalta and all its consequences. We want Europe, but a Europe which refuses to decline. We call on the free world to be firm and vigilant in all it does. And, above all, we ask it, ultimately, to mobilize its spiritual resources, the only things that can form an effective opposition to the destructive force of Marxism and ultimately win through for the good of mankind.

Mr Ulburghs (NI). — (NL) Mr President, in this last century Europe has been the biggest battlefield in the world but nonetheless it has an important task to perform with regard to peace. Is it not in Europe that the Jewish-Christian tradition, with its concern for the poorest, has its deepest roots? Is it not in Europe that free liberal thinking developed? Has the Socialist philosophy of equality, on which the workers' struggles are based, not been the sign of hope and of peace for the weakest? These three currents in Europe merge together in the search for peace. In specific terms this means a radical rejection of nuclear weapons. Europe's self-defence finds a superior form to my mind in moral and social self-defence. That is the ideal towards which the peace movements in Europe are irresistibly striving. Such a Europe will be invincible to any attackers. This presupposes three conditions.

Ulburghs

Firstly, there must be an economically independent Europe where production is based on real needs (an ecological economy independent of both East and West) with respect for man and nature. Secondly, there must be a social Europe, where social security, far from being reduced as it is in these time of crisis, should be improved and increased for the benefit of the poorest. I am thinking particularly of the mine-workers affected, whether in Britain or Belgium or elsewhere. And thirdly, there must be a Europe which expresses solidarity with the peoples of the third world.

That is why, Mr President, I appeal for unity among the progressive spirits in this House on the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of peace — to the progressive Christians, progressive liberals, progressive socialists, communists, the Rainbow Group, to definitively denounce the megalomania which has led the separate European countries to slaughter in the past.

Finally, Mr President, we must build together a Europe which no longer attempts to suppress other peoples or groups either in our continent or in the rest of the world.

Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul (S). — *(DE)* Ladies and gentlemen! 8 May 1945 marks the end of fascism and the end of a war that was caused by Nazi fascism. However, the motion for a resolution tabled by the right-wing groups of this Parliament fails to mention this. We have tabled a number of amendments so that this responsibility is clearly reflected in Parliament's resolution.

Why do we have to make this clear, place responsibility firmly where it belongs and emphasize that it was fascism and national socialism that led the people of Europe to ruin and cost the lives of millions of people in East *and* West? Why? Because there are people, for example in West Germany, who would like to repress these facts; because there are also people in West Germany who would like to play down Germany's historical guilt and emphasize the consequences of national socialism — i.e. the division of Germany and the division of Europe. But the two are inseparably linked.

Those who ignore the historical responsibility for the millions of victims of oppression and war are also ignoring the reasons for the rise of national socialism and fascism, for the extremism of the political centre, for the tactics of branding certain sections of society as scapegoats and making them the targets for aggression. It represents a refusal to accept the responsibility of German industry which financed Hitler's criminal policies and profited from them. Those who ignore their responsibility allow new forms of fascism to arise. This is why we must not forget. As a result we believe it is important to learn how to nip in the bud any attempts to undermine democracy and any attempts to promote authoritarian policies. We must oppose poli-

cies which pave the way for another war and learn that it is possible to settle conflicts in a civilized and peaceful manner.

We should also apply this principle of the peaceful settlement of conflicts, which is one of the basic tenets of the European Community, to our dealings with Eastern European countries. No progress towards overcoming the division of Europe can be achieved by verbal confrontation here or anywhere else but only by accepting existing frontiers, a policy of detente and a European defence partnership with the long-term aim of emancipation from opposing blocs.

I hope that this European principle of securing peace through cooperation will be commemorated on 8 May 1985 and I still hope that it will be President Pertini who expresses these European interests on our behalf.

(Applause)

Mr Habsburg (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President! This has been a very interesting debate and I would like to begin by thanking the two main speakers, Mrs Veil and Lord Bethell, for what they said on behalf of those Europeans who do not live in freedom.

But there is a depressing side to this debate. I listened very carefully to two of the early speakers. There was much talk of dead dictators and defunct movements, against which it is easy to take a heroic stance. But there was no mention of today's problems, of Soviet racism, of the persecution of Jews in the Soviet Union, of totalitarianism in Central and Eastern Europe.

(Applause from the centre and from the right)

This is what led to enslavement once and I regret to see history repeat itself in this Parliament. I would like to agree with Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul, who said, correctly, that these tendencies must be resisted while there is still time. I could only wish that the whole of this Parliament would oppose totalitarianism in whatever form it takes, instead of turning a blind eye.

(Applause from the centre and from the right)

Ladies and gentlemen, Yalta is for . . .

(Interjection from Mr Fellermaier)

. . . The Socialists have nothing to teach us. Certainly nothing to teach me . . .

(Interjection from the Socialist Group)

President. — Only one person may speak, and that person is Mr Habsburg.

Mr Habsburg (PPE). — *(DE)* There are hundreds of millions of Europeans today who are not free and who

Habsburg

are cut off from us. We must accept responsibility for these peoples . . .

(Interjection from Mr Fellermaier)

I do not believe that your policies are any better, Mr Fellermaier. You bear part of the blame for the present regrettable situation. It is our task to promote European solidarity, freedom and democracy.

Mr President, just one more point. Mr Hänsch said that we must be realistic. He is considerably younger than I am.

(Interjection from the Socialist Group)

I should just like to point out to Parliament that at my age there have been so many realities that the inevitable conclusion is: realities always change. I have experienced the reality of Hitler. Thank heavens, this reality has passed and this is what we shall be celebrating on 8 May. I ask you therefore to give your full support to the Selva motion for a resolution.

(Applause from the centre and from the right)

Mr Møller (ED). — *(DA)* Mr President, I have no desire to celebrate the Yalta Agreement, not least because the 40th anniversary took place at the beginning of this month and it is therefore a bit late in the day for that.

Second, I feel that Yalta has always cast a long shadow over Europe and Europe's history, and we still have not emerged from under that shadow. So long as this continues, I have no wish to celebrate the Yalta Agreement. But the 8 May, it must be said, was for my generation a great day in our national life, in our lives as Danish citizens, as Europeans. I would therefore be very happy if in this Assembly we could celebrate 8 May — Europe's freedom day.

I should like to compliment the group chairmen because they, in contrast with the sour face we presented at the beginning of this session, took the opportunity to invite the American President, Mr Reagan, to address Parliament on 8 May. This is, first, an appreciation and recognition of this Assembly's importance for Europe's democracy and freedom. Second, and this has not been mentioned today, also Parliament's recognition of America's significance for and contribution to our freedom. We all know that we could not have set this goal of freedom without the United States' help, during and after the war in the form of Marshall Plan aid and in many other forms which I shall not enumerate here. But we are bound to celebrate our affinity with the great democracy across the Atlantic, and this can best be done on 8 May when we meet President Reagan here in our Parliament.

(Loud applause)

Mr Adamou (COM). — *(GR)* Mr President, we Members of the Greek Communist Party support the proposal that during the May part-session we should celebrate the anniversary of the people's victory and the crushing of the Fascist axis. It was a victory of very great significance. Europe was saved from Fascist barbarism, and has been able to live in peace for 40 years.

The contribution of the Greek people to the war against Fascism was very great. In 1940-1941 the Greek army scored the first victory against the Fascist axis, delayed its advance, and by dint of magnificent and heroic resistance for four years and at the cost of half a million lives, lent considerable strength to the common struggle against Fascism.

Mr President, the basic lesson we must remember as we celebrate this anniversary is that we should intensify our struggle for peace, for the avoidance of a war incomparably more destructive and lethal than the 2nd World War. All the more so since those who newly aspire to world domination are fomenting conflicts in various areas on our planet, supporting the resurgence of Fascism and its methods, escalating the arms race, and trying to spread war even into space. In parallel, they are intensifying their attacks against the international agreements that guarantee the inviolability of postwar frontiers, and are directing vindictive territorial demands against independent nations.

We believe absolutely that if the peoples of Europe, of the whole world, intensify their struggle and coordinate their actions, they can frustrate these criminal plans and save mankind from wholesale destruction.

Mr Beyer de Ryke (L). — *(FR)* Mr President, Honorable Members, a long history, a harrowing history of suffering wrought by what has been called, by what we in this House have in fact called the European civil wars, does not need a long speech to ask you to ratify symbolically the resolution from which I take some of the names (in the order in which they appear) involved in a dynasty which reigned over Europe, and over Germany in particular, of a woman who symbolizes the suffering of a *Nacht und Nebel*, of a Group Chairman, whose country — Britain — was the rock on which the waves of National Socialism crashed and then foundered, and of another Chairman whose Group claims the heritage of the pride of the French resistance, Charles de Gaulle.

They all combine to paraphrase what Briand, in his cello-like voice, meant with his now famous cry: 'Lay down your cannon! Lay down your machine guns!' It was a great illusion at the time because nobody listened. Let us hope they take more notice of us. This is what justifies the construction of what we are doing and the spire of Strasbourg cathedral is the stone flame of our ideal.

Mr Pelikan (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, Honorable Members, it is a good thing for the European Parlia-

Pelikan

ment to join with those who are commemorating the 40th anniversary of the end of the War, of the liberation of Auschwitz and the Yalta conference, for Yalta has unfairly become the symbol of the division of Europe. But this idea of Europe being shared out by the great Western powers and the Soviet Union is not borne out by any documents from the conference or any testimony from those involved. On the contrary, one of the documents from the conference is a declaration on a liberated Europe in which the three participants recognize that all the peoples — and I mean all — of Europe have the right democratically, by free elections that is to say, to choose the system under which they want to live.

So there was no collusion against Europe by the great powers — just unilateral and arbitrary alteration of the results of Yalta by the Soviet Union, which therefore has considerable responsibility for the present situation.

However, neither can we forget that Czechoslovakia was betrayed by the West in the autumn of 1938, nor can we forget the Russo-German pact of 1939 or, above all, the war triggered off by Nazi Germany and the political, military and psychological consequences it had for the countries of Europe.

I agree that relations should be developed between all the countries of Europe — but it would be wrong to forget that we want more than just relations between the governments. We must always remember that, in the countries of the Eastern bloc, it is the Sakharovs, the 1977 Charter people and the Lech Walesas who are our real partners and our real allies in the campaign for a united Europe.

(Applause)

In conclusion, Mr President, I should like to emphasize the fact that the present division of Europe is no basis for stability or peace. Quite the opposite. A gradual breakdown, by different methods, of this division of Europe is what the European peoples want in their heart of hearts and it would be the greatest contribution to the maintenance of peace in Europe and the world.

(Applause)

President. — The joint debate is closed.

(Parliament adopted the resolution Doc. 2-1599/84/rev. and resolution No 1¹ replacing the two resolutions Doc. 2-1623/84 and Doc. 2-1647/84. Parliament then adopted resolution Doc. 2-1629/84).

¹ *Amendment No 1 by Mr Chambeiron and Mr Cervetti, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, Mr Ford and Mr Arndt, on behalf of the Socialist Group.*

Election of Members of the EP

President. — The next item on the agenda is the debate on the motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-1619/84) by Mr de la Malène, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, Mr Klepsch on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, Mrs Veil on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, Sir Henry Plumb on behalf of the European Democratic Group, on the significance of a single system for the election of Members of the European Parliament.

Mr de la Malène (RDE). — *(FR)* Mr President, the resolution we tabled will, I hope, get the unanimous vote of this House.

We all know what the election by universal suffrage has brought to our Parliament and to the construction of Europe. So it seems reasonable to think that it would be a relative step backwards for our Parliament and for Europe if, tomorrow, some of its members were, for a time, not elected by universal suffrage.

This morning we adopted an amendment expressing satisfaction that this House was elected by universal suffrage. We ask you to confirm this vote, as it were, that is to say to let the relevant authorities and interested countries know, through our resolution, that it would be of the greatest importance for enlargement to take place in conditions which provide for this House to be composed of MPs elected by universal suffrage.

(Applause)

Don't let them tell us we don't have the time. Don't let them tell us that the example of the Greeks shows we can live otherwise. In the Greek case, there are first of all an infinitely smaller number of MPs and, second, and this is most important, the Greek divergence did not last long. But if we embark upon the course of action we fear, the divergence will last. It will last and the consequences on the weight and the legitimacy of this House will be considerable. But this House needs to be legitimate at a time when this Europe of ours has serious difficulties to handle.

It is for all these reasons that we call upon the competent authorities and the Spanish and Portuguese authorities. They want to join Europe. They are going to join Europe. But when in Rome, they must do as the Romans do. They must make a gesture for Europe that reflects their faith in Europe and that gesture is to elect their representatives, in both Spain and Portugal, by universal suffrage. This is possible and it is necessary. It is necessary for the legitimacy of our House and it is necessary for the very success of enlargement.

(Applause)

Mr von der Vring (S). — (DE) Mr President, I should like to begin by making one point quite clear: obviously direct elections to the European Parliament should follow Spanish and Portuguese accession as quickly as possible. This was the view expressed in the 1980 Blumenfeld report on Greek accession which Parliament adopted and it should also apply now. But that is not what this resolution is all about. The mere fact that Messrs de la Malène and Klepsch, Mrs Veil and Sir Henry Plumb have tabled the motion provokes the question as to why a group of right-wing parties should concern itself with Spain and Portugal. I particularly welcome Mr de la Malène's support for Enlargement to the South. I am very surprised to see Mr Klepsch's name on a document implying that the Spanish and Portuguese governments are unaware of their democratic obligations. This is like urging someone not to beat his wife when there is no evidence that he has any intention of doing so. Mrs Veil: do you agree that it is insulting to insist that these governments set a date for elections for the first week in January 1986 by claiming that delegated members would not have the proper credentials? Incidentally, I find Mr Bocklet's amendments very helpful.

Mr President, whatever the motives behind the resolution, we cannot behave like this. What sort of picture is Parliament presenting to the people of the Iberian peninsula? Are we setting ourselves up as examples of democracy, as teachers? Do you really expect these Parliaments to discuss and adopt electoral laws at a time when accession is still uncertain, when the Council of Ministers is still wrangling over olives and wine. Legally, an electoral law can only come into force when accession has taken place. But Spain and Portugal must be represented in this Parliament from the beginning. Therefore in the short-term we cannot avoid a situation similar to that on Greek accession.

Ladies and gentlemen, you should not disparage the credentials of these potential colleagues, even if they are only to be with us for a few weeks. This is quite out of the question, whoever the colleagues. It is clear that there is bound to be a delay of some months before elections can take place.

Spain is faced with the practical problems of whether to have one or two national elections in 1986. The European Parliament has no right to decide this! To interfere in this way — with party-political undertones — without clarifying the situation, without talking to those involved, using a procedure of urgent and topical debate is outrageous! What sort of impression will the Spanish and Portuguese public have of this Parliament!

These countries are anxious to join us. They have set aside their personal interests and have taken the political decision for European democracy. They are risking a great deal. They have come to appreciate the help of this Parliament that has always opposed pettyfogging small-mindedness on major political issues. But now

that Parliament itself is concerned, it is a different story. What a sorry picture we present!

Mr President, let us revert to the line we took with Greece in the Blumenfeld report. Direct elections as soon as possible is enough. Let us not pontificate. Hence our motion for a resolution. We would like to discuss this matter in the joint committees with our Spanish and Portuguese colleagues in the appropriate manner to find a solution free of the odium of any party-political interference.

May I add that I withdraw amendments 7 and 8 which refer to the Council to keep to the Blumenfeld motion for a resolution.

(Applause from the left)

Mr Bocklet (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen! It is obviously unacceptable that there should be Members in this Parliament for three years who have not been directly elected. On the other hand, we should apply the same ruling that was used in the case of Greece. I have therefore tabled an amendment calling for direct elections in the applicant countries Spain and Portugal by the end of the first year. This represents a compromise between the basic principle which I am sure we all accept and what is feasible, and observes the rules of diplomatic courtesy towards the applicant countries.

Secondly: when we agree on a joint proposal this April for a standardized electoral procedure we should try to ensure that the applicant countries take account of this in their electoral laws, even if the Council has not at that point accepted our proposal, in order to prevent electoral procedures in individual Member States from drifting even further apart.

Lord Douro (ED). — Mr President, I speak as chairman of the Joint Committee of this Parliament and the Spanish *Cortes* and I very much regret that the resolution which we are considering today was, in fact, only signed by the groups on this side of the House. I very much regret that the Socialists did not join it and, indeed, that they tried to remove the item from the agenda yesterday. This, I hope, is not a party-political matter. We are a directly-elected Parliament and we want to ensure that all Members of this House are directly elected. We do not want to have two classes of Members. I am aware that Greece was given one year in which to elect its Members of Parliament, but I think that was an unfortunate precedent which we should not repeat in this case.

Of course, it is inconvenient for all governments to hold elections and, certainly, the present Member States of the Community may have found it inconvenient to hold direct elections to the European Parliament in June 1984. However, it is an obligation of

Lord Dourou

membership of the Community that the member countries should hold direct elections to the European Parliament so that they have their own representatives here in Strasbourg.

I am very surprised at the attitude of Mr von der Vring. This matter has been discussed with both our Spanish and Portuguese colleagues, and I was present on both occasions. He knows it has been discussed. He is right in one sense, because there was not agreement, but it has been discussed so no one should pretend that we have not consulted our Spanish and Portuguese colleagues.

It also concerns Parliament. Of course, Parliament has a right to give its opinion on matters about membership of this House. It certainly is urgent because the negotiations will, we hope, be concluded within the next few weeks and there will be an article in the Treaties of Accession particularly referring to this matter, as indeed there was in the case of Greece. So it is absolutely right that this should be discussed today. I am sorry it is appearing to be a party-political issue. I hope all groups in this House will support a perfectly moderate resolution which simply asks our Spanish and Portuguese colleagues to ensure that they send directly-elected Members to this Parliament as soon as they are members of the Community and, of course, we all hope that that will be next January.

(Applause from the European Democratic Group)

Mrs Barbarella (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, we have three basic objections to this resolution.

In the first place, we object to the fact that, at every sitting, more or less the same questions turn up, but with different proposals for their solution. I should like to recall that, during the January sitting, we adopted a resolution, presented by the Committee on Political Affairs, that referred to the question of enlargement and, in addition, the question of the appointment of Members of the European Parliament.

Secondly, I should like to remind this Assembly that the ministerial committee for negotiations on enlargement has already decided that, when the treaty of accession comes into force, the Members of Parliament of the new Member States must at the same time take on their functions. This has already happened in the case of Greece, and I do not see why we should change our attitude in the specific case of Spain and Portugal. Moreover, I should like to remind members that we used this same initial 'flexibility' — if we can call it that — in other cases also, as well as in the case of Greece. Obviously, it is the wish of us all that the Portuguese and Spanish members of the European Parliament should also be elected by universal suffrage as well, but it is equally evident that we cannot, on this account, slow down the process of enlargement, and that, therefore, we must accept flexibility and accept

the new Members of the European Parliament in accordance with the rules that we have already approved in the case of Greece.

Mr Kuijpers (ARC). — *(NL)* Mr President, like the rest of my group I am also in favour of Spain and Portugal acceding to the Community. But even before the accession date is fixed we are behaving like an interfering mother-in-law by wanting to decide on internal elections in the Iberian peninsula.

The motion for a resolution contains a passage on the symbolic value of universal suffrage for the new — and I stress 'new' — democracies of Spain and Portugal. What do we say then of the value of the anti-democratic election systems of Great Britain and France? Would these Jacobin states not be better giving a democratic example of proportional representation? The two new states are entitled to organise their elections themselves. We can but refer to the Bocklet report which envisages a proportional election procedure. We can but point to international law in Europe on the basis of which respect should be given to the peoples of the Iberian peninsula who historically have older rights than the Spanish and Portuguese state and I think it only fair that Catalonia, the Basque country and Galicia, to name but a few, should have a proportional representation system just like many peoples represented here.

Lord Cockfield, Vice-President of the Commission. — Mr President, the question of parliamentary representation for the applicant countries has already been raised during the enlargement negotiations. The Community has considered that, as in the case of Greek accession, Spain and Portugal should be allowed to choose between the following two options: first, either to hold supplementary, partial elections for the reduced period, or, secondly, by way of exception make use of their quotas in accordance with the formula in the original Treaty. That is, the Spanish and Portuguese Parliaments would appoint delegates from among their members until the third direct elections are held simultaneously throughout the enlarged Community. The option chosen by each will be specified in the instruments of accession. Portugal has already made it known that it intends to adopt the second of these options, whilst Spain has not yet announced a decision in this connection.

President. — The debate is closed.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)

Mr Elliott (S). — Mr President, on a point of order. I want to refer to the English text of the de la Malène resolution which we have just been voting on. I think it is very unfortunate that this text, in the way that it is printed, seems to suggest by implication a totally com-

Elliott

mon practice of voting in elections. I know that is not the real intention. We are simply saying that we should have direct democratic elections without perhaps specifying any particular form of voting. The English text does suggest that there should be total uniformity in the system of voting. I do not think that is the intention, and I hope that in any future publicity on this particular motion it is quite clear.

President. — We shall consider your objection and have the translations looked at in the light of the original.

International Women's Day

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-1600/84/rev. II) by Mrs Van den Heuvel, on behalf of the Socialist Group, Mrs De Backer-Van Ocken, on behalf of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group), Mrs Veil and Mrs Larive-Groenendaal, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, Mr Battersby, on behalf of the European Democratic Group, Mrs Cinciari Rodano, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, Mr de la Malène, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, on the unofficial meeting of the Ministers responsible for women's rights of 7 March 1985 on the occasion of International Women's Day.

Mrs Van den Heuvel (S). — (NL) Mr President, there has already been much discussion in this Parliament on the need for a policy to end inequality between men and women. Debates in this House can still count on a hefty majority. And that could lead us to the conclusion that the majority even of our male colleagues here agree that this unacceptable discrimination must be combated with all our energy. Yet I still have my doubts.

We still find people who do admittedly campaign for equal rights for — and I only give a few examples — followers of a particular religious group, for citizens of a particular country, for all social classes — and to avoid any misunderstanding I want to say here that such commitment has my full support — but who appear to be considerably less concerned when half the human race, namely women, are discriminated against by governments. And it is precisely because there is still so much inequality, precisely because too little attention is paid to the discrimination against women, that the Socialist Group welcomes the fact that our former colleague Yvette Roudy, now Minister for Women's Rights in France, took the initiative last year of organising a ministerial meeting for the first time on the position of women on the occasion of International Women's Day.

Nonetheless we wish to make some comments, especially on the procedure adopted by the Council. The

problems before us are well known to us all. The governments of our countries must be forced finally to implement equal treatment for men and women. This House has debated a number of directives submitted by the Commission and has urged the Council on various occasions to adopt them. One could well imagine: so much the better then that the ministers with portfolios for women's affairs are now meeting to take decisions at last. But unfortunately, things are not as rosy as that. It is true that the Ministers of the Ten are meeting at the request of many, including this House, but it seems as if simultaneously everything is being done to prevent results emerging from such a meeting. Last year it was called an informal Council, now it is being called an informal meeting of the Ministers as an informal Council now appears to be too serious a formula.

I fear this could be a symptom of the low priority many members of the Council give to this affair. When Mr Andreotti introduced the Italian presidency, for example, no mention was made at all of the enormous task facing the Community in the area of equal treatment for men and women. Fortunately I can say that some men regard this problem as an actual problem, but those men and women whom we represent here must feel bitterly disappointed by it all. My group hopes that the motion for a resolution under discussion today will help to improve the situation.

Mrs Lenz (PPE), chairman of the Committee on Women's Rights. — (DE) Mr President! I should like to point out that it was the express wish of our committee that this motion for a resolution should be tabled. It is based on drafts from the Socialist Group and the Group of the European People's Party (Christian Democratic Group) and now represents a joint statement by all the Groups which signed it.

I welcome the continuation of a tradition begun last year, even if International Women's Day is not celebrated by all political parties and in all countries on the same scale: there are still considerable differences. Our main concern, however, is quite different. We are urging the Council (whether formally or informally) to take action to promote equality for women in Europe at a faster rate.

The adoption of the recommendation for a campaign for positive measures in December 1984 is merely a cautious step in the right direction. We had hoped that particularly the Member States would have reported promptly on the implementation of the directive on equal access to social security. We strongly urge the Council and the Member States to show more imaginativeness in the field of policies for women and to give more positive information on what has been achieved. Is it really so difficult to convert the campaigns in our countries, some of which are very positive, to conform to Parliament's wishes? Our Member States ought to be a great deal faster and better at taking initiatives which would meet with Parliament's approval.

Lenz

We call on both the Commission and the Council equally to increase pressure on the national civil services, both sides of industry and political parties to implement our demands. In view of the high level of unemployment and the new, revolutionary technologies, there is an alarming potential for unrest among the population, particularly among young people. We are calling for action and intend to make this clear to the ministers on 7 March.

(Applause from the centre)

Mrs Maij-Weggen (PPE). — *(NL)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we welcome the fact that the Council is again holding an informal meeting on the position of women in the European Community. It is precisely in these times of economic crisis that the attainments of women in the seventies come under severe attack. A meeting such as that planned in Rome can be an important shot in the arm for women who feel under threat.

Nevertheless, a word of criticism is also in place. An informal Council can admittedly look at the problems, but it cannot take any decisions, and at the moment decisions are more necessary than ever before.

In the seventies the EEC adopted three important directives which had a very positive effect on improving women's lot: in the area of pay, in the legal position of women on the labour market and in social security.

Following a debate in 1982 in this House a new series of directives was prepared to guarantee equal treatment of women in other areas, including part-time work, temporary work, professional regulations and collective wage agreements, parental leave and self-employed professions. But what has happened in practice? Since 1978, since the Third Directive was adopted, no single directive on equal treatment has been passed in the Council. Five new directives are waiting for a Council decision and no further decisions have been taken in the past seven years. Of course the Council has adopted some resolutions or recommendations. But resolutions and recommendations do not have the force of law. Directives *are* binding. That is why we welcome the informal meetings of the Council but what we really need is a formal Council meeting where decisions are taken. After seven years Europe's women are wondering whether they can still count on Europe. It is time for the Council to prove they can.

Mrs Veil (L). — *(FR)* Mr President, I am pleased at the initiative which some groups have taken and with which we are very pleased to associate ourselves. It is very important for the relevant Council of Ministers at last to deal with the large number of suggestions and resolutions which Parliament has taken in this field. I think the date that has been fixed is an excellent one.

I should like to stress the fact that, in our countries, bearing in mind the economic problems and unemployment above all, women have their own special difficulties at the present time, when I look back at the way women's status has evolved over the past 20 years, I think that things are marking time for the moment and I am worried about the future of the younger generations. As things stand, they are at a crossroads.

Decisions have to be taken to prepare their future and they may be somewhat discouraged that no really decisive provisions have been made in this field to enable women to make any real choice in the organization of their lives, to combine the full life of a woman who wants to have a family — and it is quite normal for them to want this for their happiness — and the responsibilities of professional, political and economic life. We are to an ever greater extent aware that this is extremely difficult. To achieve it, a certain number of proposals we have made absolutely must be taken into consideration. For if there is one field in which Europe can play its part and get the countries to follow suit, it is that of the legal and indeed the sociological situation of women. This is why my Group, naturally, will support the resolution — which it has signed.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

Mrs Heinrich (ARC). — *(DE)* The Rainbow Group supports the request for an urgent debate on International Women's Day on 8 March. However, we are concerned that the Council merely intends to hold informal discussions on the urgent problems of women. The long list of cases where equality between men and women does not work demonstrates the need for urgent action. After all, this is the twentieth century and not the middle ages.

Laws on the equality of women binding on all Member States should have been enacted long ago. Even if the odd directive does exist, what are the Community institutions doing to ensure that they really work? What is being done to implement these directives? The European Community does not usually find it difficult to issue rules and regulations.

Examples are important as they lead to shifts in public opinion. Changes in public opinion cannot be induced by legislation. But if the Council simply intends to meet informally to discuss problems which after all affect half of the people of Europe, then we Parliamentary women should not be satisfied with demands for one woman commissioner, we should take over the Council for a change.

(Applause)

Mrs Squarcialupi (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, first of all I should like to make an observation. With this resolution we are calling on the Council for action,

Squarcialupi

and yet there is no representative of the Council here present, and there are not many members of the Commission. Despite that, we hope that, through the medium of the provisional edition of the verbatim report, the Council will take note of what we say and, hopefully, take proper account of it. It is time that that happened, seeing that we have been waiting for so many years for decisions on the four directives that are very important for women, but are also important for the whole of society. That which is important for women, let us remember, does not only concern women but society as a whole and, obviously, the family.

We shall do everything in our power, therefore, to unfreeze this situation, since we cannot hope that in the next Council approval will be given to the directives in question, and also because, otherwise, we cannot even hope that attention will be given to other subjects about which European women are so concerned.

Let the Council and the Commission know, therefore, that the European Parliament, thanks mainly to its women Members, will always be very careful and very vigilant, because women are the emerging class of society and have a part to play, the most important part, today, in the building of Europe.

(Applause from the left)

President. — The debate is closed.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)

EAGGF

President. — The next item is the joint debate on

- the motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-1596/84) by Mr Provan, on behalf of the European Democratic Group, on Mafia frauds in Italy,
- the motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-1638/84) by Mr De Pasquale and others, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, Mr Gautier and others, on behalf of the Socialist Group, and Mr Provan, Mr Battersby and Mr Hutton on Mafia fraud at the Community's expense in Sicily.

Mr Provan (ED). — Mr President, can I say at the outset how pleased I am to see the Commissioner himself here to listen to a debate on what I believe will be an important and continuing aspect of monitoring CAP expenditure in the future.

Mr President, this is not an anti-Italian resolution in any way at all. It is not meant to be a divisive resolu-

tion. It is meant to be a helpful resolution to Members of this House who wish to see the Community rid itself of a scourge that has been with us for too long. We must not allow Community finance to go towards encouraging thuggery and intimidation. We must not allow payments from the Community to assist protectionism and deceit. We must stamp it out.

It is not for the European Parliament, however, to interfere in Member States' own internal affairs. What we must do is help citizens to live in real freedom. However, we have got a responsibility as a Parliament, Mr President, because Community monies are being spent. If that Community expenditure is being diverted for whatever reason, we have got a responsibility as a Parliament to point it out and we have got a responsibility to ask the Commission and the Court of Auditors to do something about it.

What particularly galls me is that in the 1985 draft budget there was a line, line 387, calling for a payment of 8 million ECU to monitor CAP expenditure in a Member State. Under the Treaty it is already incumbent on that Member State to monitor without payment. I cannot understand why the Commission came forward with these proposals at all in the first place. It would be helpful if we could have a real and proper explanation. For too long there have been too many allegations and too many rumours to allow this to continue. I would have thought, Mr Commissioner, that in the circumstances it would have been better for your own officials, at your own expense, to carry out that monitoring of CAP expenditure rather than granting extra finance to a Member State which has already shown perhaps that it cannot monitor the situation properly.

Therefore I would hope that there are many in this House who will be able to support what the Italian Communists sitting opposite have really brought to the forefront for debate today. It is not for me to take the initiative. It has come from within the Member State itself. I believe that that is a welcome opportunity for this House to support a very courageous initiative.

I will certainly be supporting Mr De Pasquale in his efforts and I know that he, coming from the part of the Community that he does, is aware of the problems and certainly needs encouragement. I believe that the European Parliament must show solidarity and show that we are trying to assist in ridding the Community of this scourge and granting freedom to people. I am surprised at some of the amendments that have been tabled. The trouble with most of them is that they wish to deflect our view from the main issue in the resolutions and therefore appear to condone some of the things to which we are totally opposed as a Community.

Mr De Pasquale (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, I should like to thank Mr Provan. By adopting this reso-

De Pasquale

lution, Parliament will be doing an act of great political and moral importance. In Sicily, the forces of the State, the courts, the police, are carrying on — with the growing support of a vast, youthful movement of the people — a difficult bloody fight against the Mafia. This fight should be carried on at all levels, including the Community level. We have reported here a number of frauds to the detriment of Sicilian and Community producers, as they emerge from the judicial inquiries, without exaggeration and without dressing them up. In these trials you can see the most notorious, the most feared, and, until yesterday, the most respected names of the hierarchy of the Sicilian Mafia — Greco, Salvo, Aiello and others.

Through the fraudulent use of Community rules, and using a vast network of accomplices, the intervention of the Mafia has thus penetrated even into this sector. We have asked the Commission to intervene, investigate and check. The destruction of products, for example, that is financed by the Community, is the first source of fraud; change the rules, therefore, avoid destroying the fruits of the earth and man's labour. But, so far, the Commission has pretended not to see, not to know, not to understand. The Sicilian people are healthy and hardworking. Sicily is not the Mafia, as some people obviously think. Sicily is fighting against the Mafia. It must therefore be helped, and its economic, social and civil development supported. That is why we call on the regional, national and Community public authorities each to do their duty. No one must be an accomplice of the parasitism of the Mafia, not even passively and through inertia. Every lira gained by the Mafia is a lira lost to the production, the work, the employment of the Sicilians. And to those who exhort us to keep quiet, those who invite us to join a conspiracy of silence, we answer 'No'! It is not our denunciations that sully Sicily's image, but the conniving, the fraud, the crimes that are committed or tolerated. The cleaning up of public life in Sicily must be done by the Sicilians themselves, and this is what we are trying to do — and from you, members of all parties, we ask for understanding and support.

(Applause)

Mr Gautier (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen! The Socialist Group supports both these motions for resolutions and intends to reject all the amendments tabled by the Christian Democrats. There are two reasons for this.

Firstly, for years we have had good reason to believe that certain Community directives are not always complied with as they should be in Italy. We base this assertion on analyses and statistics, and also on information from the Court of Auditors on fruit and vegetables and believe that the Mafia could be involved in fraudulent practices.

Secondly, and more importantly, I feel that the Community institutions and Parliament should support

those in Italy who, for years, have been trying to combat the Mafia effectively. Council President Pandolfi informed us in Berlin that some of the present Italian government are attempting to implement an active campaign against the Mafia. There are courageous state prosecutors in Italy carrying out investigations in some cases at the risk of their lives. During the Pope's visit some years ago to Sicily, he urged that attempts must be made to prevent Mafia involvement in politics and I also recall that many of our colleagues here, in my group, as well as in the Communist group have also been in the forefront of the campaign against the Mafia for years, at considerable personal risk. We have a moral obligation to support this campaign with the aid of the Community institutions and instruments and we as Socialists therefore intend to support both these motions for resolutions.

(Applause)

Mr Costanzo (PPE). — *(IT)* Mr President, I note that in Mr Provan's proposal, the content has very little to do with the title.

You are right, Mr Provan, to be alarmed at the many rumours concerning fraud and infringements to the detriment of the EAGGF, but I find it strange that you should bother to ask for greater checks, and greater stringency, only as far as concerns the operation of certain types of Community aid, and only for a limited number of products, overlooking the fact that the Court of Auditors in its annual reports, also primarily suspects fraud in connection with other products and other countries.

Mr Provan, in the country which is the subject of your resolution — and, I believe, in that country only — the courts are interested in fraud, and take action. I do not know whether the same thing is true of the other countries which, according to the report of the Court of Auditors, are concerned in so-called fraud.

We do not intend in the least, with the amendments that we are presenting, to water down the Provan proposal. Instead, we wish to make it complete. That is to say, we want to urge the Commission and all other Community institutions to act promptly and fully in order to prevent and uproot all frauds at the expense of Community Funds, and ask for them to be severely punished, no matter by whom or where these frauds are committed.

With regard to the proposal of Mr De Pasquale, we have to say, clearly and explicitly, that we are all concerned and alarmed at what is emerging from the investigations by the Italian courts into interference by the Mafia in the use of Community funds in Sicily and in other regions.

The competent institutions and departments of the Community must not therefore remain indifferent and

Costanzo

inert, Mr Commissioner for Agriculture; instead they must take all the initiatives and steps that the situation calls for. And let that happen within the framework of your own powers, Mr Gautier.

Of course, Mr De Pasquale's proposal can have, and does have, our support and it can have the support of this Assembly. But the validity of a parliamentary resolution — I say this to my friend and colleague, Mr De Pasquale — especially in this Parliament, with the powers that we have, depends on its ability to make itself effective and, therefore, its ability to be accepted by the institution to which it is addressed. But it does not seem to me that Mr De Pasquale's proposal is designed to help and support the meritorious and brave initiative of the Italian courts which are investigating, without hindrance and without respect for anyone, the activities of the Mafia and its interference in the use of Community funds. I do not think that any investigation by the so-called inspectors of the European Commission can bring clarity to the Mafia investigations, or speed them up or make them more stringent.

In my opinion, the Commission should do three things only. First: it should set up an inquiry inside its own offices to check whether, by chance, the Mafia has not sunk its roots also in the Berlaymont Building, in view of the fact that the Mafia has now a multinational structure and is of multinational dimensions.

Secondly: the Commission should give the Italian courts all available information and every assistance, to facilitate the judicial inquiries that are in progress. Then, in agreement with the national authorities, it should take all appropriate initiatives to ensure that, not only in Italy but in all Member States, action be taken by the courts to ascertain the nature and explanation of all of the numerous frauds committed in all countries and regions of the Community — not only in Sicily — as can be seen clearly from the recent report of the Court of Auditors.

Thirdly: contrary to what Mr De Pasquale asks, the Commission should suspend payments destined for undertakings that are the subject of judicial inquiry.

We call for help to be given to the courts, to enable them to carry out their investigations everywhere with speed, severity and fairness.

Mr Maher (L). — Mr President, anyone who believes in the future of this Community and, therefore, in the policies that are commonly pursued by the Community, must support any effort to ensure that any wrong-doing which leads to these policies being brought into disrepute is stamped out. That is why my group will particularly support the resolution by Mr De Pasquale.

That is not to suggest that we are against what Mr Provan is saying, but I think Mr De Pasquale's resolu-

tion does give a somewhat broader base to this subject. The last thing I believe we want to do in this House is to point the finger too directly at wrong-doing in any particular country — in this case Italy and more precisely on the island of Sicily — because there is proof that in the past, in other parts of the Community and in other countries, misappropriation of Community funds has occurred. These funds were not always used as they should be used. There has been wrong-doing in other parts of the Community. So I do not think we should try to suggest that it is only in Italy that such misappropriation is taking place. However, I think it is necessary to emphasize one point that was made by Mr Provan, namely, that where Community funds — and it is taxpayers' money — are being used it is the responsibility of the Community, through the Commission, to monitor what is going on. I do not think it is enough to depend on member governments to ensure that everything is done correctly. If it were, this kind of abuse would not take place. Therefore, I would insist that it is the responsibility of the Commission to monitor what is going on in each Member State to ensure that Community money is not wasted and does not find its way into the hands of people who are essentially against the operation of the European Community. This kind of practice is not to the advantage of farmers or the taxpayer and must be stamped out.

Mr Guarraci (S). — *(IT)* Mr President, the fact of having called for and taken part in a debate on the details of frauds, illicit operations, speculation and the Mafia, which have been uncovered by the Sicilian courts, and the fact of having called for the debate as a matter of urgency — and asked for Parliament to vote to commit the Commission to get to work with prompt initiatives aimed at blocking, uncovering and denouncing every form of speculation by the Mafia — both show the commitment of Mr De Pasquale — who tabled the motion — and the other signatories, to the protection of the Community's institutions, and to ensuring that the Community's resources — the taxes contributed by the citizens of Europe — should be used for the sole benefit, in every field and sector, of whomsoever is legitimately entitled to them, through systems and procedures that are totally transparent and widely publicized, and are in themselves able to discourage any form of parasitic intervention by the Mafia.

To have done this, Mr President, is no small thing, and — if you will permit me to say this to those of us who are from Sicily, Mr President — it is even more remarkable, seeing that precious time has already been lost. We now need to act urgently, and we must immediately separate the wheat from the chaff. That is why we subscribed to the De Pasquale motion for a resolution, and why we call for its adoption.

Let it be clear, however, that because it is we who have raised the question that does not at all mean that this

Guarraci

problem exists only in our country, and that all the other regions of the Community are immune and exempt. It may perhaps move others who are affected, though certainly not to the same extent, to do likewise, namely denounce and fight every form of degeneration and parasitic intervention in every region, sector and field of the Community wherever there are signs of its presence.

Let the organs of the Community carry out their investigations; but they should also at the same time make an objective examination of the instruments and systems by which Community funds are made available, to assess whether any changes are necessary to make them proof against parasitic infiltration and penetration by the Mafia, obviously taking care that any initiative and action taken cannot and must not in the slightest degree hinder or even delay the proper use of resources, thereby penalizing twice over those honest people that constitute the majority of Sicilian operators.

Mrs Castle (S). — Mr President, I want to congratulate Mr De Pasquale on his courageous initiative and on the content of his report in which I am proud to have had my own absorbed. Of course it is not just a question of saying Italy is the only place where frauds take place. But there is a special problem in Italy in which he has asked for our support, and this Parliament should give it wholeheartedly. There have been a succession of frauds exposed in this Parliament over the past few years: frauds over tomato paste, over olive oil, over wine, over fruit and vegetables — we all remember them — from the mysterious subsidy of 150 million that was given to olive trees which we then found did not exist. And one could go on quoting case after case which has been raised in this Parliament.

These frauds are bad enough when it is a question of diverting taxpayers' money into the pockets of petty criminals. But here there is growing evidence, as our Italian friends have pointed out to us, that some of this fraudulently obtained money is being siphoned off into the pockets of a criminal gang. And all the Commission has been able to say to us over the past years is that it is encouraging the national authorities to step up their monitoring. And we know that has not worked. That is why in 1982 this Parliament adopted the Marck report calling for much stronger control powers to be given to the Commission itself. That was adopted with very little dissent in this Parliament, but it has never been put into action by the Council of Ministers. As I understand it, the Commission's regulation has not been adopted even though Parliament stressed that it should. Today, Mr President, we need a new Marck report; we need new far-reaching investigations by the Commission; we need detailed annual reports to this Parliament; we need a new machinery for Commission monitoring; we need a new drive to stamp out fraud and not only to stamp out fraud but to help the Italian Government to stamp out crime.

(Applause)

Mr Aigner (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen! I welcome this discussion. The members of the Committee on Budgetary Control will confirm that the fight against fraud is one of their main concerns. I should like to remind you of a report by our former colleague Mr Gabert on this subject which was adopted by the previous Parliament unanimously. I strongly urge Members to re-read these reports. We have also requested the Bureau for permission to draw up a new own-initiative report.

The potential for conflict is obvious and can be summarized as follows: subsidies are paid in advance to Member States on the basis of information supplied by the Member States. Monitoring is carried out by the Member States which also bear the cost of monitoring. The more efficient the monitoring is, the less money each country receives. The less effective the monitoring is, the more money it receives, with correspondingly less of its own funds having to be spent by a country. This system represents a conflict in itself.

We have observed with great concern that the customs authorities are gradually becoming less conscientious. As you will be aware, customs authorities are national bodies. They collect the Community duties on behalf of the Community, but the cost is borne by the Member States. We must resolve this conflict somehow — we have already made various suggestions.

I should like to make the following point on the fight against fraud in Italy: fraudulent practices occur everywhere. The latest statistics on fraud show 124 cases of fraud in West Germany, but only 4 in Italy. It would therefore seem that most cases of fraud occur in West Germany, which is of course untrue. The reason is simply that the German investigating authorities are more efficient than in other countries. The administrative and investigation bodies have greater powers.

I would also like to add my thanks to those of Mr Gautier to the Italian authorities. The personal courage shown deserves recognition by this House. But this is not enough. Some 10 or 12 years ago, the previous Parliament called for the establishment of a flying squad to enable surprise checks to be carried out by the Community. The former Commissioner Mr Cheysson promised Parliament at the time that this would be done. To date, however, nothing has been achieved — I am aware that the main culprit is the Council and fully agree with my colleagues. Public opinion must be mobilized so that stronger monitoring authorities and instruments can be created in the Member States. There is no other effective way of combating these fraudulent practices.

Mr Andriessen, Vice-President of the Commission. — *(NL)* Mr President, the Commission is grateful to the Parliament for having raised so enthusiastically once again the question of controlling the expenditure of Community money. I am very willing, at the beginning

Andriessen

of my new responsibilities in the new Commission, to promise this House that I shall do everything in my power to use the existing instruments to the full and if necessary to develop new ones.

The point at issue is both a general and a particular one. The general problem is as follows. It is not true to say that specific measures are necessary in one country or another. Frauds and irregularities are perpetrated in all Member States. They must be checked and if necessary punished. As I already said, the Commission will try to act, although as far as the Council is concerned all I can do is promise that I shall try with all the power I have to ensure that the Council adopts the proposals in front of it and enables us to exercise these controls. I would add one thing, which is that I would hope to find in the Community's budget the necessary finance to cover an extension of the instruments. We must have the practical instruments. It is difficult enough to get the authority. But once we have the authority we must also have the instruments. So much, Mr President, for the general aspect.

May I perhaps be permitted to add this? It has been said here that perhaps we need a new market report. The Commission would welcome such a report as it might well support it in its attempt to organize things as well as possible.

Mr President, the motions for a resolution tabled by Mr De Pasquale and Mr Provan ask for a number of specific things. The Commission will respond to these questions positively insofar as possible. We shall instigate the investigation with the limited funds available and in proper cooperation with the authorities. We shall, if necessary and possible, implement the prescribed sanctions and we shall consult with the authorities on how best the existing Community instruments can be used in order to encourage as far as possible development and progress in the specific part of Italy we are discussing.

May I say in this connection that the Commission in its relevant actions — and the Commission has been active, it is not true to say that the Commission has been inactive in the past — has always had the support and the loyal cooperation of the Italian authorities in its actions for example on olives, on fruit and vegetables. I think it important to make this point.

That is all I wished to say in this debate. No answer to the question of guilt which is sub judice, and the Commission does not have access to the relevant files, but a promise that with the instruments of enforcement, if the Council will give us them and if the budget is available for them, we shall help all those who are trying to put order into these affairs and to stamp out other criminal activities in this field.

(Applause)

President. — The joint debate is closed.

Mr Provan proposed that references to 'in Italy' in the title and the references to 'wine and olive oil' in paragraphs 1 and 3 be deleted.

(With this amendment Parliament adopted the two resolutions)

*
* *

President. — We have some ten minutes left and can only get through the next business if no one speaks.

(Applause)

Good, we shall go ahead.

— **Motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-1522/84) by Mr Costanzo and others, on the damage caused by the exceptionally severe weather in many Mediterranean areas: adopted**

*
* *

— **Motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-1594/84) by Mrs Scrivener, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, on the damage caused by the cold weather in Europe: adopted**

*
* *

— **Motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-1615/84) by Mrs Dupuy and others, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, on the damage caused by the severe spell of cold weather in Europe: adopted**

*
* *

— **Motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-1637/84) by Mr Selva and Mr Klepsch, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, on the damage caused by the bad weather in the upper Val di Taro (Emilia): adopted**

*
* *

— **Motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-1649/84) by Mr Cervetti and others, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, on the damage caused by the bad weather in Europe: adopted**

*
* *

— **Motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-1524/84) by Mr Vandemeulebroucke and others, on behalf of the**

President

Rainbow Group, on measures which need to be taken in view of the air pollution which occurred in Europe in January 1985: *adoped*

*
* *

- Motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-1604/84) by Mrs Larive-Groenendaal and Mrs Veil, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, on treatment of a Community citizen by the Yugoslav authorities: *adopted*

*
* *

- Motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-1621/84) by Mrs Lizin and others, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the situation of Jorge Palma Donoso, Carlos Araneda Miranda and Hugo Marchant Moya, who are being held in Chile.

- Motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-1651/84) by Mr Cervetti and others, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, on the persistence of violence and repression in Chile.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 1¹, replacing the two motions for resolutions)

*
* *

- Motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-1627/84) by Mr Ulburghs and others, on the release of Nelson Mandela.

- Motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-1648/84) by Mr Wurtz and others, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, on the release of Nelson Mandela.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 1/rev.², replacing the two motions for resolutions)

*
* *

- Motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-1630/84) by Mr Schwalba-Hoth and others, on behalf of the Rainbow Group, and Mr Huckfield and others, on the

grouping together of politically motivated criminals in prisons in the Federal Republic of Germany and on the outrageous treatment of Members of the European Parliament visiting those prisons: *rejected*

*
* *

- Motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-1636/84) by Mr de Camaret and others, on behalf of the Group of the European Right, on the miserable plight of Christians in Lebanon: *rejected*.

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

IN THE CHAIR: MR MØLLER

Vice-President

4. Market in wine

President. — The next item on the agenda is the second report (Doc. 2-1575/84) by Mr Gatti, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food

- A. on the proposals from the European Communities to the Council (COM(84) 515 final — Doc. 2-629/84) for

I. a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 337/79 on the common organization of the market in wine

II. a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 338/79 laying down special provisions relating to quality wines produced in specified regions

III. a regulation introducing a derogation to the scheme provided for in Regulation (EEC) No 456/80 on the granting of temporary and permanent abandonment premiums in respect of certain areas under vines and of premiums for the renunciation of replanting

IV. a regulation on the granting for the 1985/86 to 1989/90 wine years of permanent abandonment premiums in respect of certain areas under vines

B. on the amended proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (COM(84) 539 final — Doc. 2-780/84) for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 337/79 on the common organization of the market in wine (COM(84) 515 final of 12.9. 1984)

C. on the proposals from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (COM(84) 714 final — Doc. 1447/84) for

¹ Amendment No 1 by Mr Cervetti, Mr Piquet and Mr Epbremidis, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, Mrs Lizin, Mrs Van den Heuvel, Mr Arndt, on behalf of the Socialist Group.

² Amendment No 1/rev. by Mr Ulburghs, Mr Wurtz, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, Mr Graefe zu Baringdorf, Mr Härlin, Mr Schwalba-Hoth, Mr Roelants du Vivier, Mr van der Lek, Mr Schmitt, Miss Tongue, Mrs Lizin, Mrs Viehoff, Mr Balfe, Mr Van Miert, Mr Ford, Mrs Baget-Bozzo, Mr Fellermaier, Mr Piermont, Mrs Durry, Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz.

President

- I. an amended proposal for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 337/79 on the common organization of the market in wine (COM(84) 515 final and COM(84) 539 final)
- II. an amended proposal for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 338/79 laying down special provisions relating to quality wines produced in specified regions (COM(84) 515 final)
- D. on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (COM(84) 775 final — Doc. 2-1481/84) for a third amendment to the proposal for a regulation amending regulation (EEC) No 337/79 on the common organization of the market in wine

Mr Gatti (COM), rapporteur. — (IT) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the resolution submitted for your consideration summarizes all of the discussions which, from September last year, have seen the members of the Committee on Agriculture often taking opposing sides, voting, and in the end finding agreed solutions for the grave situation in the wine sector, which, despite the fact of its having been governed for some time by regulations designed to bring about the structural reduction of production, has been marked in recent years by a state of imbalance in the market that still persists — the imbalance between production and utilization.

It has been a considerable task, for their assistance with which I have also to thank a number of private individuals and officials of the Community. I should like also to thank those colleagues who have always been present at discussions, making proposals and offering a systematic approach, and have shown the great importance of agreements and decisions that are not so much taken at top level but are increasingly of an institutional nature, firmly rooted in the true economic situations in individual countries.

And it is because of this principle of fairness, just balance and validity that, in this resolution, there are neither victors nor vanquished. The resolution on wine is not a neutral, anonymous collection of proposals made to keep everyone happy. On the contrary, the resolution presented to you by the Committee on Agriculture is a systematic, global set of measures aimed at tackling both the problems of the long-term equilibrium of the wine market, and the removal of some of its present anomalies. And I would like those colleagues who, I know, do not support this resolution, to give that aspect some consideration.

Simply because one detail — the question of sugaring — is approached in a certain way, they take a hostile view of the resolution as a whole. I think that this is the wrong line to take because, ladies and gentlemen, the situation in the wine sector is such that, either we have a complete, systematic set of measures, or the problem of surpluses will not be solved. It may possi-

bly be shelved, because production has fallen very considerably as the result of bad weather, but sooner or later it will come up again, in all countries, and we all know for example that the Community can no longer bear 7% costs in order to distill 27% of production. In 1983/84 32 million hectolitres of wine were sent for distillation, and we all know that the first to suffer for the failure to solve this problem are the producers.

In addition to these initial basic factors we have to consider the situation in the grape and wine growing sector as it is evidenced by the reports, which I shall not go into again, though I must thank the Commission for having always made the necessary documents available to us in good time. But, with regard to the Commission, may I be allowed, Mr Commissioner — whilst acknowledging publicly your having approached the problem of the wine sector systematically in the first place, putting forward draft regulations for both structural measures and measures to deal with the market — to say that unfortunately, from October onwards, there has been a sort of 'dance of the documents and draft regulations', down to the last one, which we have now before us, which reproduces in full what was agreed at the Dublin Summit, omitting a set of initial proposals that are extremely important and, from our point of view, fundamental for tackling the wine problem.

Now, it is fundamental that, where wine is concerned, both the Dublin Summit and the Commission's proposals should have removed the fixing of physical production quotas, that is to say, quotas per producer. But it is equally fundamental that the Commission should accept, of course, the lines — and I emphasise the lines — the spirit of Dublin; however I think that the criteria, too, should be accepted — the operative indications that come from the Commission itself and from Parliament — from the institutions, that is. If that does not happen, Mr Commissioner, if you copy — as you have done, in their entirety, down even to the punctuation — the Summit agreements, then you are doing nothing more than carrying out precisely that role of a secretariat that President Delors and you yourself — as you have also said again to us recently — say over and over again you do not want to carry out.

The documents that we are considering concern different aspects — as you have said — of the structural measures and market measures. The Committee on Agriculture has always discussed the grape and wine-growing sector as a whole, starting from one basic point, which is that there is a structural surplus of wine in the sector even though, obviously, the exact quantity of surplus wine cannot be identified because of the more or less accentuated processes of adulteration, and because of certain measures that are adopted in some countries which — even though they have been less, recently — place obstacles in the way of wine consumption. At all events, there is a structural surplus. The Committee acknowledges this. And the first

Gatti

step in tackling this is to exploit the quality wines, the best quality ones, produced in areas that are best suited by tradition, history, culture, climate and agronomic conditions to wine production — and conversely we have to stamp out the poor wine, wine produced in areas where it should not be produced.

But the regulations that have been put into effect have not been sufficient, although in seven years they have brought about a reduction, in Italy and France, of almost 78 000 hectares in the total vineyard area. They have not been sufficient because — I say again — if we look at the difference between wine production, which amounts to 167 million hectolitres, and wine utilisation, we have still a surplus of 25-30 million hectolitres.

For that reason, Mr Commissioner, ladies and gentlemen, we have to confirm the structural measures, details of which are given in paragraphs 18-24 of the resolution. In particular, we agree on the limiting of replanting rights, excluding, however, the hill areas and zones or areas with no alternative crops, and safeguarding small-scale producers; otherwise it would mean the abandonment of the environment and the land.

We need strict regulations, with European parameters for the recognition of quality wines produced in specified regions. An adequate income must be guaranteed to small producers who abandon grape growing, and arrangements must be made for them to change to alternative crops. A proper policy is needed for promoting the consumption of wine, aimed in particular at finding new outlets. Here I should like to make a point in passing, seeing that certain amendments have been presented on this question. I want to make it clear: we are not proposing to promote and increase the per capita consumption of alcohol. We are proposing to seek new markets, new outlets. Hence we confirm the need to implement, with different timing and procedures in different countries, these necessary measures for restructuring the sector and restoring its equilibrium, particularly on the eve of the accession of Spain and Portugal.

As I have said, together with these fundamental structural measures that cannot be put off, immediate measures are necessary to handle the present situation of crisis and surplus: measures that do not treat everyone and everything — that is to say, quality and quantity — alike. That is what would happen if the proposal for physical production quotas were implemented. There would no longer be any distinction between the quality producer and the producer who produces quantity, just to obtain the price guaranteed by the Community. There would be no distinction between producers in suitable zones and those in unsuitable zones; that is to say, with physical quotas no distinction would be made in the wine removed from the market. No! I think we have to reach a situation in which the market determines which wine, and how

much of it, is to be distilled or eliminated. That is the only principle to apply, if we want European agriculture to continue its technical and economic progress, and if we want our farmers to feel the stimulus, the desire to cultivate, experiment and improve quality, producing for the market and the tastes of the consumer. It is therefore necessary, ladies and gentlemen, Mr Commissioner, to draw up budgets every year that will take into account variations in production, consumption, and the financial resources of the Community; budgets prepared by the Commission, the Management Committee, to avoid negotiations between individual Member States. These budgets should however be managed by the regions, since they are institutions of the Member States; they must centre on the average yields per hectare indicated by the regions, beyond which the penalties should come into effect.

What we propose, therefore, is not percentage limits in relation to past years, nor ten-year commitments, but a very simple scheme: an annual budget, the adoption of a system of measures, preventive distillation, support distillation, compulsory distillation, and penalization in the form of reducing prices even for average yields: a scheme that tackles the problem of surpluses systematically, and that can mark a turning point in Community agricultural policy, which needs those changes of which you reminded us yesterday. We have deadlines to meet. The Committee on Agriculture hopes that these principles will be accepted by the Commission and that, in the first place, obviously, they will be adopted by Parliament, because that can really mark a turning point for the grape and wine-growing sector, opening up a new prospect for the entire agricultural policy of the Community.

Mr Guarraci (S). — *(IT)* Mr President, on the question of the grape and wine-growing industry, apart from the fact that we come to discuss it in this Chamber after substantial decisions have already been taken, we have observed changes in the content of the proposals put forward that, broadly speaking, we can only approve of. From the initial proposal for a fixed, pre-determined limit or threshold guarantee, which was reminiscent of the system of production quotas and nullified the free play of the market, replacing this by the administrative logic of the rationing system, we have finally come to the proposal for fixing annual guarantee thresholds and, hence, the determination on a variable basis year by year of the quantity of surplus production for compulsory distillation. This last proposal gives no grounds for rejoicing, even if it is accepted on account of its helping to unfreeze the process of enlargement of the Community to include Spain and Portugal, and because it represents a solution that, unlike the original one, allows the market to play a balancing part, providing flexible machinery for adjusting imbalances between the demand and supply of wine.

Guarraci

No one can consider, however, that what we are talking about represents the final solution to the question of surplus wine production. This is because, in the first place, it is based in the main on the administrative logic of market stabilisation that has been applied in the case of many agricultural products that are in surplus production, if not all of them — a form of logic that, in addition to being inadequate, is counterproductive in the long term, and appears increasingly incomprehensible to the people of Europe because of the absurd waste of resources that it involves, and the perpetuation also in the farming sector of a dangerous dualism between North and South.

Where wine is concerned, like other products of which there are surpluses, structural policies must urgently be put in hand to remove, at their very roots, the causes of the now constant crises of over-production. The concept of surplus that is referred to in the motion we are discussing needs to be defined correctly. It cannot be treated as an item to be ascertained mechanically year by year, without having first undertaken every initiative conducive to the considered structural limitation of production, and the expansion of wine consumption both inside and outside the Community.

Surplus, obviously, depends upon the relationship between demand and supply, and the Community cannot just limit its action to the clerical function of recording annual surpluses and then implementing the measures for the destruction of surpluses, to stabilise the market.

We must have active policies, then, for reducing and disposing of surpluses, reducing and continuing to reduce excise duty, abolishing sugaring, providing incentives for planned abandonment and an increase in the consumption of wine and its products. All of these things would probably be less costly to the Community and would reduce the areas of conflict between Member States, whilst at the same time reducing the need for paralysing, costly mediation by the Community, which makes its role so humiliating. The Gatti report, which is precise, complete and absolutely objective, and is fired by a strong Community spirit, amends the proposal of the Commission along the lines that have already been outlined, and for that reason we support it and will vote in favour.

Mr F. Pisoni (PPE). — (*IT*) Mr President, before saying a few words regarding Mr Gatti's report, may I be allowed to congratulate him on that report, to which we also have contributed in committee. It is in our view an extremely well-balanced document that deals carefully with the real problems facing the grape and wine-growing sector today.

The proposals on wine appear to be the most severe measures of any put forward for correcting surplus production in the different sectors.

In the wine sector action is proposed along three lines. Structural action, by extending the ban on new planting, introducing premiums for the abandonment and grubbing-up of vineyards, and curtailing the right to replant. Where prices are concerned we have the prices freeze, which the Commission now proposes, the limitation of guarantees to fixed quantities, and the progressive reduction of the intervention price in proportion to the quantities considered excessive. And finally, there is the third measure — compulsory distillation, at punitive prices, of surpluses calculated on what is perhaps an over-zealous basis.

It should be noted that only the grape and wine-growing sector is controlled in such a strict manner. If the same principles were applied to other sectors, we should certainly have fewer surpluses, less expense, and fewer contradictions in the CAP.

The wine producers, of which there are millions in the Community, risk having their incomes not only unguaranteed but not even protected, especially in the southern regions of the Community. There will only be any income if, by adopting the measures contained in the report that we are considering, we achieve better balance in the sector and a more remunerative price for the product. For this to come about it is absolutely essential that all the measures that we are considering are now approved by Parliament and adopted and put into effect by the Council sufficiently quickly. There can be no acceptance of compulsory distillation unless, at the same time, wine enrichment and sugaring are controlled differently. If, for technical reasons or historical and cultural motives it is not possible to enforce the immediate discontinuation of sugaring, let it be made subject to restrictions and taxes on those that practice it.

The new discipline should apply not only to table wine, but all wine — AOC included. We should not abandon the Commission's proposed provisions for quality wines produced in specified regions ('quality wines psr').

The area given over to wine production must be reduced in each of the wine-producing countries of the Community, not just in some of them, or in some regions of them. No one likes to lose production potential *vis-à-vis* the others: everyone could agree to reduce the area under vineyards and avoid surpluses, provided the burden does not fall on a few countries alone.

Surpluses are caused because, at the same time as there has been an increase in production in the countries that consume most wine, there has been a fall in per capita consumption; and the consumption of other beverages has increased because habits have changed, and also because the producers of manufactured products have their own advertising budget.

The measures proposed by the Commission must be accompanied by promotional action, to place before

F. Pisoni

the citizens of Europe a proper campaign of education in wine consumption, a campaign that should avoid alcoholism in any form, but should also take the edge off all the factious arguments put forward by the manufacturers of alternative beverages. This campaign should be undertaken by the wine industry and by Member States, but should also be supported by the Community with specific measures and adequate finance. This is a line of action that would enable the Community very considerably to cut down its expenditure on the sector.

The Community often speaks of distortion of competition and the free circulation of goods. Wine is still subject to taxes and excise duty, which treble or quintuple the price of the product itself. New harmonization of excise duty and taxes on wine and alcoholic beverages is necessary.

Finally, it should be emphasized that, in the recent Dublin agreement, certain things are reaffirmed, but others are forgotten; there is a call for compulsory distillation — which is penalization in every sense of the word, and a surreptitious way of imposing quotas — but no consistent decisions are taken for the entire sector, and for all countries. There can be no piecemeal policy for restoring the equilibrium of the sector; a global policy is needed to accompany, without disruption, the changes that are necessary, and that will ensure the production of quality wine, whilst maintaining the producers' incomes. A system of checks should be introduced, at European level even, which would exclude all possible fraud and adulteration, which damage the producers and the Community alike.

Having said that, we fully support the Gatti report.

Mr Provan (ED). — Mr President, first of all I would welcome the Council of Ministers' agreement in Dublin on some reforms in the wine sector. I also congratulate Mr Gatti on his report and his welcoming of the Dublin agreement, because I think it is important that when the Council of Ministers does actually face up to a difficult situation and reach agreement we should try and make certain that those agreements can be sustained.

I am also very pleased that Mr Gatti was able, in committee, to accept some of the amendments that I put forward to his report. It is therefore in the light of all these things that we as a group will be happy to support the Gatti report when it comes to the vote later today.

We must face the fact, however, that in the wine sector at the present time we face a situation of gross over-supply. We must have a freeze on prices, even though Mr Gatti does not accept that and points out some of the difficulties that it would cause to some of the smaller wine producers. We must also restrict the

replacement of vineyards, we must encourage the grubbing up of current over-production in some of the valley bottoms, and we must, I believe, promote other products such as grape-juice in order not to aggravate the market over-supply situation that we have in the wine sector.

We have had difficulty in trying to come to a conclusion on what to do about the sugaring and adding of sucrose to wines. There is no doubt in my mind, however, that if one does add sugar to wines, one adds to the cost of the wine regime. At the same time, one is adding considerably to the amount of wine available that is up to the standards that are required. So sugaring only aggravates the wine problem. We in our group have therefore decided that we have to vote against any addition of sugar to wines, because that adds considerably to Community expenditure in the sector.

We must also make certain that we do not export problems from the wine sector to other Community sectors. Compulsory distillation may well form distortions in the alcohol market as a whole. When one considers that in 1982 one-fifth of all table-wine production was liable to distillation, one has a measure of the problem, because distortions created by wines that have been distilled take place in a highly competitive market. People who are already engaged in supplying that market must not run into difficulties.

Mr President, let us emphasize quality in the wine sector, let us emphasize the necessity for long-term thresholds, and let us hope we can get our house in order before the accession of Spain and Portugal.

Mr De Pasquale (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, the Italian Communists support the Gatti report and will vote in favour of it, together with the proposed amendments.

In our view, a solution of the present crisis in the wine sector is not to be found by fixing pre-determined production quotas, or by placing wine produced in areas that are naturally wine producing, and that have no alternative crops, on the same level with wine that is produced in irrigated areas, especially with the addition of sugar.

Moreover, the measures to be adopted for the recovery of the wine market must form part of a global package that tackles all aspects of the wine problem together, and tackles them consistently.

The enforcement of compulsory distillation at prices that are so costly for the wine producers is not acceptable unless, at the same time, we put an end to the scandal of wine produced with sugar. In the same way, the incentives to grubbing-up and definite abandonment are not sufficient, unless producers are shown alternative crops for the different areas of the Com-

De Pasquale

munity. With regard to this last aspect, that is to say the structural measures proposed by the Commission, we fully agree with what the rapporteur of the Committee on Agriculture emphasized, regarding the need to make these measures more selective in relation to the different types of area, excluding in any event hill country.

I am convinced that, for the full application of the structural measures to best advantage, there must be territorial programming, which only the local and regional authorities are in a position to do. A more direct relationship between the Commission and local bodies is therefore desirable, with regard also to the checks that will have to be carried out.

The establishment of a proper balance between demand and supply where wine is concerned cannot be restricted only to reducing supply. There are possibilities for market expansion, and so many new outlets, that could be followed up. Incentives could be provided for the introduction of new ways of using the product of the grape. But, to date, the Community has not undertaken any action along these lines, preferring to send massive quantities of wine for distillation, thereby causing considerable expenditure from the Community budget, as well as frauds that are difficult to detect, and serious problems in the alcohol sector. A new approach is necessary. We have to guarantee outlets and profitable prices for quality wine, and we have to eliminate poor quality wine and punish adulteration.

We approve of the fact that the proposed system tends to hit the higher yields obtained in each region. That means that we are introducing the principle that the production that is really surplus — the production of poor quality wine — will be hit. This is the first attempt to introduce into the machinery of the Common Agricultural Policy — which has hitherto made no distinction, and has been the same for everyone — a system of modulation that takes account of the characteristics of the product. This might be an opportunity to introduce in other market organisations as well the criterion on which we are today basing the management of the wine market — the disincentivation of large quantities, the industrial kind of agricultural production, so hitting the real surpluses but protecting, on the other hand, small producers, and at the same time avoiding the abandonment of agriculture and the consequent risk of desertification of vast areas of the territory.

Mr de Camaret (DR). — (FR) The report up for discussion aims to alter the common organization of the market in wine to reduce the production of table wine. The imbalance of the market will increase in the light of three criteria, (a) when stocks exceed four months' requirements, (b) when market prices stay below 80% of the guidance price for a time and, (c) when the production of table wine reaches 108 million hl, i.e. 9% surplus to requirements.

It is proposed to try for a better balance of the market as follows.

First, to distil surpluses (1) by preventive distillation at a reduced price of 65% of the guidance; (2) by compulsory distillation (a) at a purchase price of 50% of the guidance price for quantities of up to 10 million hl and, (b) at a price brought down to 40% of the guidance price for quantities larger than this.

Second, the breakdown in quantities as between the different regions of the EEC will be calculated on a *pro rata* basis according to the volume of the production in excess of a specific volume of production for each region, equal to the average of the three latest harvests. Third, the breakdown of quantities to be distilled between producers in the light of the yield per ha, on a scale fixed by the Commission, may vary from one region to another according to past yields and, lastly, these measures shall be applied until the end of the 1989-90 agricultural year.

The Group of the European Right notes that quality wines approved as regional wines will be subject to compulsory distillation in the same way as other table wines, thereby unfairly penalizing the work of the producers. In view of the financial help which the European Community provides for the production of quality wines, it would seem necessary to exempt the regional wines from this compulsory distillation. Similarly, the table wines that meet objective quality criteria should also be exempt if they have been analyzed and tasted by a competent committee. This is the only way to encourage the development of a policy of quality. Furthermore, compulsory distillation will give a certain advantage to producers on high-yield plains.

How will the production: distillation ratio be calculated without a viticultural land register, exact declarations or Community controls in certain countries of the EEC? Will the obstacle not prove insurmountable?

The Dublin compromise includes no measures on surpluses due to synthetic wine or fraudulent wine obtained from watering down white wine and red wine, although a Community fraud squad could cut down abuse and withdraw something like 5 million hl from the market every year. The cost of a service such as this, probably involving 90 people, would be very much less than the cost of the compulsory distillation of 5 million hl. Cheap distillation, freezing the price of wine until 1989, would mean a lot of farms closing down. These harsh measures aim to get 210 000 ha of European vines grubbed up.

The Group of the European Right also points out that the Dublin compromise covers the present production of table wine, taking enlargement into account. Limitation of the volume of production should put a brake on the growth of Spanish production. Will Spain accept the Dublin compromise? What is its position? Spain wants the level of production to be used for

de Camaret

implementation of the compromise to be the average of the three best harvests over the past five years, plus 30% to take account of a smaller yield due to more restrictive discipline.

If such a request were granted, the Dublin compromise would be drastically threatened. So let us have the greatest reservations as to the future of a compromise that is subject to such serious contestation. It is also reasonable to wonder how the Guarantee Section of the EAGGF will be funded and whether the compensatory amounts with Spain will not be worked out by the usual rules. What is more, any unilateral reduction in the compensatory amounts to the benefit of Spain will encourage its producers to dump on both the Community and external markets. And the consequence of this new distortion of the rules of competition is the greater inadequacy of the resources of our Community.

The grubbing up of 210 000 ha of vines should, we feel, be restricted to the fertile plains rather than the hillsides. With this in mind, the Commission should present a report on the various replacement crops that might be grown on the ground in question. Lastly, the grubbing up premium per ha represents the average earnings from three harvests delivered to the cooperative — but we note that the land is worth two thirds less, reducing the fortune in question by that much. It would therefore be fair to provide reconversion bonuses over and above the grubbing up premium and deal with the way they are to be calculated in a report on replacement crops.

Lastly, and this is my conclusion, it is obvious that limiting the right of replantation of the grubbed-up land to 50% is a direct attack on ownership rights and cases are likely to be taken to the Court of Justice. If this measure is condemned, the European Community will be forced to reimburse replantation allowances that are far higher than those laid down by the Commission.

These reservations are so fundamental that the Group of the European Right will, I am sorry to say, come down against Mr Gatti's report.

Mr Sutra (S). — (FR) Mr President, Honorable Members, unless Mr Gatti's report is distorted by regrettable amendments, we shall be voting for it. It is a courageous report and I congratulate him on it. In the wine war our two countries have been fighting for the past 14 years, this is the most courageous text his country has produced.

No doubt the Colliselli reports which we discussed in the previous Parliament were working along the right lines, but, generally speaking, they got no further than good intentions.

And this report is positive in relation to the Dublin agreements, which should have got the wine industry out of the crisis it has known for 14 years now.

Before going to the root of the problem, I should like to point out something that is extremely rare. On Monday evening, the Committee on Budgets took a majority decision not to give an opinion on this report, thinking it was so unacceptable to present the opinion which Mr d'Ormesson had submitted to it.

As to the Dublin agreement and the Gatti report, we have always said that enlargement of the Community to bring in Spain and Portugal was an undeniable problem, but that negotiations on the occasion of that enlargement were our only hope of bringing order to the European wine market. In my report for my Party in 1978, I wrote that we had to set our own house in order before opening the door to new members of the family. I note that, now enlargement is under way, all the negotiating to put the house in order took place in the Ten before the door was opened to a new member of the family.

The historic and unique opportunity we had was seized in Dublin.

Let us just return for a moment to what the common market in wine used to be. First of all, since 1970, we have had the most uncontrolled kind of liberalism, which broke the 50-year old French tradition whereby the market in wine was supposed to be regulated by very strict laws. This *laissez-faire* has totally ruined the market. At that time, after Montrodon, when men were shot dead, the Right thought the answer would be aid to make up for lost income, in an attempt to create a welfare-dependent mentality. Last year, 1984, a third of the production of table wines in Europe and one third of the income in the wine industry in my region came from distillation and the EAGGF budget.

The biggest revolution in the Dublin agreements is, of course, that earnings must once more come from the market and not from aid or the budget. And this means bringing order — seriously. The Dublin agreements are certainly not perfect. They are retrograde, particularly when it comes to chaptalization.

I shall end, Mr President, by saying that the concentrated rectified must is, at the moment, grape sugar, as saccharose is beet sugar, and we should not accept the kind of slanderous statement that says the quality is inadequate, because it is totally neutral.

Mr Provan, who came to see the wine harvest in my regional cooperative cellar, has just said that he would be against any chaptalization. When people representing places in the north commit themselves to that extent, it would be wrong for the wine growers of the south and the Mediterranean to say the contrary.

Lastly, I have to say that we will very clearly vote against an amendment that I find very difficult to understand — amendment No 34, from our colleague Mr Maffre-Baugé, who tells us that he rejects the machinery which the Commission suggests for the

Sutra

triggering of compulsory distillation as it penalizes the wine-growers in a linear and non-selective manner, regardless of any effort they may make to improve the quality of what they produce.

When you see that tiny yields of 0-45 hl are penalized at 0% and that above 140 hl per ha it is 100% and it is claimed to be linear, what more can be done? Should they be sent to prison for producing more than 140 hl?

I thank Mr Gatti for coming to this House, for having met leaders from the wine industry — at my invitation and at the invitation of Mr Maffre-Baugé in Languedoc-Roussillon — and for having presented a report which aimed at being honest and European. This is a sound agreement, but we shall have to be on our guard as to how the Commission applies it.

Mr Mühlen (PPE). — (FR) Mr President, it was no easy matter for the Heads of State and Government to reach a compromise on the organization of the wine industry when they held the summit in Dublin in December. The fact that this question was dealt with at this level and the time it took to reach agreement show how difficult it was to find a solution. Although it does not seem to please everybody, it would still be proof of a certain amount of realism to hold it up to question, as some of the Honorable Members hope. This would be the case if, on the subject of chaptalization, the European Parliament had, in its resolution, found the study suggested at Dublin was superfluous and, therefore, demanded that proposals to harmonize costs and, more particularly, the levy on sugar, come into immediate effect.

And the chaptalization issue has aspects that are far more varied and complex than some people would have us believe. It is not just a question of harmonizing costs; for compromising the use of this method is tantamount to transferring the surplus wine production from south to north, given that the use of rectified must (in comparison with saccharose) leads to an increase in production of something like 11%. That, no doubt, explains why this debate has had contributions by so many of our Italian colleagues as well as the *rapporteur*.

So it is in fact reasonable to ask whether we have solved the wine question by transferring the surplus from south to north, for the problem is still there.

Then there is the question of changing the taste of wines if growers are forced to change their method of vinification. Lastly, there is no point in saying that introducing restrictions on chaptalization makes the countries that use the process exaggeratedly dependent on the must they can choose to fortify the wine.

Those are one or two reasons, Mr President, to emphasize that the process of chaptalization is justified by historical tradition and climatic conditions in

some regions and that it is therefore impossible to prevent its use overnight unless we have a serious study of the consequences of such a step. For all these reasons, it is vital that paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 of the resolution, as it stands in the Gatti report, be changed along the lines I have just mentioned.

Mr P. Beazley (ED). — Mr President, my group welcomes the Gatti report and the four regulations to which it refers. We are indeed pleased that the Commission has seen fit to deal with the very difficult problems of wine and that it has provided regulations which we believe will enable the Community to make the essential change of direction required in this field. We in no way underestimate the difficulties involved and we are absolutely clear that the necessary structures and arrangements must be implemented. We are, of course, fully aware of the social consequences which reduction, and in some cases the cessation, of wine production in certain areas will have on local communities. Hence the need for the creation of alternative employment either within these areas or elsewhere within the Community.

Now it may seem strange for an Englishman from a northern non-wine producing area to speak on this subject. It is because the problems of wine and other predominantly southern European products, like olive oil, tobacco, etc., all affect our Community budget. The Community is one, and the principle which requires these actions in the case of wine is equally valid for northern European products in structural excess, like cereals, butter, sugar etc. I would go so far as to say that it affects not only agricultural products. Whenever market forces are prohibited from affecting industries and commercial operations through the misuse of State subsidies and interventions, the consequences are just as serious and as expensive.

What are the reasons for the wine problem? It is the result of two contrary forces, significantly increased production with significantly reduced consumption, and both are long-term trends. One-third of the table wine produced in 1983/84 had to be withdrawn from the market. Market prices only achieved 70% of the guide price. The financial burden was 1 000 million ECU, and stocks quoted as being at five-months level were very seriously underestimated. High-priced distillation was exorbitantly expensive and the Commission could not support it. Distillation proved to be only a temporary palliative and quite uneconomic compared with the production of industrial products. The cost of an open-ended wine policy had therefore become impossibly expensive for the Community to bear. There was no chance of upgrading table wine to match supply and demand, and the Community has faced the necessity of putting its own house in order before the accession of Portugal and Spain.

My group will support Amendments Nos 40 and 41 because we find that neither paragraph 11 nor the

P. Beazley

explanatory statement is clear enough about the type of vine products which it is proposed to support. I personally cannot support the use of Community money to promote either wine or grape products, because the former will be completely non-cost effective and the latter are a matter for private enterprise. In my view, the risks of finding and supporting a market for grape-juice and such products in competition with other fruit juices are much too high for the Community, as compared with specialist entrepreneurs, to undertake.

In conclusion, wine is the first of a whole series of agricultural products in structural surplus which we shall have to discuss over the next five weeks. The principles in all cases are the same. The Community must employ its resources of manpower, capital, time, skill and effort in the most appropriate fields to maintain the standards of living to which we all aspire and discharge the responsibilities we have towards less fortunate countries like those of the Third World. To neglect this would condemn us to an ever diminishing future. To release some of these resources for redeployment, given appropriate social provisions for those directly affected, would assure an ever improving standard of living and employment.

Mr Maffre-Baugé (COM). — (FR) Mr President, honorable Members, first of all, and by way of introduction, let me just say a word to our British colleague to tell him that the reduction of the British contribution costs the Economic Community far more than the wine budget. I had to start with that.

Secondly, the Gatti report, honorable Members, comes after the Dublin compromise — after the battle, I think, and a strictly political battle whose conclusions fixed the guiding principles of a new wine policy, one which goes under the banner of stringency. Parliament is consulted after it has been overtaken by events without any reference to its opinions. Rearguard action is never completely pointless, certainly, but the rapporteur's attempts at analysis are somewhat useless, whereas before Dublin they might have helped with a more practical assessment of the economic consequences the compromise will involve.

So the second Gatti report can only be seen in the shadow of Dublin and the assessments that I am led to make must not be seen outside that context — which is, I repeat, a political one.

Because of this false poise, although I congratulate the rapporteur on the work he has done, his approach seems rather like a sine curve, going from well-known ambiguities to intentional aspects of a positive nature. But alas, there are two prior conditions — enlargement must be accepted and even speeded up and the Dublin agreement must be taken into account. These prevent me from approving the report. But does it mean that I reject the proposals as a whole? Certainly not. I am trying to look at each paragraph objectively.

It is obvious that in the few minutes at my disposal — and how silly it is to have to talk about wine issues in three minutes — neither I nor others who have spoken can give an exhaustive analysis of a subject which, as everyone realizes, is a technical one.

So I can only mention particular points to show the absurdity of the principles adopted at Dublin — blind distillation, which is not what the consumer needs, distillation that is badly distributed between the Member States and the wine growers, a compulsory analysis that will undermine the industry and strike a serious blow to the producers' organization, a limitation of replantation rights that blocks any development of vine-stock selection, a three-year price freeze and the disappearance of any income guarantees, not to mention the lack of control, the false prospects offered in the matter of diversification and structure and the absence of any measures to develop consumption or harmonize taxation. The French table and regional wine industry has been hit hard and the 10 000 wine growers who joined forces in Montpellier recently said so loud and clear. Although we accept production discipline with a view to the quantitative and qualitative rationalization of the market, we refuse the slow death of French vines and table wines, particularly from the French Mediterranean, that the Dublin agreements will bring in their wake — and which the rapporteur did not, I think, make sufficient objection to.

Mr Musso (RDE). — (FR) Ladies and gentlemen, I only asked for a minute as what I have to say is very short. I shall give my Group's position on the Gatti report this evening during the explanation of the voting.

Having heard the speakers, all I want to say is that it is not possible to let this session pass without officially condemning what has been called the Dublin compromise.

No representative of governments which have vines or make wine was pleased with the compromise. And, when he left the Dublin meeting, our own Minister for Agriculture said it was a disaster that should never have been allowed to take place.

I shall repeat what Mr de la Malène said here recently — that if it ought never to have taken place, then France ought never to have signed it!

Mr Sutra (S). — (FR) Mr President, the French Minister for Agriculture has just been mentioned. I should like to say that what he said after the Dublin agreements was: 'an unhoped-for agreement' — which is not what I just heard!

Mr Graefe zu Baringdorf (ARC). — (DE) Mr President, the development in the wine sector follows the pattern of almost all sectors of agricul-

Graefe zu Baringdorf

ture, i. e. rationalized production methods have been encouraged and have led to the creation of so-called structural surpluses. This means that smaller undertakings and areas with less favourable conditions have higher costs and cannot compete with rationalized production methods which puts them at a disadvantage in a system with standard prices. As a result of these surpluses, attempts are made to squeeze small producers out of the market. This agricultural policy favours the creation of structural surpluses because they work against those operating under so-called unfavourable production conditions.

We intend to support this report, as Mr Gatti has tried to make it clear — despite considerable opposition, not least in committee — that it is not just a question of overcoming the problem of surpluses by a general reduction in prices, we must also try to protect small producers. He has also made it clear that if compulsory distillation becomes unavoidable, this must be above a certain yield per hectare, so that the rationalized methods of production are affected and not small producers. I had hoped for more from this report — a minimum payment or price support for small undertakings to keep them in production and to prevent them being pushed out to business by large-scale producers. Obviously this was not possible. However, I am grateful that a start has been made. I trust that during the course of further discussion of the agricultural policy it will become clear that small producers deserve protection.

Mr Musso (RDE). — (FR) I have been personally attacked and I should like to confirm what I said. I invite my eminent colleague, Mr Sutra, accompanied by his Minister, to go and explain to the winegrowers of southern France.

President. — Mr Musso, that was not a point of order nor, clearly, was Mr Sutra's intervention. But Mr Musso has left the interpretation of the French Agriculture Minister's remarks to the Minister himself, which is the sensible thing to do.

Mr Gautier (S). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen! A few brief remarks on Mr Gatti's report: I agree with the previous speaker from the Socialist Group that we support Mr Gatti's report and congratulate him on its impartiality. We do not share all his views, but this can hardly be expected when Europeans attempt to arrive at a compromise.

The present situation in the wine market — as in other sectors — is that we have systematically over the last few years — despite certain fluctuations — increased production. The yield per hectare has risen. Some parts of the European Community have even expanded their wine-growing areas. A reduction in the consumption of wine has led to the creation of struc-

tural surpluses which can neither be financed in the long term, nor marketed in any sensible way.

I draw your attention to the major problems involved in disposing of distilled alcohol without damaging the market for traditional industrial alcohol, or alcohol produced from cereals or molasses. Once Spain and Portugal have joined the Community, wine-growing potential will be considerable. If Spain were to apply the methods of wine-growing that are unfortunately common in West Germany, where yields are of the order of 200 to 300 hectolitres per hectare, the European Community would literally drown in wine. We need effective measures, not only for areas where production appears to be greatest. They must also apply to areas where — in absolute terms — less is produced, as is the case in West Germany. We also contribute to the surplus and some of it is not of a particularly high quality.

We need an uncompromising four-pronged approach to this problem, i. e.: measures to control the market — a great deal has been said on this, including the question of sugaring, with which I agree; structural measures — again a great deal has been said with which I agree; fiscal measures and export measures.

I should like to say a few brief words on fiscal measures in reply to those who are campaigning against the consumption of alcohol — understandably! It is not a question of increasing alcohol consumption in the European Community — this could certainly lead to health problems — we are trying to eliminate the discriminatory taxes on wine compared with other alcoholic beverages in some Member States. The protectionist barriers that some Member States have erected round their domestic beer production to the detriment of wine must be abolished.

One final comment on an aspect which is not currently to the fore, but which does appear on the Council agenda, namely regulations on the labelling of alcoholic beverages. I appeal to both the Council of Ministers and my own government to implement the regulations on the labelling of alcoholic beverages and not to heed the assertions by the Christian Democrats that labelling alcoholic beverages will confuse the consumer. The consumer is better informed if he knows how much sugar, sulphur and similar substances wine contains.

Mr Adamou (COM). — (GR) Mr President, as a result of the Community's unplanned policies, the fall in working peoples' purchasing power that has led to reduced consumption, and also because of the competition represented by beer and the high tax on wines in some countries such as Great Britain, the EEC has a wine surplus that exceeds consumption by some 20 million hectolitres. Greece cannot be considered to share the blame for this surplus because she has only been a Member of the Community for four years,

Adamou

whereas the relevant problems date back to the seventies. Besides, while Greece maintains an almost constant level of production, in the Federal Republic of Germany to name but one example the production of wines trebled between 1981 and 1984.

To restore equilibrium to the market in wine the Commission proposes measures such as compulsory distillation, guarantee thresholds, the uprooting of vineyards, and prohibition of any expansion of viticulture. These measures cannot possibly be agreeable to agricultural workers in a country such as Greece, where the conditions for viticulture are incomparably better than in the Federal German Republic. All the more so since viticulture is a dynamic sector of Greece's agricultural economy, one which represents the livelihood of some 400 000 families. In particular, no reduction in wines of named provenance is acceptable. On the contrary, the interests of the Greek cultivators, of Greece's agricultural economy, and indeed the interests of the Community's wine market itself demand, firstly, an extension of the variety of vineyards that produce wines of named provenance. Secondly, the search for and application of appropriate agricultural technology for their cultivation. Thirdly, support for the renewal of vineyards producing such wines, with generous incentives and subsidies. And fourthly, incentives and subsidies for the modernization of wine production and for qualitative improvement of the wines produced.

Since 1982 Greece has been carrying out distillation. However, this has not solved the problem of surpluses, because we already have a surplus of alcohol in our country. What the Community must do, in our opinion, is to grant subsidies for the promotion of exports of Greek wines to the Socialist countries, with parallel support for Greek viticulture, which is exceptionally well-favoured by the climate and soil of our country.

Mr Abens (S). — (DE) Mr President! In view of the enormous wine surplus no one in this Parliament would dispute that a far-reaching reform of the common policy on wine is essential. Spain and Portugal are waiting at the gates and even now a quarter of Community table wine production has to be distilled. This represents only one of a considerable number of problems that are a major political burden on the Community.

Before the Dublin meeting, the problems appeared to many to be insoluble, and we welcome the success that the European Council was able to achieve by adopting a package of balanced directives that represent genuine progress towards reducing wine production, improving the structure of wine-growing and establishing a better balance between supply and demand on the international wine market.

The decisions on table wines show that the European Council intends to protect the northern wine-growing

areas, e.g. the Moselle, Rhine and Ruwer regions from unnecessary hardship in connection with the reform of the common agricultural policy. This is particularly true of the decision to delay consideration of the controversial methods of amelioration until a thorough report on the possible use of concentrated grape must and sugar is available and the decision not to adopt the Commission proposals to alter the present regulations for quality wines produced in specified regions, which include the Luxembourg Moselle wines.

If the European Parliament adopts the motion for a resolution contained in the Gatti report, this will endanger a balanced and constructive compromise that was only reached with great difficulty. I very much doubt whether this would encourage the necessary reform of the policy on wine.

As I personally am unable to accept this, I will only support the resolution if amendments ensuring at least the following are adopted:

Firstly, the European Parliament's motion for a resolution must under no circumstances prohibit amelioration by the addition of saccharose, i. e. chaptalization, a process which improves unfermented grape juice when the sugar content is too low. In particular, this must be permitted where local tradition or poor weather conditions justify this measure to improve quality. At the very least this must be permitted until it has been established whether the use of rectified, concentrated grape musts from other wine-growing areas alter the character and taste of local wines or not.

Secondly, the introduction of a tax on wine from areas where chaptalization is presently permitted or is still to be permitted must not be allowed. Under the present circumstances this would not be justified.

Thirdly, the Commission's proposed amendments to the present regulations on quality wines produced in specified regions must be rejected since it would lead to further unnecessary centralization, if in future Brussels were to decide which wines are to be recognized as being produced in specified areas.

If there is to be any real progress in the wine policy, the European Parliament would do well at least not to call into question the basic principles of the Dublin compromise.

Ms Tongue (S). — I am asking the House's support this evening for two amendments for the following reasons. I view with extreme concern the recommendation in Mr Gatti's resolution that the European Community should introduce an active policy to promote wine consumption. In the World Health Organization's goal of health for all by the year 2000 the reduction of alcohol-related problems is an important component. An active policy of promoting

Tongue

increased wine consumption surely runs counter to the policies that the WHO has encouraged EEC Member States to undertake. It is important to note that in traditional wine-consuming countries the rate of wine consumption is very closely correlated with the rate of hepatic cirrhosis and increased consumption will inevitably lead to increased damage to health.

I should also like to draw the attention of the House to certain social and economic factors. In my own country, the United Kingdom, 1 million people suffer from drink dependency. 500 deaths of young people per annum are related directly to alcohol consumption. 78% of all assaults are committed by those under the effect of alcohol and 88% of all criminal damage is linked to alcohol consumption. A recent survey conducted by the Department of Health and Social Security in the United Kingdom links drinking with low productivity at work and absenteeism from work and underlines the major role that alcohol plays in accidents at work. In fact, they estimate that 1 000 million is lost to the UK exchequer through alcohol abuse each year.

Whilst realizing the problems posed by surplus production of wine, I hope that every effort will be made to solve this problem by other measures, i. e. diversifying the use of the vine products.

Mr Andriessen, Vice-President of the Commission. — (NL) Mr President, I should like to begin by expressing my gratitude to the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, and in particular to its chairman and rapporteur for their willing cooperation in the preparations for today's debate in Parliament on the restructuring of the wine sector and the wine policy.

The rapporteur said in his introduction that a large number of documents had been produced in recent months on wine. And that is true. That is not solely the fault of the Commission, it also reflects the extraordinarily complicated nature of the wine problems and solutions that must be found to them, but that undoubtedly did not make Parliament's task any easier. The Commission is particularly grateful to this House that it is nonetheless prepared to debate these complex issues at this time as we think it extremely important that definitive decisions should be taken on wine problems in the very near future in the Council of Ministers and Parliament's opinion is indispensable here.

May I say that the Commission feels that the present wine problems are explained in a very clear manner in Mr Gatti's report and I have the feeling that a large part of the committee's opinions, and many opinions expressed in this debate, meet with those of the Commission.

We are all familiar with the situation. We are faced with structural problems, structural surpluses and that

means a need for both a market and price policy and also a structural policy, with all that that entails. We all agree on that, although we may not see eye to eye on the modalities. Well now, one speaker said that this debate is being held 'under the shadow of Dublin'. That is true but perhaps one can also say that this debate is being held 'under the protection of Dublin'. In other words: although one may disagree on a number of decisions taken in the Dublin compromise, it nonetheless contains a number of solutions which enable the debate to be continued and conclusions to be reached. And perhaps we should not regret too much that every now and then such compromises help the Community to move forward.

I would deny the fact that if the Commission incorporates into its proposals the contents of the Dublin summit then the Commission is acting as the Council's secretariat, as the honourable rapporteur suggests. Let us not forget that the Council acting unanimously may under the Treaty deviate from the Commission's proposals and that this may help to provide a solution to the problems. I repeat that there are some things in the Dublin compromise that the Commission does not welcome. The Commission had submitted different proposals on for example the de-acidification of wine, on the way in which the problem of adding sugar and enriching wine should be tackled, and I think that is the reality with which we must live, even though the Commission continues to think its original ideas on the subject should have been followed.

It is for that reason, Mr President, that the Commission now recommends that it should not accept some of the amendments tabled by the rapporteur even although it could well agree with their actual substance, because they would affect some elements of that compromise. I am thinking for example of amendments no 4 and 8 which obviously run counter to elements in that compromise.

Mr President, I shall try in the limited time available to me to go into as much detail as possible of the texts and opinions before me so that this House knows the position of the Commission. May I comment first on the motion for a resolution in front of me, repeating that it contains a great deal with which the Commission can agree. On paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 on enrichment, I must say that the Commission will have to reject those elements which obviously run counter to the compromise I talked about — even though we may well approve of the actual substance itself.

On the definition of production regions in paragraph 29 of the motion for a resolution, where it says that this matter must remain in the hands of the Member States, the Commission retains its right to say that from the point of view of coordination and administrative practice it would be better for the Commission to have an important role here. On replanting, the Commission feels that the proposals in the motion for a resolution if fully implemented would not restrict

Andriessen

replanting sufficiently and that therefore the aim of this structural measure would not be adequately met. It is obvious in the Commission's view that grubbing-up premiums and replanting restrictions are two sides of the same coin. Whether it would be possible, as was suggested in the debate, to have reconversion premiums as well as grubbing-up premiums, is something I cannot judge just now from the budgetary point of view. I would add that the amount of 740 million suggested by the Commission for its structural policy on restructuring the wine sector has not been passed by the Council and that an animated discussion on it is still under way with the Council.

As regards the view expressed in the motion for a resolution on table grapes and the suggestion of a ban on table grapes being used to produce wine, the Commission believes that although theoretically there may be something in the idea, in practical terms, in terms of supervision, it is not feasible; and that is why the Commission cannot accept that recommendation. As regards the need for a codification of the complicated regulations on wine, may I say, Mr President, that as I have studied the wine dossier I have felt the need of it. The codification problem has been left somewhat open by the Dublin compromise but I can assure you that we have made good progress and that the Commission certainly intends to continue in this direction.

Some speakers in the debate have urged that so-called local wine should be exempt from compulsory distillation. The Commission believes that such an exemption from the system of compulsory distillation is not acceptable. Local wine is an integral part of table wine in the Commission's opinion and if that were to be exempt then the Commission believes that our regulation would be made less effective.

There has been some discussion on the desirability or otherwise of promoting local wine. May I say that there is a legal basis for promoting local wine, and that the Council of Ministers shares the objections expressed by a number of Members to promoting the use of alcohol, and that therefore any action on this point is highly unlikely. We are now thinking of promoting grape juice, a somewhat more innocuous derivate, at least as far as the alcohol content of wine is concerned. The question is whether it will be successful.

Mention was also made of the small producer, whether the small or very small producer should not be considered for compulsory distillation. The regulation as it stands just now exempts the very small producer who would have a very small amount of wine for distillation. Whether this meets the wishes expressed may be doubtful but it is clear that the Commission has not been blind to this problem.

Mr President, this problem has also been viewed from the angle of Spain's and Portugal's accession. May I state here unambiguously with reference to the acces-

sion that the *acquis communautaire*, as of the time of accession, will apply unabridged to the new acceding countries of the Community. There are no grounds for fearing that the *acquis* will be affected by this accession. What is necessary, and that is why I am pleased about today's debate and I hope the Council of Ministers will soon take a definitive decision, is that we put some order into our own affairs with a view to the accession and that as soon as possible.

And finally a few comments on a number of amendments tabled by the rapporteur and the committee. I have already dealt with amendments No 4 and 8. Amendment No 1, in the Commission's view, implies price fixing criteria which fail to meet the need for putting order into a market regulation. That is why the Commission rejects it. The Commission accepts amendment No 2. On amendment No 3 on replanting, although it is an interesting idea to extend the reduction by 50% to areas which are sometimes particularly suitable, the Commission would envisage such major problems in implementing it that it advises against it. The same holds good for the amendments under b) and c). I have already dealt with amendment No 4. Amendment No 5 on table wine has been taken care of in my views on the motion for a resolution. On compulsory distillation there is no difference of opinion between the Commission and Parliament on the substance, but again for technical reasons the Commission prefers its own view. The Commission is perfectly willing to present the report of the results of the structural measures not merely to the Council but also to the Parliament.

On establishing a team of Community supervisors — in view of what I said this morning on supervising other aspects of the agricultural policy, I rather like the idea. But I must tell Parliament that so far this idea has found little sympathy in the Council.

Finally the Commission finds amendment No 9 interesting but also foresees difficulties in implementing it. The question is whether it is feasible in practice to give compensation to wine cooperatives.

To sum up, Mr President, I would say to Parliament: sincere thanks for being prepared to hold this debate today; agreement with the broad lines of the report, in the hope that when Parliament has finished its debate the Council will also be prepared to take these ideas which have long been accepted at the top political level in the Community and put them into practice in the form of regulations.

(Applause)

Mr Graefe zu Baringdorf (ARC). — (DE) Mr President, perhaps you could record for the Minutes, in order to prevent linguistic confusion, that whenever the Commission says structural improvements, it really means structural destruction.

President. — That wasn't a point of order.

The debate is closed.

The vote will take place at the next voting time.

5. *Customs debt*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 2-1590/84) by Dame Shelagh Roberts, on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, on

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 2-620/84 - COM(84) 395 final) for a regulation on customs debt

Dame Shelagh Roberts (ED), rapporteur. — Mr President, I wish to propose that under Rule 87 of the House's Rules of Procedure debate on this report should be adjourned until the first day of the April part-session. I suggest April rather than March because I understand that the programme for the March part-session is already very full and, as there is no immediate urgency to take this report, April would seem to be more convenient.

The reason I propose the adjournment is that we have certain technical problems with the publication of the report. These arise from the fact that the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights, whose opinion was crucial to the considerations of the Committee on External Economic Relations, and the Committee on External Economic Relations both had to work very quickly and in parallel. Unfortunately, this has resulted in some confusion over the amendments in the various languages. To add to the problems, there are translation difficulties as well. And in its present form I consider that the report is unsatisfactory for debate and voting upon this afternoon. That is the reason why I propose the adjournment. And I am authorized by Mr Rogalla, who is the draftsman of an opinion for the Committee on Legal Affairs, to say that he supports my motion for an adjournment, which I hope the House will agree to.

Mr Fich (S). — (DA) Mr President, I should like to say on behalf of the Socialist Group that we agree with Dame Shelagh Roberts' reasoning. We see no reason to hasten discussion of this matter. We think there is good reason to wait until the Legal Affairs Committee has thoroughly considered the subject. I therefore support the request that this issue be deferred until the April part-session.

(*Dame Shelagh Roberts' proposal was accepted*)

6. *Extension of the agreement between the EEC and Indonesia together with the other members of ASEAN*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 2-1529/84) by Mr Seeler, on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, on

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 2-1110/84 — COM(84) 601 final) for a regulation concerning the adoption of the protocol extending to Brunei-Darussalam a Cooperation Agreement between the European Economic Community and Indonesia, the Philippines, Malaysia, Singapore and Thailand, member countries of the Association of South East Asian Nations

Mr Seeler (S), rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, on 1 January last year, the former British colony of Brunei became a new, independent state. Since 7 January of last year, Brunei is the sixth member of ASEAN. The object of this resolution is to extend the Cooperation Agreement between the European Community and the ASEAN countries to include Brunei. A Protocol between ASEAN and the European Community was signed on 15 November last year. Parliament is now being asked for its approval. There are no particular problems and the protocol should therefore be ratified.

However, I would like to take this opportunity of considering whether this Cooperation Agreement between the ASEAN countries and the European Community has fulfilled expectations over the past five years. Five years ago I had the honour of being the rapporteur for the original Cooperation Agreement. At the time I laid particular emphasis on the aims of the ASEAN countries for this cooperation. The ASEAN countries wished and still wish to be a zone of peace, security and of joint economic development, and sought and still seek the support of the European Community. They did not wish to be subjected to unilateral Japanese and American influence in the Pacific region, an influence which has since grown even stronger.

Europe is of increasing importance to them, not merely economically but also politically. The ASEAN countries were particularly interested in the political dimension of Europe. This then was not simply an economic cooperation agreement but also, and this must be emphasized, a movement towards political cooperation.

How have these two aspects developed over the last few years? Trade and economic relations cannot be said to be more than satisfactory. European Community exports to the ASEAN are still only in third place. Too many European firms and businessmen have failed to recognize the major opportunities that economic cooperation in this region could provide.

ASEAN is, after all, a region with a real average annual growth rate of 8%. By comparison, the Euro-

Seeler

pean Community is well satisfied with growth rates between 2% and 3%. Moreover, this region is very rich in natural resources. We must remember that Brunei's major oil and natural gas resources make it one of the richest countries in the world with an average per capita income of US \$ 19,500.

Many European firms are wary of the risks in this unfamiliar market. To be fair, the ASEAN countries have not always given investors all the assistance possible. Excessive bureaucracy has placed obstacles and difficulties in the path of European investors and the safeguards necessary to protect investments and the transfer of profits are lacking.

A great deal remains to be done by both sides if the opportunities that this Cooperation Agreement could provide for the European economy are to be exploited to the full. We welcome the growing contacts and exchange of information and expertise between businessmen, industrialists, representatives of the banking world and other leading figures in the economy.

Sadly, however, it must be said that the Commission has, for various reasons, failed to promote first tentative contacts between trade unions as actively as it has done for trade and economy. I very much hope that the omissions of the past will be rectified as soon as possible.

I should now like to comment on the political aspects of the Cooperation Agreement. The major issue during the last five years has been and still is: Cambodia. The ASEAN countries have consistently condemned the Vietnamese occupation of Cambodia in the sharpest terms. The loss by this state of its sovereignty and consequently its independence is a violation of the basic principles of the ASEAN countries. On the other hand, however, they have never denied that the evils committed by the criminal Pol-Pot regime were equally deserving of severe condemnation and their political aim was never to re-establish this regime.

The European Community has also condemned Vietnam's occupation of Cambodia, but it is obvious and has always been obvious to Europeans that Vietnam's intervention in Cambodia did in fact topple the previous inhuman regime. The Cooperation Agreement with the ASEAN countries commits Europe to support the Cambodian policy of the ASEAN countries and to continue to do so actively.

I would like to suggest at this point, and I am choosing my words carefully, that perhaps it is time that the European Community and the Member States exerted a stronger influence on developments in Vietnam with a view to encouraging Vietnam to withdraw from Cambodia. A first step could perhaps be improvements in economic and trade relations between the European Community and Vietnam. Our political aims in Asia must be to assist the ASEAN countries to maintain

their political and economic independence *vis-à-vis* the superpowers, and, where necessary, to reassert this independence. As an initial aim, we should help the three countries in Indo-China, Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia to loosen gradually the ties that bind them to the Soviet Union on the one hand and the People's Republic of China on the other. To a large extent, the Cambodian conflict is nothing more than a Sino-Soviet conflict by proxy.

In conclusion, I would like to touch on a subject that was an important issue five years ago: the protection and promotion of human rights in the ASEAN countries. In many ways, progress has been made since then. Europeans must beware of too automatic a comparison of conditions in Asia with those in Europe. However, we are concerned at regular reports of arrests and imprisonments without trial for indefinite periods of time.

In particular, the position of the inhabitants of Timor, especially those in the former Portuguese areas, continues to give rise to serious concern and criticism. Indonesia is one of the world's major nations and has no need to persecute and suppress minorities. Such actions only damage the national dignity and international reputation of this state. We must, however, expose and condemn violations of human rights wherever they occur, not least as part of the friendly cooperation to which our Cooperation Agreement with the ASEAN countries obliges us.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MR LALOR

Vice-President

Mr Zahorka (PPE). — (DE) Mr President! The Group of the European People's Party accepts Mr Seeler's report and thanks the rapporteur for his impartial work and cooperation. The PPE Group welcomes any extension of the ASEAN agreement, both as regards the accession of additional suitable countries such as Brunei and when cooperation with the original five partner countries of the European Community in South East Asia can be intensified. Brunei is a rich country. We are aware of this and it is certainly interesting for Europeans to learn that the number of horses owned by the Sultan is far higher than those owned by all European heads of state together. Even the number of rooms in the new palace exceeds the number of rooms in the Vatican by 388. — The Vatican previously held the record, according to the Guinness Book of Records for the highest number of rooms. — The rich country of Brunei has a positive attitude to Europe, otherwise the Sultan would not have bought the Dorchester Hotel in London a few weeks ago.

Zahorka

However, I would like to take the opportunity of this report to make a few general remarks in our relations with the ASEAN countries. My group feels that the individual sections of the Cooperation Agreement should be reconsidered now that four years have elapsed. Every effort should be made to develop it further — for example in the cultural sphere, and I fully agree with what Mr Seeler said on the subject of human rights. ASEAN was established on the pattern of the European Community and our partner countries are eager to emancipate themselves from American and Japanese domination. At the same time, this region represents a storehouse of raw materials, some of which have not yet been developed and the crisis management by these countries of the Cambodian question has proved effective. — Mr Graefe zu Baringdorf, in reply to your 'Aha', I said 'developed' and not 'exploited'. Perhaps they would be exploited if there were a Green government but this would not be what the population wanted.

Although trade is increasing, Europe has fallen behind the American and Japanese in the ASEAN region and for once this is not the fault of either the Commission or the Council of Ministers, and certainly not of the European Parliament, but primarily of European businessmen. We Europeans must make our presence felt more in this area of high growth and high demand for investment. Our initial activities, such as a visit by thirty firms from the electronic, agricultural and building sectors to Thailand, Malaysia and Singapore in December 1984 proved a great success. The Europe of the Ten currently buys more in Thailand and Malaysia than it sells to these countries and it is high time that European business stepped up its efforts to open up new markets for our products.

At the same time, Europeans must promote more investment in these countries, more joint ventures, to include the fields of training, financing and the transfer of technology and we should do all in our power to avoid any suggestion by the ASEAN countries that Europeans are protectionist.

But whenever we mention ASEAN it is our duty to express our solidarity on the problem of Vietnam and Cambodia. In November Vietnam launched its greatest offensive yet against Cambodian civilians and the population along the borders to Thailand and drove more than 200 000 civilians into Thailand. According to ASEAN these refugees are in urgent need of help. The reason is that the Soviet Union has still not managed to cut off its military aid to Vietnam or to persuade Hanoi to withdraw its troops from Cambodia. Despite frequently paying lip-service to the principle of detente, the Soviets do not actively promote this process worldwide and they have not ensured Vietnamese withdrawal from Cambodia so that this sorely tried country can revert to self-determination and non-alignment.

We are fully in favour of the European Community investigating Vietnam, but this must not be at the

expense of the ASEAN countries. We urge the European Parliament to adopt this report which should be followed up in the near future by the Committee on External Economic Relations and Parliament.

(Applause)

Mr Chanteric (PPE). — *(NL)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, as a member of the Interparliamentary Delegation for relations with the member states of ASEAN and AIPO I welcome the accession of Brunei to ASEAN and the extension of the cooperation agreement to the Sultanate which received its independence at the end of 1983. The inhabitants of this small wealthy oil state do indeed enjoy — as has already been said — the highest per capita income in the world. Although the economy of Brunei is almost totally dominated by oil and gas, a start is being made nonetheless on a programme of economic diversification which to a certain extent will offer the opportunity of sales of consumer goods and equipment for example.

I should like to take this opportunity of dwelling on our relations with ASEAN as a whole. No one will deny the fact that this group of countries in South East Asia is enjoying in these times of crisis the fastest economic growth in the world. In general terms they have reached the level of the 'countries with an average income' although there are still considerable differences between the member states in economic and social development.

In objective terms the expectations of the cooperation agreement are to a large extent satisfied. This becomes quite apparent when one looks at developments in the three main areas of cooperation. Firstly, economic cooperation, where the figures speak for themselves. Over the last ten years ASEAN has increased its exports to the European Community by 340% and its imports from the EEC by 435%. It is important to note that the structure of imports from ASEAN to the EEC has radically changed over the last ten years. The share of finished products has risen from 25% to 41%. Allegations that the EEC market is a closed one are contradicted by the facts themselves.

As regards industrial cooperation the greatest progress is undoubtedly due to the three industrial conferences which have been organised and to the beginning of the '*EC-ASEAN Business Council*' which groups the Chambers of Commerce from the two regions. All this has led to an atmosphere which favours cooperation and is best illustrated by the increasing number of European investments in ASEAN and the rise in cooperation activities between industrialists.

The development cooperation with the three ASEAN countries which can still be considered developing countries accounts for 20% of the EEC budget for aid to non-associated developing countries. European aid

Chanterie

at 23% is second with regard to loans but at 27% is first with regard to gifts.

Regional cooperation between the European Community and ASEAN is remarkable and must and will undoubtedly expand further in the future, whereby the necessary attention must be paid to the creation of international agreements on basic commodities and to the renewal of the multi-fibre agreement.

In view of the pending expiry of the validity of the cooperation agreement between the EEC and ASEAN a balance can be drawn up which is undoubtedly positive. Nevertheless we must examine where improvements can be made so that in cooperation the emphasis could be shifted from food aid to education and from gifts to loans.

These are only a few suggestions but we shall be happy to discuss these and other proposals with our colleagues from AIPO and the 'ASEAN-Brussels Committee' which plays a very effective role in promoting cooperation between the European Community and ASEAN.

Mrs Heinrich (ARC). — (DE) Mr President, we the Green-Alternative European Link in the Rainbow Group see major problems and have reservations and criticisms concerning an extension of the Cooperation Agreement between the European Community and the ASEAN countries to Brunei.

The former British Protectorate of Brunei is one of the richest countries in South East Asia, thanks to its oil and natural gas resources, but the reigning Sultan and his family have scant respect, if any, for democracy. The European Community may be an economic community, but it is also — or least claims to be — a community that supports human rights and aims to encourage the development of democracy. Conditions in Eastern Europe were the subject of severe criticism during today's debate on the 40th anniversary of the victory over national socialism and the Yalta agreement. But the extension of the Cooperation Agreement with the ASEAN countries would enhance the prestige of regimes that trample democratic freedoms and human rights underfoot.

There are constant reports of waves of arrests in the Philippines and of murders organized by the state of opposition politicians who call for the establishment of democracy. In Indonesia, where the present military regime seized power by murdering hundreds of thousands of their opponents, death squads operate at the behest of the highest authorities, with the cooperation of the police and armed forces. The former Portuguese colony of East Timor was forcibly annexed in 1976. Despite demands by the UN General Assembly in 1982 and the UN Commission on Human Rights in 1983 that East Timor should be granted the right of self-determination, the annexation has been

maintained. Even worse, a handbook on torture for use by the armed forces was brought to public notice last year. According to 'Der Spiegel' in July 1984, the head of the Singapore government, Lee Kwan Yu, has initiated a campaign to ensure a so-called genetically high-quality population. Poor and uneducated women are to be persuaded by state premiums to be sterilized following the birth of their first child. These are but a few examples.

In our opinion, the best method of criticizing violations of human rights is to refrain from lending credibility to such regimes by cooperation agreements. These agreements relate in particular to textiles and the trade in silk and cotton fabrics. Are the representatives of the European Community aware that the materials that adorn the cream of society at receptions and in ballrooms were created under working conditions that can only be described as wage-slavery? South East Asia is indeed a paradise for investors, where minimal wages 10 to 20% of European wages are paid in the textile and clothing industry. More than 90% of employees in these industries are women; half of these women are less than 20 years of age and their life expectancy is low, because under these working conditions women age prematurely.

The textile industry, and the electronics industry have the longest working hours, work is most intensive, the worst working conditions prevail. There is dreadful poverty with insufficient provision for old age, health or invalidity. There are restrictive labour laws, unions are suppressed and strikes broken by the army. This is the reality behind this Cooperation Agreement. The significance of the ASEAN countries as far as the question of Cambodia is concerned was mentioned earlier. I would remind you that the military base of the ASEAN countries . . .

(The President requested the speaker to come to a conclusion)

We cannot give our approval to this Cooperation Agreement and do not wish to encourage its extension.

(Applause)

Mr Mosar, Member of the Commission. — (FR) Mr President, allow me first of all to warmly congratulate the Honorable Member, not just for his excellent report but above all for the very pertinent questions and suggestions with which he completed it just now. I am also pleased at the many speeches, a very useful contribution to the debate, that have just been made.

Mr President, on behalf of the Commission I should like to express satisfaction at Brunei-Darussalem's accession to ASEAN. This enlargement, I feel, once again highlights the dynamic role this association plays

Mosar

in South East Asia. ASEAN, which has indeed shown remarkable political stability, can see its economic weight now increasing with the accession of Brunei-Darussalem. At the same time, the cooperation agreement which the Community and ASEAN concluded in 1980 becomes more important as a framework for commercial and economic relations between the two regions.

One question, on which the rapporteur insisted, was about the progress of the EEC-ASEAN cooperation agreement so far. Well, I was pleased to see the number of details in Mr Chanterie's speech — which, to my mind, is a very pertinent and full reply to the rapporteur's question.

The rapporteur said something with which I entirely agree — that he regrets that our firms have or seem not yet to have sufficiently recognized the importance of this association. The hope expressed here should indeed be emphasized.

In view of the importance of the ideas put forward, of the questions that have been asked and of the suggestions that have been made, I (and I can, I think, speak for the Commission here) am in favour of a far-reaching exchange of views with Parliament over the coming months, with a view both to examining the rapporteur's question further and to looking at the results obtained in the first five years of the agreement and laying down guidelines for future cooperation, as suggested by the rapporteur just now.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

7. Ratification of *Torremolinos*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 2-1569/84) by Mr Provan, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, on

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-357/84 — COM(84) 340 final) for a decision on the ratification of the *Torremolinos* International Convention for the Safety of Fishing Vessels and the application of the provisions thereof by the Member States pending the entry into force of the Convention at international level.

Mr Provan (ED), rapporteur. — Mr President, it is a great honour for me, if I might say so, to introduce to the Parliament what I believe to be a very important subject which the Parliament has over the last five years — certainly since I have been a Member — shown a great deal of interest in. It is vitally important that we pay strict attention to it because of the dangers that our very courageous fishermen of the Community

have to face. As I say, the Parliament has been interested in this for many years and many documents have come before us which have highlighted some of the problems in the fishing sector.

Tragic fishing accidents at sea could largely be prevented if fishing vessels were better designed and fishermen given better safety training. I believe that the *Torremolinos* Convention is only a first step as far as the Community is concerned towards bringing greater safety to sea-going fishermen.

The *Torremolinos* Convention will not be operative in the world until 15 countries have signed it and over 50% of the world's fishing fleet over 24 metres are involved. A large number of Community Member States have already signed, but I think it is important for the Commission to be seen to be involved and for the Community actually to sign the convention. There are many reasons for this, one of the main ones, of course, being support for the general principle, but basically also the need for guidance to Community fishermen, to boat builders and also to stop distortion to competition within the fishing sector.

As a first step, however, it is not really enough for the Community to be involved. We must step up action in this area, because boats over 24 metres are very few and far between in the Community fishing fleet. Most vessels in our fleet are between 12 and 24 metres in length and therefore will be unaffected by the *Torremolinos* Convention.

Only 3% of fishing vessels are covered by the International Maritime Organization's regulations, as these apply to vessels over the 24 metres, as I have said. Safety is really not just a matter of vessel size. We need, therefore, to do something for the European Community fleet.

There are some 150 000 people employed in sea fishing in the Community. Working conditions at sea are far more difficult than is generally realized, especially if you compare them with conditions in other forms of employment.

Not only is injury more likely at sea, but fishing accidents are more serious than elsewhere.

In the United Kingdom — my own country, for instance — if you take statistics for every hundred thousand people who are at risk, there are 3 deaths in the manufacturing industry. There are 13 deaths in the construction industry, which is always held to be the most dangerous, and yet there are 200 in sea fishing. That is quite an extraordinary statistic and it is amazing to think that for every hundred thousand accidents, 200 people are going to die in the fishing sector. This report of mine discloses a major lack of research on accidents in sea fishing. A great number of accidents to fishermen are among people between the ages of 18 and 25. The extent of the injuries should be

Provan

avoidable, and it is disconcerting that insufficient attention has been paid to this problem.

Some 30 to 40% of the accidents are at the hands of fishermen whilst they are involved with the fishing sector. And there is also a high level of accidents due to falls on board and falls overboard during hauling and the shooting of fishing gear during the catching process.

It is also very worrying that in several countries dock-side accidents account for 25 to 35% of accidents in the sea fishing sector. So what we really need is concerted effort between fishing vessel designers, vessel users and experts in accident prevention. We should really make certain that all these people come together and do something. We need to make sure that we get better training and that training aid is available, and all Member States must become involved in this research. European money spent on research and training in this field will be money well spent if it helps to reduce the unacceptable toll of accidents in sea fishing. What we must also, I think, ask the Commission to do is come forward with codes of practice so that the fishing industry knows the type of thing that it can do to stop these horrible statistics increasing.

It would be wrong also, particularly with Spain and Portugal joining the Community thus doubling the size of the Community deep-sea fleet, for some States to be allowed lower standards than others. As I have already said, part of these proposals and codes of practice should be put in place so that there is no distortion to competition between the differing Member States' fishing fleet.

I, therefore, in conclusion, welcome the Commission's proposal to ratify the Torremolinos International Convention. I only regret that it applies to vessels over 24 metres, which are constructed substantially differently from some of the smaller ones — and, of course, it also affects boats that are going to be reconstructed. We must now press for more action on the smaller vessels. I would also like to see a study done and proposals brought forward for specific measures designed to improve the working conditions on fishing boats. Therefore on training and research, the common fisheries policy I believe has gone a long way to try and make the fishing industry more acceptable and easier to operate in. There is not the same pressure on the fishermen to overload their boats and work long and severe hours because of the quotas that are currently in place.

It is an extensive report that I bring before the Parliament, Mr President, I recommend it for all to read and I hope that Parliament will accept it as the first step to a large measure of progress that needs to be made in this field if we are serious in trying to help the fishing industry.

Mr Klinkenborg (S). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen! On behalf of the Socialist Group, I

would like to express my support for the report and for the rapporteur's excellent work.

Present developments to improve safety in fishing vessels represent a step in the right direction, but do not go far enough. We would like to make this point quite clear. The problems are not merely technical, but also concern crew-training and vessel-manning. As far as technical development is concerned, fishing vessels certainly offer scope for improvement, provided measures are not confined to vessels of over 24 metres, as the vast majority of fishing vessels are — as the rapporteur has already pointed out — considerably smaller than 24 m and they represent the real problems of safety at sea.

It is undisputed that improvement in safety must come in two areas, on the one hand in the field of nautical technology and on the other hand in safety techniques.

However, a second area, that of training at sea, is, in our opinion, equally important. There is a considerable deficit in this area where the fishing industry is concerned. There are no sensible training programmes to promote safety at sea, nor is there any attempt to ensure that the captains of these vessels have the proper nautical qualifications. I will come back to this point later.

However, no progress can be made if we do not ensure that fishermen at sea have regulated working hours with proper rest periods. Technology must fail if there are human errors, and as a rule mistakes are made because of exhaustion. In my view the proposal before us does not go far enough and the Commission must press for further developments.

As I have already mentioned, we would like to see a change in manning regulations. It ought to be possible to set up a code of conduct for fishermen to ensure that rest periods during fishing voyages are adhered to, both by those responsible for the technical sphere and by those responsible for safety. With regard to this I would draw your attention to Mr Woltjer's report which Parliament accepted by a large majority in 1982.

I would also like to draw your attention to the dangers which emanate from the fishing vessels themselves. There are potential dangers when nets are being hauled in — sufficient attention is not always paid to the safety regulations. Urgent action is called for.

But there is a second area which is, in my view, even more complex and of greater urgency. Fishing vessels do not always give way to vessels with right of way. This is particularly so on main shipping routes where small fishing boats of less than 24 m cut across the bows of the large vessels which then have to make awkward manoeuvres to avoid collision. To date, thank heavens, there have been no serious consequences, but we cannot exclude the possibility that one day there may be a serious accident. Exhaustive enquiries by the

Klinkenborg

marine authorities are then of great interest, but prevention is better than cure! We call on the Commission to consider how training schemes for helmsmen could improve safety at sea.

It is people who benefit most from the elimination of dangers at sea. We support the rapporteur's conclusions which, on behalf of the whole of the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, call for increased efforts. We have taken a step in the right direction, but must not rest on our laurels and would welcome further steps.

Mr Ebel (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen! On behalf of my group I would like to take this opportunity of thanking the rapporteur for his excellent report and to draw attention to what seems to me to be the decisive issue.

Both the comments by the previous speaker and the report make it clear that Torremolinos is an international, world-wide agreement and is therefore simply a compromise at the level of the lowest common denominator. This is made clear by the rigorous conditions imposed before the agreement can be ratified and come into force: as we know, at least 15 countries whose fishing fleets account for more than 50% of the world-wide fleet must ratify before it can come into force. Secondly, it only applies to new vessels, with a further limitation to vessels longer than 24 m.

The Commission's proposal that the Community ratify this agreement, thus making it effective, would counteract this protracted delay in ratification. Of course, this does not mean that the agreement will apply to all vessels and we know how large the European fishing fleet is, with a disproportionately high number of accidents. We will not affect this 'fleet under sail' in this way.

As a matter of urgency, Torremolinos should be considered as a first step in the right direction, but at the same time the Commission and all others involved must be encouraged to draw up a Community code of safety without delay which would cover all vessels putting to sea.

The rapporteur has shown us the right way in his motion for a resolution, in his comments and conclusion. I call upon Parliament to support him unanimously and in conclusion call upon the Commission to take the action I have detailed.

Mr Guermeur (RDE). — *(FR)* We have here a draft decision that is extremely important in a Europe which, it has to be admitted, does not always give maritime activity, and fishing in particular, the attention it warrants. There are not very many seamen and they rarely go out into the streets to defend themselves — which is why, perhaps, we do not always hear what they have to say.

As Chairman of the Committee on Fisheries, I warmly congratulate Mr Provan for the standard of his work and the clear-sightedness of his report. I shall make one or two remarks on my own behalf and on behalf of Mrs Ewing — whose passion for the world of fishing we all know about.

Sea fishing is a dangerous job. Mr Provan gave a number of highly significant figures — three deaths per 100 000 workers in industry and 200 deaths per 100 000 in sea fishing. That is something to think about — and to tell people about. It is a dangerous job and it is getting more dangerous too — more than 50% more deaths on large vessels in less than 10 years. But it is a job that is vital to the life of the population at a time when so many millions of people are dying of hunger because they do not have the protein the ocean could provide.

These facts, I think, call for a reply for four main reasons. The first is a humanitarian reason. There is no cause for thinking that less attention need be paid to the safety of a sailor than to the safety of a farmer or a factory worker or a craftsman. There is a social reason too. Solidarity has to extend to those who cannot always do what others do and count on the protection of powerful unions. And there is an economic reason — insecurity attacks production, that is clear. The negligence which certain Member States display in getting safety regulations adhered to and paying the social costs generates a distortion in competition by infringing Article 117 of the Treaty of Rome and this is food for thought at a time when Europe is going to expand and take in other countries. The fourth reason has to do with the entry, as I have just said, of Spain and Portugal. This will double the number of workers on the Community's present fishing vessels and fleet.

The Torremolinos Convention of course only offers a very partial solution, Mr President. It only covers new or renovated vessels of more than 24 m in length, which is only a tiny part of the European fishing fleet and a tiny part of the problems, but I think it is a step in the right direction and should not be overlooked. I think the vote Parliament is now going to have — a unanimous one, I hope — will commit the Member States to running security enhancement schemes, i. e. harmonized schemes between them for vessels that meet safety standards, for equipment that meets safety standards and also for the safety education and training that is all too often absent from the courses offered for fishermen. And for medical assistance and medically-equipped support ships at the fishing grounds. These are all too rare and all too often the fishermen are left to their own devices on the fishing grounds.

Mr President, our Committee on Fisheries will monitor the application of the decision we are about to vote very closely. We shall also ensure — and this is very important — that an adequate budget is voted to finance the security training schemes of the kind given in Lorient at the seminar in May 1984, which had such

Guermeur

good results. The ball, I should say, is in the court of the 10 governments of the Community and in the court of the Council, which has to adopt realistic and efficient safety directives. It should do so on the basis of a proposal from the Commission which, I know, is working in liaison with the joint social committee whose activity under the chairmanship of Mr Parès I should like to praise here.

(Applause)

Mr Sutherland, Member of the Commission. — Mr President, I would like to commence by thanking the rapporteur and the committee for the report, which is comprehensive and of assistance. Indeed the oral contributions made during the course of today's debate have also been useful and helpful.

It is, I think, extremely relevant and important that a debate on this issue should take place at this time. As has been said, the sea fishing industry is one of the most dangerous occupations of any major industry within the Community. It is 10 to 20 times more dangerous than mining or construction, for example. This is indicative of a situation which is to be deprecated throughout the Community. The statistics referred to, indicating a deterioration rather than an improvement in safety standards over the last 20 or 30 years, are indicative of the crisis being faced. As such, the problem merits special consideration under the terms of the second action programme on safety and health at work providing for the establishment of specific measures to prevent accidents in high-risk activities. This is such a high-risk activity.

To a great extent the risks to which fishermen are exposed have to do with the safety of the ship. The International Convention for the Safety of Fishing Vessels adopted in 1977 at the conference held in Torremolinos, which was attended by all of the coastal Member States as well as Spain and Portugal, was a major step forward in this respect, although, as successive speakers have pointed out, the Convention itself is limited in its effect. It lays down safety regulations for vessels of a length of 24 metres or more. It is perhaps salutary to note that in 1982 according to the statistics, only 4.6% of Community vessels were over 24 metres in length. However, these accounted for 51.2% of the total tonnage and approximately one-quarter of the workforce. It is recognized therefore that the Convention is limited in its application.

On 23 September 1980 the Council adopted a recommendation on the ratification of the Convention by 31 July 1982 which has had some effect. Five Member States have ratified the Convention and two more are in the process of doing so. The fact that all Member States have not ratified is something to be deprecated. However, the Convention can only come into force if it is ratified by at least 15 countries whose fishing fleets account for more than 50% of the worldwide

fleet. Regrettably, on 1 May 1984 only 11 countries were signatories to the Convention and they accounted for only 20% of the total in question. It has to be said that it is impossible to foresee when the conditions for the entry into force of the Convention might be fulfilled, even when all Member States have ratified or acceded to it. None the less certain Member States already have regulations which take account of provisions set out in the Convention.

I believe that the Commission proposal is a realistic step towards improving safety in sea fishing. However, it is only a step. More needs to be done. It takes into account the resolution on the Community shipbuilding industry adopted by the European Parliament on 29 March 1984, which pays particular attention to safety standards. The Commission is carrying out studies of accident prevention by a better design and by improved training which involves coordination between ship designers, shipbuilders, shipowners and fishermen. I have noted the various points requiring further work and these will be given their priority. It can also be said that in regard to some of the issues raised during the course of the debate, amelioration is in the process of taking place as a result of activities by the Commission.

The first such issue I should like to deal with is the training of fishermen. The Commission is in the course of a study and is developing models for training fishermen in safety procedures under three separate headings defined in the context of the nature of the fishing operation in question — whether it is a major industrial, semi-industrial or a smaller capacity fishing operation. It is anticipated that at the end of the year these models will be complete and will be available for use. This then is one issue raised in the course of the debate which is currently being attended to.

The other significant aspect referred to was the extension of the Community's concern to fishing vessels of a smaller size than that contemplated by the Convention. This is a matter of concern for the Commission, which is currently studying the criteria for the safer design of equipment which could apply to new fishing vessels over 12 metres in length. This work is being proceeded with. It is considered to be a matter of significance and concern, having regard to the appalling loss of life and injury in this sector.

In regard to Community safety codes, again the Commission is working on the conclusion of safety codes. The Commission's officials are in the process of seeking to draw up these codes. It will be some time before they are complete, and I am not in a position to give anything like a specific undertaking in regard to the timing of the completion of this work. Suffice it to say that the matter is being attended to and that it is a matter of immediate concern to the Commission.

In conclusion I would like to thank both those who have contributed to the preparation of the report, par-

Sutherland

ticularly the rapporteur, and those who have participated in this debate and by their contributions identified issues of importance as far as the fishing communities throughout the Community are concerned. This is an area of activity which in the past has perhaps received nothing like the attention that it should have received.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

8. Milk and milk products

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 2-1563/84) by Mrs Caroline Jackson, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, on

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-190/84 - COM(84) 5 final) for a regulation on the designations used in the marketing of milk and milk products.

Mrs Caroline Jackson (ED), rapporteur. — Mr President, this report was carried by 20 votes to nil in the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection with 2 abstentions. I should like to underline that given the number of amendments which have been tabled to it by the subsidiary committee, the Committee on Agriculture, Parliament referred it to the Consumer Protection Committee and we have produced our report.

The Commission's draft regulation is an attempt to restrict the use of certain descriptions connected with dairy products which are given in the annex, such as milk, cream, milk powder and so on, exclusively to products which consist entirely of dairy produce.

Again I should like to underline that the Consumer Protection Committee is not against the idea of legislation in this area. It is possible — only just, but it is possible — to argue that consumers could conceivably be misled by the existing labelling on imitation milk products. However, in the view of the Consumer Protection Committee the case for a European Community regulation rather than a directive was simply not established by the Commission. We think that a regulation in this area is an example of unnecessary and unwanted over-government on the part of the EEC.

In particular, we object to the background to the draft regulation. The Commission says in its explanatory memorandum that manufacturers of imitation milk products have often been in a position (this is paragraph 4) to present imitation products in such a way as

to confuse the consumer. We should like to ask what evidence they have that consumers are being confused.

We should like also to ask why if the main aim of this regulation was to stop the confusion of consumers, the regulation has come forward from the Directorate-General on Agriculture rather than the Directorate-General which looks after consumer protection.

As far as the consumers in the European Community are concerned we note that they were not consulted by the Commission when this draft regulation was drawn up. The European Consumers Bureau in Brussels wrote to me:

It is not an issue which we consider should be taken up by consumer organizations throughout Europe. We were, moreover, not consulted by the Commission.

And it is the Commission whose prime aim is to stop the confusion of consumers. So there is a lack of consumer demand on this. I may say in parenthesis and speaking from the point of view of a British consumer that there is one product in Britain which might have benefited from the Commission's concern and that, of course, is ice cream, which, in Britain, does not have to be made simply of dairy produce. However, this was not something which the Commission went into. I just say that in parenthesis.

All we had to go on was the Commission's draft regulation, which is a very thin document. We did have certain information from our individual Member States that legislation already exists to protect consumers. For example, in Belgium there has been a case where a firm was stopped from using the description *beurre végétal*. In Britain there was a case not very long ago where one of the largest British milk marketing organizations was prosecuted for using a designation which was thought to be confusing. We can only go on these anecdotal reports, because in producing the draft regulation, the Commission gave us no evidence to support its reason for bringing forward this measure.

We did not have to look very far, however, for the other reason for bringing it forward and that is of course that even with the introduction of dairy quotas there is going to be a milk surplus of some 10 million tonnes. And alongside, nestling close to the question of consumer protection in the draft regulation, we find rather higher up that the Commission is also arguing that the disposal of milk products should be improved by the promotion of consumption. That, of course, is the real reason behind this draft regulation.

However, if the Commission is going to argue that one of the reasons why it wants to have a measure in this area is to promote consumption, it might at least produce some evidence of how far a regulation of this sort would promote consumption and how far imita-

Caroline Jackson

tion milk products, vegetable oil products and all that sort of thing, are in fact in their opinion displacing dairy produce. There is no evidence here. We were given no evidence in the committee.

Another aspect, that we thought we should bring out in the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection is that the Commission tends to play down the evidence which does exist of consumer preference. People in the European Community have been turning to non-dairy imitation milk products for a variety of reasons. They have been turning to them for price reasons. But they have also been turning to them for reasons of health. In our view, these weighed as much if not more than the fact that consumers have been turning to non-dairy imitation milk products because they are all so confused.

We did feel that the draft regulation, if the Commission was so singularly concerned for the consumer, was extremely badly drafted. For those of you who have it with you, I might draw your attention to Article 2, which I have tried to amend in my report. This is where the Commission says that

the provisions of Article 1 shall not apply where the designation of a foodstuff indicates a product which cannot be confused with one of those given in the Annex.

Now there are certain mischievous people in this Chamber — I won't name them, I'll simply say that some of them usually sit opposite me — who have been suggesting that this draft regulation would outlaw such things as *crème de cassis*, cream crackers and cream sherry. Indeed, as one reads the draft regulation it is just possible that that might be the case. I hope therefore that in the spirit of goodwill and clarity the Commission will feel it possible to accept my Amendment No 3 to Article 2.

Perhaps I have been speaking very much about the consumer side. I should now like to say a word on behalf of the people of the dairy trade in the European Community who might, one would think, be anxious to see this draft regulation. I was very surprised, as your rapporteur, to find the dairy trade, at least in my country, arguing that this draft regulation would not do them all that much good. They are particularly concerned that it might restrict developments in new technologies which would allow milk to be broken down into its component parts and rebuilt with non-dairy ingredients. Now, if that is the case and we have a very restrictive draft regulation, it is not going to help the people in the Community who actually produce the dairy products.

Can I now say a word on the opinion of the Committee on Agriculture under its able spokesman, Mr Simmonds. Anybody who cares to read the committee's opinion at the back of my report will have a rare treat in reading one of the most schizophrenic

opinions that has ever been put down. May I just read you one tiny example of that? At the top of page 21 of the English text, Mr Simmonds says:

The committee agrees that consumers should be protected from being misled by fraudulent practices, but a directive on this subject already exists.

It is the Food Labelling Directive which I think we should have an amendment to, instead of this draft regulation and

... if this directive is not perceived by the Commission as being adequate, it should be amended.

Thank you, Mr Simmonds!

Paragraph 2, further down:

The committee considers the Council regulation on the designations used in the marketing of milk and milk products proposed by the Commission to be necessary in the interests of both producers and consumers.

If the Committee on Agriculture is so schizophrenic, then the only thing to do is to ignore it!

Finally, my last words. Can I ask Commissioner Andriessen in the spirit of compromise and a fresh start and goodwill towards one of the committees that he has to deal with quite simply to withdraw this draft regulation and to do what we want him to do, which is to propose an amendment to the existing directive on food labelling. That is all we ask.

Ms Tongue (S). — The characteristic for which this Parliament has perhaps so far been rather notable in its short life is budgetary unrest. Some three months ago we voted down the budget for being rather unrealistic. The other area which has most drawn us into the public eye is the stark contrast between our mountains of butter and milk powder and the devastating consequences of drought and famine in Africa. We are at present in a period of time when the Commission itself has been called upon to preside over the rationalization of overcapacity in our traditional industries in Europe and accompanying unemployment as an inherent austerity package and so we can only oppose yet another proposal which is designed to defend an over-producing dairy industry and outmoded dietary preferences. If ever there was need for rationalization in any industry, I put it to you that here is one of the finest examples. No less than 65% of our total budget is consumed by the farm policy and of that up to 40% is spent in the milk sector. I have ten to add that we do not lay the blame for present over-production at the door of the farming community. Dairy farmers have, I may say, delivered what has been asked of them, and a lot more. Colleagues, we in the Socialist Group challenge the whole philosophy of this draft regulation which pretends to act in the interest of consumers

Tongue

when, in fact, what the Commission wants the people of Europe to do quite simply is to consume the dairy surpluses. In their own words, and I quote:

Whereas there are structural surpluses on the market in milk and milk products, therefore disposal of these products should be improved by the promotion of consumption.

The Commission presumes — and quite falsely, I believe — that consumers are being misled by labelling of certain dairy products. As my colleague Mrs Jackson has pointed out in the resolution here before you today — in fact she has just outlined this very fact — the EEC Commission has never consulted consumers or in fact produced any evidence whatsoever that consumers are being misled. They have completely ignored the real reasons why in recent years we have witnessed a decline in the consumption of dairy products. High prices for butter and other dairy products have prevented any increase in consumption. The growing number of people in Europe — and this includes seven million people in the United Kingdom alone — are living on the bread, not butter, line and cannot even afford the luxury of choice in their diet.

Secondly, I find it totally incomprehensible that the Commission has failed to take into account that growing body of medical opinion and research which clearly links the unacceptable levels of coronary disease with high animal fat levels in the diet. People are concerned about their health and are consuming less high-fat milk and dairy products.

Children, however, who may need low-fat milk in the diet when they are growing, are being denied this, particularly in my country where once every primary school child received free milk but now under local authority cuts imposed by our government are unable to do so.

These are inescapable facts which the Commission surely had a duty to take into account but patently did not. We in the Socialist Group reject this move by the Commission to force consumers to swallow what they do not want in an attempt to cover up for their failure to achieve a fundamental reform of the EEC farm policy and to have us believe that these surpluses are due to consumers being fooled by labels.

That is why my group and the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection are calling for the Commission to resubmit its whole proposal in the form of an amendment to the food labelling directive which is the only logical and sensible way to proceed in this matter.

Mr Mertens (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen! Obviously, there are widely diverging opinions on milk, dairy products and imitation milk products. This is not surprising, nor is it surprising that the

Commission found it difficult — and took years — to formulate this new proposal.

To reiterate, the Commission makes three important points. Firstly, there is a milk surplus and suitable protective measures are needed.

Secondly, a number of raw materials used in the production of imitation milk products have been given special tax advantages, with the result that it is not surprising that they compete with milk.

Thirdly, the Commission takes the view that the best way to deal with the confusion that has thereby arisen is to formulate clearer definitions and clearer labelling for the benefit of the consumer.

We agree with the Commission on this point and are grateful for the clear formulation of their proposal. We are also grateful to the rapporteur for doing all in her power to clarify the definitions so that all consumers are aware of what they are buying. Up to now there has been an almost Babylonian state of confusion because the producers of imitation products describe their products in such a clever way that they appear to be natural products. Definitions have become too vague. It should be made quite clear that in nutritional terms milk remains the most valuable product.

I would like to address a few words to some of the colleagues in my group who are of a different opinion. We have said that it is right for us to inform the public. Some of my colleagues take the view that this is not enough and that some sort of protective measures for milk are necessary. Although I appreciate this point of view, I feel that this is not the responsibility of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, since it goes beyond their terms of reference.

Secondly, my colleagues object to coupling this with the directive on labelling. I think that this is the right way to proceed and that it will lead to progress. There is a saying: a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush! Not all of you will agree, but I believe that these steps are in the right direction.

We shall accept the proposal. Consumers must have enough information to know what they are buying and what is best in health terms.

Mr Sherlock (ED). — Mr President, firstly, it had not been my intention to speak on this, because you have already had two excellent addresses on the subject from both sides of the House by our lady colleagues. I think they have put the point of view of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection with admirable clarity, and I could not improve upon their efforts.

I have risen therefore solely to deal with a rash outbreak of amendments submitted by a Mr Tolman. He

Sherlock

claims to have submitted them on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food. Undoubtedly they are a stark case made out for the promotion of the farming industry, but they are not made in the name of the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food: they are made by Mr Tolman on behalf of Mr Tolman. They have never been submitted to that committee, and the rapporteur himself has just come down and told me they have never given an opinion on this load of drivel which I hold in my right hand.

It is Tolman on behalf of Toper, if you please, but it certainly ain't anything to do with the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food! Those of you in this Chamber tonight who are fortunate enough to be in possession of these documents can begin your evening's work by striking those words out. They are totally irrelevant.

I would also say that it is very likely that my highly respected colleague, Mr Mertens, is speaking for some of the members of his political group but not for all of them, because the majority of them voted, as the rapporteur has already pointed out, in the way which was indicated in the vote in the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection. That majority could not have been sustained without the help of Mr Mertens colleagues.

So, to the demolition: let us have a look at Mr Tolman, shall we, Mr President? He first of all deletes in the motion for a resolution Article 1. Article 1 just says it is really quite a good idea that consumers are given the information that enables them to distinguish between milk products and non-milk products. Representing his farmer lobby, he doesn't even agree with that. He then wants to go on and delete paragraph 2. Having deleted paragraph 2, which fully supports the principle of giving the consumer full and clear product information, he takes the second step in the demolition of the consumer protection attitudes which have been reinforced in this Parliament time and time again, as Miss Tongue and our rapporteur have reminded us.

He goes on to delete paragraph 3 and paragraph 4 and paragraph 5. When we eventually get to his Amendment No 30, he suggests a totally farming-lobby substitute for the whole of the rest of it, divided into paragraphs numbered, of course, 8 to 8 g. My colleague has already commented on some of the schizophrenic attitudes that have been manifested. This is a manifestation of innumeracy as well. Here we have paragraphs 8 to 8 g, which just support the farming lobby and, as Miss Tongue has said, try to stuff as much milk and cream down the throats of the unsuspecting, even those who she fondly believes cannot afford to buy the stuff anyway. It is a stark attempt at demolition of milk lakes and butter mountains and all the rest of it.

My colleague, the rapporteur, has suggested to Mr Andriessen that this matter could very much better

be covered by an amendment to the food-labelling requirements already in existence. I am certain this is right. Apart from anything else, Mr Andriessen, whose English I know is pretty excellent because he has had to suffer a great many of us talking to him from time to time, will know full well that here again, if it goes through in this form — particularly with this lot — it will be the subject of ridicule in every press story that goes out in the entire United Kingdom. Even the BBC will laugh at it. You cannot get much worse than that, Mr President, can you?

Mr Maher (L). — The first point I would like to make will perhaps clear the minds of some people who have already spoken and that is to make the basic statement that we are all consumers. I do not know anybody who is not a consumer. Whether we are producing dairy products or not, we are all consumers. We are all interested in what we consume and we are interested when we are buying the product in the shop or wherever to know, as far as we can, what we are buying. I think there is some justification for criticism of the rapporteur, though I must say she has done an excellent job even though I might not agree with everything. It was necessary to clarify the situation in order that people would understand more clearly when they buy a product exactly what they are buying, and I think the Commission has made an attempt to do that. Now, of course, as I said the work is not perfect and I would agree that we ought to look further at the labelling of products as well. But there is no contradiction between these two approaches. You cannot get everything on a label, of course. Otherwise every tin or bottle would be covered with data that nobody would read. I think this has been clearly shown in the past when attempts were made to spell all this out on the packaging and nobody took any notice.

I have nothing to say against attempts to clarify this situation. The value of a naturally produced product, a product which is produced in a natural way by animals which are fed in a natural way, is something the consumer ought to be interested in. The people who produce imitation products go to the greatest lengths to try and make them look like the natural product. Why do they try to make them look like the natural product? Because they know that the people want the natural product. That is a compliment to the natural product. So I see nothing wrong in making it clear that the product is a natural one.

And if this means higher consumption of that natural product, then why not? If this is in the interests of the people of this Community, not only the farming community but the whole rural society, the towns and the villages, and all those industries that directly depend on agriculture, the input side and the output side — we sometimes forget those, we sometimes ignore their problems — then why not take this step? And so I certainly would recommend acceptance of this proposal, even though we have to do further work on it. And I

Maher

hope that the Commission will look also at the labelling and come up with a proposal later on.

IN THE CHAIR: MR ALBER

Vice-President

Mr Tolman (PFE), Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food. — (NL) Mr President, on a point of order. Unfortunately, like many Members, I am unable to be present in the Chamber every single minute and I have been informed that Mr Sherlock has made an unfair attack on the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food and its chairman, to the effect that the amendments tabled should not have been tabled on behalf of the Agricultural Committee.

Mr President, I fail to understand this, but I wish to instruct Mr Sherlock. I, as chairman of the Agricultural Committee, tabled the amendments on behalf of the committee because a member of his own political group was not present in time and as rapporteur did not take the opportunity of tabling the amendments on behalf of the Agricultural Committee. Therefore, Mr President, this attack on the Agricultural Committee and its chairman is totally unjustified and consequently Mr Sherlock ought to keep in touch more with members of his group.

President. — Thank you for that clarification.

We shall now break off the debate and resume after the voting.

9. Votes

Motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-1620/84) by Mr Hutton, on behalf of the European Democratic Group, on the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes: rejected

*
* *

Motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-1642/84) by Mr Avgerinos and others, on behalf of the Socialist Group, Mr Lambrias and others, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, Mr De Pasquale and others, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, Mr Ducarme and Mr Romeo, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group and Mr Musso, on behalf of the Group of the European Progressive Democrats, on the Integrated Mediterranean programmes.

Explanations of vote

Mr Avgerinos (S). — (GR) Mr President, I would like to express my disappointment at what was said yesterday by Mr Delors, which apart from its lack of clarity, revealed a tendency towards reducing the amounts set aside for the Mediterranean programmes, and towards altering their nature. Mr Delors told us that the aim of the Mediterranean programmes would be achieved, but he did not say whether these programmes are to be implemented without changing their essential nature, and in particular the characteristic of additivity.

He also did not make it clear whether their implementation is to take place with an increase in the sum provided by the structural funds, independently of the increase that is in any case necessary to meet the current and new obligations of those funds. Because, Mr President, we believe that this additional sum will have to be earmarked in its entirety for the financing of the Mediterranean programmes.

Of course, it is difficult for us to comment on all this because we do not have specific proposals before us. However, there are plainly two things we cannot accept. Firstly, the functioning and orientation of the funds cannot be tampered with in such a way as to bring into doubt the general aims of the Mediterranean programmes, making them subservient to those of the funds themselves. And secondly, to be more specific, we will not accept proposals that in effect take away with one hand what the other hand gives.

For these reasons we intend to vote in favour of the proposal, which in any case received general approval yesterday. We believe that only in this way can the principles of the Treaty of Rome be realised effectively.

Mr Musso (RDE). — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, yesterday we had the President of the Council come and explain to us that the Council had been unable to take the relevant decisions on the integrated Mediterranean programmes, in violation of the decisions and commitments made previously, and we had the President of the Commission come and explain to us that, to remove a veto and iron out the difficulties, the integrated Mediterranean programmes were going to be replaced by the use of structural funds.

My Group will vote for the resolution, which reiterates its attachment to the integrated Mediterranean programmes. I should like to say that all our colleagues, all the Honourable Members, whatever their party, should tell the Commission and the Council that there can be no question of attacking the principle of the integrated programmes. If the principle is attacked, we go against the principles on which the Treaty is

Musso

based. We go against what Mr Delors yesterday called solidarity and this will only mean that the gaps between certain regions of this Community of ours will get wider.

I repeat that our Group will vote for the resolution and I want all our colleagues to go beyond the political considerations that sometimes divide us and join together on this issue to make the Council and the Commission realize that there can be no question of changing things in mid-stream.

Mr Colocotronis (S). — (GR) Mr President, I would like to explain my vote by stressing certain points in the resolution which I think are decisively important. This is because for Greece, my country, the integrated Mediterranean programmes constitute a policy which will have long-term and very substantial results and consequences. There can be no question of abdication or withdrawal from insisting on the implementation of the IMP's.

The specific points I wish to stress are as follows:

Firstly, the enlargement of the European Community with the accession of Spain and Portugal can hardly be contemplated other than in combination with the prior approval and consequent implementation of the Mediterranean programmes — and this indeed is the principle significance of my vote.

Secondly, the enormous importance of the IMP's is directly linked to my country's demands, which as you know are set out in the Greek Memorandum.

Thirdly, I consider it unthinkable that the financing of the IMP's should be reduced from the figure originally determined, and that no special item should be provided for it in the general budget of the Community, but on the contrary, that the appropriations for financing them should be entered under the various funds.

Fourthly, I think it is essential that the regulation implementing these programmes should be approved without delay or postponements.

Finally, in explaining my vote I feel obliged to stress that the Mediterranean programmes represent a very broad framework of policies by the Commission, aimed at the future of Europe, which will contribute directly and effectively to the development of my country. Despite this, the Council of Ministers is substantially rejecting these policies, and one can only admit that the President, Mr Delors, disappointed us with what he told the House yesterday.

Mr Lambrias (PPE). — (GR) Mr President, as you know, the compromise proposed resolution was tabled on behalf of all but one of the groups. In the name of the European People's Party I would like to stress

something that previous speakers have omitted to say in their explanations of vote, namely that as a matter of respect for Parliament itself but also for the Commission, which has completed a very important work, there must be no changes, even indirectly, in the scheme in question, which is inspired by a specific philosophy and a specific effort to reduce the disparities between North and South.

The European People's Party considers that the Commission's views should harmonize with those of Parliament, and that the Mediterranean programmes should be implemented as they stand.

Mrs Pery (S), in writing. — (FR) The integrated Mediterranean Programmes must be resolutely supported as regards both principle and as to their application.

Undertakings have been given to countries and to regions.

Spain's imminent entry to the common market could harm the economy of Greece, Italy and various French regions such as Languedoc-Roussillon, Midi-Pyrénées and Aquitaine.

These areas received an assurance of solidarity from the countries of northern Europe so as to help them adapt to EEC enlargement, to modernize their agricultural structure and that of fisheries, to irrigate their land, but also more generally to develop their region's infrastructures and economic fabric by means of integrated projects.

The programmes are ambitious: 73 000 million francs spread over six years from 1985 to 1990. Perhaps excessively so if I understand correctly Jacques Delors' message:

'I cannot be blind to the fact that four or five of the EEC countries do not wish to pay for the IMPs. We cannot practice the policy of All or Nothing'

and we know what the Community's budgetary situation is.

Well then! Let us spread out over a longer period the implementation of these programmes but let us remain solid and faithful to our commitments.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)

*
* *

Motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-1605/84) by Mr Veil, on behalf of the Liberal Group, on the fight against terrorism.

Explanations of vote

Mr Iversen (COM). — (DA) The party I represent, the Socialist Peoples' Party, is strongly opposed to terrorism. My party opposes terrorism wherever violence is used indiscriminatorily. Terrorism is a threat to democracy, and my party will do everything in its power to defend and consolidate a democratic social system.

But when the EEC's foreign ministers at their latest meeting in Italy discussed how best to combat terrorism, one could not help recalling the well-known saying: You cannot have your cake and eat it. Do the EEC foreign ministers genuinely believe that terrorism stops at the EEC's borders? They do not. Terrorism knows no boundaries. If the EEC wishes to combat terrorism, we must be on our guard. Can we be sure that the fight against terrorism will not lead to checks on citizens? My party is against the EEC's intervening in an area where it must inevitably come up against the Danish legal system. I see absolutely no reason why the fight against terrorism should be taken up by the EEC and thereby taken out of the hands, to some extent, of Interpol. Instead of combating terrorism it would be more sensible to develop our excellent collaboration with Interpol. It would be extremely dangerous for the EEC to intervene in this very important area. It would be extremely dangerous especially when one considers how bad the EEC is at solving its already serious problems. I would urge the EEC to continue to concern itself with butter mountains and leave Interpol to get on with the fight against terrorism.

Mr Raftery (PPE). — Mr President, my group will be supporting these resolutions condemning terrorism and urging more cooperation between member governments in the prevention and control of terrorism.

No country in this Community has suffered more from terrorism than my country, Ireland. Despite criticism from some Members of this House, I can say that no country has done more to control terrorism. In 1984, for instance, we spent three times as much per capita as the United Kingdom in controlling terrorism, and the United Kingdom must after all accept most of the responsibility for the problems in Ireland for condoning a system that permanently allowed discrimination against one-third of the population in that unfortunate province of Northern Ireland. To those critics who say that Southern Ireland is a safe haven for the IRA, I say please examine the records and please study the tributes of your Westminster Government to our success in apprehending and bringing to justice the men of violence.

The consistent policy of my government is to assist in the apprehension, conviction and punishment of ter-

rorists, as is instanced by the enacting of legislation which permits the trial on our territory of terrorist-type offences committed outside our State. This Act provides the legal machinery for those who commit crimes in Northern Ireland to be tried in Southern Ireland. Under this Act there is also provision for evidence in Northern Ireland criminal trials to be heard in the South. Regrettably, this has been used only once by the Northern Ireland authorities. I should add, of course, that that legislation was the first of its kind in Europe and I would recommend that other countries follow the lead given by my government. More recently, in the Shannon and McGlinchey cases, Irish courts significantly developed world jurisprudence in the area of extradition by excluding from the exemption claimed for political offences crimes which offend against the norms of ordinary civilized human behaviour.

All civilized humanity must combine to condemn and combat unequivocally the heinous crimes committed in the name of nationalism or any other -ism. We in Ireland have no hesitation in doing so and will continue to do so. However, we must also condemn, I believe, people who preach hatred and practise discrimination, because these people in my opinion are as much responsible for the crimes of terrorism as the man who pulls the trigger or places the bomb. Let us not forget the mistakes that we in Europe made in the past by not confronting in time the bully-boys of Nazism and Fascism. If we forget the mistakes of the past, we are condemned to repeat them in the future.

(Applause from the centre and from the left)

Mr Alavanos (COM). — (GR) Mr President, the Greek Communist Party condemns acts of terrorism such as those perpetrated in our country — such as the bomb blast in a bar in the Glyfada suburb of Athens — and in other Member States of the EEC, and in general rejects terrorism as a means of pursuing the political struggle.

Nevertheless, we think that an interpretation can be placed on the phenomenon that we now see in the Western European countries, quite different from the interpretation presented in the proposed resolution. It is plain that the aim of such activities, and especially those directed against NATO installations etc., is to discredit the pacifist movement in the eyes of the European peoples. Ultimately these activities benefit those who wish, in the name of a common, supposedly anti-terrorist policy, to promote new restrictions on the popular sovereignty of the EEC's Member States, by imposing a range of measures that in the final analysis will act against the democratic, popular and unionist movement while purporting to combat terrorism.

Thus, we are in agreement with the views of our colleague Mr Iversen in opposing a Common anti-terror-

Alavanos

rist policy within the framework of the EEC. One way or another, there are already international institutions such as the UNO and its committees, which can be used to provide the necessary intergovernmental co-operation in specific cases. For these reasons we will vote against the proposed resolution.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)

*
* *

Motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-1618/84) by Mr de la Malène and others, on the fight against terrorism: adopted

*
* *

Motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-1641/84/rev.) by Mr Didò and others, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the recent terrorist attacks in several European countries and the need to establish a European legal and judicial Community.

Explanations of vote

Mrs Dury (S). — (FR) Mr President, the motion for a resolution that has just been adopted — and it was tabled by the Socialist Group — shows our desire to combat terrorism and respect our citizen's rights. We want to combat terrorism because it is a threat to democracy. Destructive and murderous action can only be a threat.

Nevertheless, there is also the terrorism of ideas. One of the Members of this Parliament has besmirched the honour of our Institution. More than his past action, Mr Le Pen, his Party and his Group are also a threat to democracy. They spread ideas that lead to racial hatred. They spread ideas that can also lead to murder. One of the members of his Party has just been condemned in France for racial hatred. This is not my imagination. So I think we must be on our guard, both about terrorism proper and about the terrorism of ideas that masquerades as traditional political action.

So I call on this Parliament to think and, once and for all, to show just what its attitude to Mr Le Pen, to the extreme right and to the terrorists really is.

(Applause from the left, protest from the centre and the right)

President. — I would ask you once again only to give explanations of vote and not to take up the debate again. Unhappily these explanations are used again

and again to make personal attacks on others, and this then leads to a whole series of counter-statements.

Mr Tripodi (DR). — (IT) Mr President, after the explanation provided yesterday by Mr Le Pen, I think that any statement to different effect heard in this Chamber can only be considered slanderous and unseemly for the European Parliament. I earnestly ask you to remind the last speaker of Parliamentary discipline and the respect for the opinions of everyone, and above all to invite her to express herself without making slanderous statements that are unseemly in the European Parliament.

Mrs Pery, in writing. — (FR) I shall vote in support of the Socialist Group's resolution calling for Member States meeting in political cooperation to establish common rules to combat terrorism in all its forms as well as organized crime, which are often connected.

The European Parliament has voted with a very large majority and on a number of occasions in favour of resolutions along these lines. International terrorism endangers our democracies, is abhorrent to the Europeans that we are and must be fought with determination.

However, I cannot help expressing some concern at the temptation of a 'witch hunt' which these decisions might permit. The fight against terrorism must not compromise liberty and the right of each person and cannot prevent each Member State from asserting its traditions such as the right, properly understood, of political asylum in France.

But it is true that the recent terrorist attacks in several European countries necessitates the creation of a 'European legal and judicial community'.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)

Motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-1643/84) by Mr Cassidy and others, on combating terrorism: adopted

*
* *

Motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-1644/84) by Mr Habsburg and others, on behalf of the European People's Party, on the combating of terrorism: adopted

*
* *

Motion for a resolution (Doc. 2-1650/84/rev.) by Mr Cervetti and others, on terrorist attacks in Europe.

Explanation of vote

Mrs Hammerich (ARC), in writing. — (DA) One can sometimes find in the press the exact formulation one is looking for. On the issue to what extent the EEC should have a common legal area and common anti-terrorist measures, I have found a very apt illustration in Denmark's biggest morning newspaper, Politiken, of 7 February 1985:

'The Italian Presidency has plans to convene a special meeting of ministers responsible for dealing with terrorism. Over and above the fact that such a meeting would be outside the parameters laid down for cooperation, it just would not be enough . . . Terrorists are not stopped by borders, whether they be the EEC's or elsewhere . . . they have carried out frightful outrages in Stockholm and in Vienna . . .

And the leader ends with a call to the EEC to stay out of the fight against terrorism and concern itself with its butter mountains.

In one of today's proposals — the Christian-Democratic proposal — a call is made for the setting up of working parities under security authorities together with EEC measures against terrorism. That is to say, a species of militarization and coordination of police forces. We are naturally against such a development. One may also have one's doubts as to whether such quasi-military measures will lead to the containment of violence or, on the contrary, to its escalation.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)

*
* *

Second report (Doc. 2-1575/84) by Mr Gatti, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, on four proposals from the Commission to the Council on the common organization of the market in wine

Explanations of vote

Mr Musso (RDE). — (FR) My Group will be voting for the Gatti report. It is not a panacea, but what were we offered? A guarantee threshold, production quotas and compulsory distillation. We shall no longer have quotas laid down in advance, we shall no longer have price freezing, so we are in favour of Mr Gatti's report.

Sir Peter Vanneck (ED). — Mr President, I rise to support this motion, not as a wine producer, but I declare my interest as a wine consumer.

(Applause)

I might even dare to say a wine connoisseur, certainly of that Portuguese speciality, the jewel in the crown of Britain's oldest ally — vintage port. That is why paragraph A7 about the prohibition of added sugar in 1990 is so important, not necessarily must but sugar. Of course the social and unemployment problems arising must be acknowledged and tackled. But I do not mind in the least if English wine, for instance, of high price and low quality, having risen in quantity sevenfold in three years, stabilizes around its present level. Blending, naturally, I accept, provided it is strictly notifiable. The *Midi Canal* wines I believe, largely benefited many many years ago as well as the thinner *Bordeaux* with additions from the *Languedoc* and sunnier south wines. And Algerian is well known as an ingredient of some Burgundies.

Mr Chaptal, in my view, did a grave long-term disservice to the discriminating wine bibber with his process and now is the time to redress the balance. I am glad that all this has been so thoroughly discussed and I personally will vote for the report.

(Applause)

Mr Graefe zu Baringdorf (ARC). — (DE) Albeit with gritted teeth, we intend to vote for the Gatti report, since it does make some attempt to counter structural destruction in this sector of agriculture even if the protection of small producers does not go far enough.

The fact that in today's debate on the report Commissioner Andriessen has opposed it and made it clear that it does not go far enough for him in promoting further rationalization clearly shows how important support for even these minor measures is, so that we can develop a different policy on agriculture which does not destroy small and medium-sized agricultural holdings.

Mr Provan (ED). — I shall be very brief. We were very disappointed as a group that paragraph 11 amendments, tabled by Ms Tongue, were not carried by Parliament. It has made us think considerably about our position in supporting the Gatti report, because we cannot go along with a policy that asks for a promotional campaign advertising harmonization and a reduction of taxation in this year to try to get rid of what is a very severe financial problem for the Community. Let me say that I was encouraged to hear the Commissioner himself say that he cannot go along with it, so my groups feels that it can, therefore, support the Gatti report.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)¹

Mr Spinelli (COM). — (IT) Mr President, I did not want to upset the process of voting with a question on

¹ The rapporteur was FOR Amendments 1-9, 13 and 25 AGAINST Amendments 10-12, 14-16, 18-24, 26-41.

Spinelli

procedure. Now that voting has taken place, I cannot however refrain from raising the problem.

For the second time today you have applied a method of voting that does not seem to me to be correct, because you have first of all taken a vote on those paragraphs for which no amendments were tabled, and then gone back and taken a vote on those texts that had amendments tabled for them. Now, since the text in its entirety follows its own internal logic, it is obvious that if one point is amended, the next point might contain contradictions such that it, in turn, could not be approved, even though no amendments had been tabled for it.

If I am not mistaken the Rules of Procedure lay down that the articles are to be voted on one after the other, and that, when there is an amendment, this should be put to the vote before the text.

Since this is already the second time you have followed this method, I should like to ask you to put this question of the correct application of the method of voting to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions, and to the Bureau. It is clear, in fact, that if every Vice-President were to interpret the Rules of Procedure in his own way, it would cause considerable confusion.

President. — Mr Spinelli, strictly speaking you are of course right. However, whether in practice it is appropriate, if not to be expected, that the acceptance or rejection of an amendment should have implications for the corresponding paragraphs, I beg leave to doubt. In any case, we save a lot of time this way.

Mr von der Vring (S). — (DE) Mr President, I would like to congratulate you for this procedure and encourage you to continue to use it. Mr Spinelli cannot dispute that you would accept this. Your method of conducting the vote meets with everyone's approval and is therefore not a breach of the rules. Parliament wastes so much time that it is very welcome when a president has the courage to reduce time-wasting.

(Applause)

President. — Mr von der Vring, since you have praised me, I am glad I asked you to speak.

*
* *

Report (Doc. 2-1529/84) by Mr Seeler, on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, on the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 2-1110/84 - COM(84) 601 final) for a regulation concerning the adoption of the Protocol extending to Brunei-Daressalam the Cooperation Agreement

between the European Economic Community on one side and Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand, member countries of the Association of South East Asian Nations, on the other.

Explanations of vote

Mr Woltjer (S). — (NL) Mr President, I shall be brief, but I do wish to comment on some points raised in the debate on this report.

The Socialist Group supports the extension of the EEC-ASEAN Cooperation Agreement to Brunei for the following reasons. We believe we can best help the peoples of Southern Asia by supporting attempts by the ASEAN countries to create a zone of peace and security in that region. That is an essential condition for raising the standard of living for the inhabitants of these countries. We should not forget that before the foundation of ASEAN there were considerable tensions in these countries including Brunei and there was even the threat of war. ASEAN has contributed towards a considerable improvement in the relations between these countries.

Secondly we believe that the European Community can best help ASEAN by improving trade relationships under the existing agreements. In this regard I am particularly pleased at the increase in contacts between the European Parliament and the interparliamentary organisation of ASEAN. As Mr Seeler already said, however, the present agreement with ASEAN should be extended, particularly in respect of human rights and trade union rights. In this connection we fully support the conclusions of the conference held in Bangkok in November 1984 of the united trades unions of the ASEAN countries and the Confederation of European Trade Unions. Among other things this conference called for the complete acceptance of ILO agreements on multinationals and social policy, with particular reference to export zones and the inclusion of trade union activities in the EEC-ASEAN Cooperation Agreement when it is discussed later this year.

Mr President, for these reasons and these activities we feel we can support these proposals.

Mr Graefe zu Baringdorf (ARC). — (DE) Mr President, Mr Woltjer's explanation of vote is in contrast to what Mr Seeler said this afternoon. His intentions were somewhat clearer. His purpose was not so much to help the ASEAN countries in their efforts to achieve a reasonable standard of living for their populations, but how the EC could benefit from the resources of this region and how it could be emancipated from the influence of the Soviet Union, Japan and the USA — all for quite unselfish reasons, of course!

Graefe zu Baringdorf

Those of us who were here this afternoon will understand why the Social Democrats and the PPE Group cooperated on this matter and that the Social Democrats are very quick to overlook violations of human rights when it is a question of opening up an economic area for the Community. I would recommend that all of you who were not here this afternoon read through what Brigitte Heinrich said as printed in the verbatim report of proceedings. She makes it clear what the real interests are, what the real position is in these countries, how human rights are totally disregarded and that in reality economic interests are involved, and not an attempt to improve human rights in this area.

(Parliament adopted the motion for a resolution)

Report (Doc. 2-1569/84) by Mr Provan, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, on the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-357/84 - COM(84) 340 final) for a Decision on the ratification of the Torremolinos Convention on the safety of fishing vessels and the application of the provisions thereof by the Member States pending the entry into force of the Convention at international level: adopted

*
* *

10. *Milk and milk products (continuation)*

Mr Guerneur (RDE). — *(FR)* Before saying my piece, I should like to mention Mr Sherlock's storm of abuse just now about the Chairman of our Committee on Agriculture. Rarely have I heard anything so frenziedly hostile to the farmers and the Committee on Agriculture in general. Mr Sherlock mentioned the Committee on Agriculture, calling it schizophrenic. When I heard his frenzied speech, I was tempted to think that what he said was paranoid — to stay in the realms of psychiatry.

Having said that, Mr President, as far as the substance of this problem is concerned, the proposal for a regulation is as pointless as it is dangerous. I think the proposal before us is globally negative in that it provides a response to neither one of our concerns. Our first concern is the disposal of milk products, which costs the European collectivity a great deal, as we all know, and the second is the protection of the consumer.

On the subject of the disposal of products, we can see that the proposal for a regulation tends to favour substitute products that are often made from imported raw materials — which puts them in a privileged position on the market and enables them to do down the natural products.

As to the protection of the consumer, it is somewhat of an illusion to imagine that you protect the con-

sumer if you define the products. There is no doubt at all that the wit of the bosses in the firms will soon settle the question by getting round the regulations — in which case the regulation does nothing.

We, Mr President, are in favour of another solution — which is for the time being to maintain the national regulations that are adequate both to market the products and protect the consumer. Although natural products need protecting, generally speaking, from imitations and threats of imitation, we think the problem should be tackled more globally, not with milk on one side and wine on the other. I should like to point out here that one of the people who spoke on the Gatti report just now was pleased to see wine protected because he likes port. Am I to conclude that some of the Honourable Members do not like milk because they refuse for milk products what they accept for wine?

In conclusion, Mr President, I should like to say that this is not a technical problem. It is much more than that. It is a problem of protecting milk and of protecting the farmers — that is to say that the problem is an economic and social one and our Group will vote against the proposal for a regulation.

Mr Andriessen, Vice-President of the Commission. — *(NL)* Mr President, when one listens to a debate such as this, one must come to the conclusion that it is extraordinarily difficult to satisfy the consumer.

(Laughter)

Nevertheless, I would dare to maintain that what we are discussing here is also the consumer's interests. Some may dispute that, but I can give you examples. Here is a French advertisement: 'If you like the taste of things cooked in butter, try Fama margarine', or 'Planta, the vegetable butter for eating and cooking'.

What does that mean, Mr President? It means that people are trying to sell certain products under the guise of milk or milk products. Other speakers have already drawn attention to this and one may wonder why it is being done if milk and milk products did not appeal to the consumer. We are not exerting pressure on anyone with these proposals. What we are aiming at with these proposals is informing the consumer about what he is buying. And I believe the significance of this activity should not be underestimated.

I would ask those who object to the marketing of dairy products what exactly are they objecting to. What objection is there in a normal market economy to trying to use normal means of selling good products to consumers? I have often heard Members of this House saying in debates on the dairy sector that we must have an active policy to market and export our goods. Well, what is the objection? I do not understand the resistance in this House.

Andriessen

The question has been asked: why must this be a regulation, why not a directive, why not an amendment to the existing directive No 79/112? May I say this first of all? It also answers a number of points made on the somewhat general nature of this regulation. This regulation is a framework, the details of which are to be worked out later. That is why I do not need to take up in this framework the details which will be decided on at a later stage.

Why should it be a regulation? It should be a regulation because it contains an unambiguous clear definition of a number of products, it is directly applicable in all countries of the Community and therefore does not need to be laboriously translated into national legislation which may not contribute to this clarity and directness. That argument alone justifies the decision not to amend directive 79/112. There is a second reason for not amending directive 79/112 which is that the said directive deals with labelling whereas in this regulation we are dealing with defining products, a totally different matter which cannot so easily be put together with the contents of directive 79/112.

Mr President, I openly admit that this regulation also covers the marketing of milk products and I fail to see why that should not involve proper information to the consumer. We are talking about marketing, we are not talking about maintaining overproduction, as has been said. I thought that the Community had recently taken action to cut down on the production of dairy products and that we were slowly trying to introduce that system into our society.

It has been claimed that the consumers have not been consulted. May I point out — although it may not be enough for those here today who claim to speak on behalf of the consumers — that we have at any rate consulted the Consultative Committee for Milk Products where consumers are directly represented. It is not true therefore to claim that the consumers have been ignored in this affair. Consumers' opinions on this matter were heard in the committee. We also discussed consumer preferences and health risks. I am not a doctor but it is going too far to claim that health problems arising from excessive consumption of fats would be seriously affected by what we are discussing. In trying to prove too much one proves nothing.

For all these reasons, Mr President, I do not think it reasonable for the Commission to withdraw this proposal; it must maintain it.

Finally I wish the House to know clearly the Commission's position on the amendments before us; I shall briefly explain, without going into all amendments in detail, which ones the Commission rejects, which it is prepared to consider if spelled out more clearly, and which it can accept.

It is clear from what I have said that any amendment aimed at changing this regulation into a directive can-

not be accepted by the Commission. The Commission also rejects amendments Nos 3, 8, 9, 11, 14, 18, 21 mostly because we feel that these deal with precise definitions which should be taken up in the basic regulation. The Commission thinks it could consider amendments Nos 2, 5, 6, 7, 10, 12, 13, 15 and 16 which spell out more clearly some parts of the text; some could undoubtedly be considered more closely. The Commission can accept amendments 4 and 17 although the number of months in amendment 4 should be looked at again.

Mr Sherlock (ED). — Mr President, there is one very relevant amendment that the Commissioner has totally failed to mention. I refer to Amendment No 30. I would greatly value his opinion on that. It has paragraphs 8 a to 8 g. Whether he cares to take them individually or dismiss them collectively, I shall be equally happy either way.

Mr Andriessen, Vice-President of the Commission. — (NL) I do not know if I have correctly understood, Mr President. I listed three categories: those amendments that the Commission rejects, those that it would be prepared to consider if accepted by Parliament which include No 13 if I have correctly understood you, and those . . .

(Cry from Mr Sherlock: 'Thirty!')

Yes, Mr President, I spoke of the amendments to the regulation. I was *not* speaking about the amendments to the motion for a resolution. And it seems to me, in view of this debate, that the two honourable Members should perhaps discuss this again between themselves.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will take place at the next voting time.

11. *Protection of workers*

President. — The next item is the debate on the report (Doc. 2-1567/840) by Mrs Squarcialupi, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public health and Consumer Protection,

on the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 2-621/84 - COM(84) 456 final) for a directive on the protection of workers by the proscription of specified agents and/or work activities.

Mrs Squarcialupi (COM), rapporteur. — (IT) Mr President, the subject of occupational health is not making the progress that we should have liked. The Commission proceeds very slowly, and tackles a

Squarcialupi

very limited part of the problem. And yet, we have to acknowledge that this proposal from the Commission for a directive has focused on one of the most real problems in the very vast field of carcinogenicity.

This proposal for a directive, in fact, prohibits for the first time the use of three substances, the three most dangerous aromatic amines, against which man has absolutely no defence. The Committee on the Protection of the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection has valued the importance of this prohibition, even though in many countries these substances have long been prohibited. But the Committee on the Environment felt that to these three substances a fourth should be added — Benzidine, which is now universally considered to be a high carcinogenic risk.

Since in most of the Member States these substances are already prohibited by law or are no longer produced, we felt furthermore that it was desirable to bring forward the deadline for applying the directive.

With regard to the substances that are prohibited by this directive, the risk was identified by means of epidemiological investigations and experimental studies which showed them to be highly carcinogenic. Then the toxicologists provided an estimate of the risk, and now these two stages must be followed by the limitation or elimination of the guilty substances. This third stage requires the involvement of both sides of industry — the employers and the unions — as well as the political bodies such as ourselves, for a decision to be taken in favour of limitation or elimination. As I have said, all of this has already taken place in the majority of our countries, and for us, therefore, it is only a matter of ratification.

It is true that the directive makes provision for some derogation, but it is to be hoped that any authorisation of derogations will be made in full awareness of the harm to which workers may be subjected if they come into contact with these substances.

The contributions of the various members of the Committee on the Protection of the Environment have been very important; they have added to the value of my report, and have not ignored the most dramatic facts of recent history — the tragedy of Bhopal, for example, with regard to which the European Parliament spoke out clearly a month ago condemning the indiscriminate transfer of dangerous technology to developing countries. We have been insistent on this point — as the Committee on Social Affairs has also been — putting forward amendments to the preamble of the directive, and altering the text of the resolution.

All of this, moreover, is in line with decisions taken by the European Parliament in the past, for example regarding harmful pesticides, which are prohibited in our countries and are exported to the countries of the Third World.

We are not new, therefore, Mr Commissioner, to these problems, and any objections that might come from you — there were some, moreover, from your representatives in our Committee, objections regarding the Community limits of directives — are no longer sufficient, believe me. In fact, just as Parliament has grown and we have grown in recent years — I mean, politically — we should like the Commission to grow, too, and not remain imprisoned by certain regulations which, moreover, are not written clearly anywhere.

Mrs Schleicher has tabled a number of amendments to my resolution, amendments which attempt to reduce the scope of the directive that we want — let us make this clear — to be an 'open' directive, one that can contain a list of all substances which, from time to time, may be judged too dangerous to human health, and in this particular case, to the health of the workers.

Our Committee has already rejected all of Mrs Schleicher's amendments, including those intended to provide the Commission with indications for future directives. We were not able to discuss in great detail the content of these amendments, to the extent that a subject such as this — occupational health, and, above all, the danger of occupational cancer — might have encouraged us to do.

In conclusion, Mr President, this document of the Commission — we have to admit it — does not represent an act of great courage, since it has already been superseded by a great many national situations and, in any event, by a very great many manufacturers' situations. It is, however, an act that shows a new way forward, a way forward that prohibits the use of agents that have been shown to cause cancer. We appreciate this new way forward that the Commission has taken, even though we recognize its great limitations, and we ask this Assembly to approve the proposal for a directive; but, above all, we ask the Commission to go forward with greater courage and also with greater speed, in the field of occupational health.

Mr Hughes (S). — Mr President, it is a cause for concern that much of the time of this Assembly is taken up with issues that have little or no immediate relevance to the lives of working people. I would say on behalf of the Socialist Group that it is good, therefore, to see a proposal of this sort, under the Community's programme on health and safety, which could help working people if strengthened in the way suggested by the Squarcialupi report and the amendments tabled by the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection.

There is little doubt that the Commission's proposal needs to be strengthened in several important respects. As it stands, it lacks a sense of urgency. At present, it proposes the banning of only three substances, already

Hughes

largely banned within the Community. It proposes potentially broad exemptions with little regard to the need to enforce safeguards where exemptions are granted. It pays inadequate attention to the need to inform workers of the dangers they face and involve them in implementation, and it fails to address the danger that substances or processes banned in the Community may be merely transferred by manufacturers to third countries — something, as Mrs Squarcialupi has said, we should all bear in mind hard on the heels of Bhopal.

I am not surprised that the Commission's proposal displays these weaknesses. They seem to me to reflect the attitude of the chemical manufacturing associations. It is now 11 years since the International Labour Office concluded that

employers' and workers' organizations should take positive action to carry out programmes of information and education with regard to the hazards of occupational cancer and should encourage their members to participate fully in programmes of prevention and control.

But over the last 11 years progress has been painfully slow, and in my view that has been largely due to the fact that, for reasons of cost and profit and possible disruption, manufacturers have continually hedged about and delayed action on carcinogenic substances.

The fundamental difference is that while workers' organizations take as their starting point the need to protect people from occupational cancer, the manufacturers' object is more often to protect substances from what they call unjustified prohibition or restriction. Now, surely the approach of this Assembly must be to put peoples' lives first and to eliminate deaths from preventable causes wherever possible.

The classic response of the manufacturers, when pressed on the subject of occupational cancer, is to play down the difference between carcinogenic and other toxic substances and to call for a new time-wasting procedure of hazard and risk assessment. No doubt, similar calls will be made in this debate today.

The fact that the Commission lists only three substances in its proposal seems to imply that much work needs to be done before others can be added. In fact, over the years a great deal of work has been done by a number of organizations: the International Labour Office, the International Agency for Research on Cancer, the European Chemical Industry Ecology and Toxicology Centre, and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration in the United States. The approach of these organizations has been to use general criteria to allow the rapid classification of thousands of chemical substances into groups of varying carcinogenic potential. As long ago as March 1982, the work of these organizations had produced a list of over 300 substances known to be carcinogenic.

The fact is, there really is no need for the Commission to re-invent the wheel in this respect. The danger is that substances will be considered innocent until proved guilty by a lengthy delaying process. This is one area where guilt should not need to be proved beyond reasonable doubt, but on the basis of a balance of probabilities. On that basis much work has been done, and it is essential that the annex to the Commission's proposal be considered open and be added to with a sense of urgency.

Turning to exemptions contemplated under the proposal, I think it vital that the points raised by the Squarcialupi report and the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection's amendments are supported to ensure a stringent placing of exemptions, a high standard of monitoring and inspection and, what is most important, to ensure that workers are fully involved and informed.

Manufacturers often declare a touching faith in their ability to contain hazards, but bitter experience shows that employers frequently fail to meet adequate safety standards. The informing and involvement of workers in this situation is of crucial importance. It is their lives and health which are at stake, and they have direct experience of conditions in the work-places concerned. It is a great pity that informing and involving workers is not accorded greater importance in general and that, for example, the Vredeling Directive lies gathering dust in some corner of the EEC maze.

Finally, Mr President, I would like to reemphasize one point. That is that we must ensure that any substance or process banned in the Community by this proposal, or others urgently needed in the series, are not merely transferred to third countries by manufacturers.

The debates of the Assembly often profess a concern for the well-being of the people of the Third World, and the Squarcialupi report includes a principle which would show that in practice. In general we must put concern for the lives of workers in the Community above concern for profit or convenience in the continued use of proven carcinogenic agents, and we must show equal concern for the lives of workers in the developing world.

The Squarcialupi report meets these points, and the Socialist Group will support it.

Mrs Schleicher (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen! The members of the European Parliament have a duty not only to check any documents submitted on their validity, but also on their potential effectiveness. My group holds that not everything that can be regulated should be regulated, but only when legislation appears useful. We consider proposals for Community legislation in terms of their necessity and their effectiveness, but also in terms of the amount of bureaucracy involved.

Schleicher

This Commission directive aims at improving worker protection by a ban on certain substances and methods of production. In principle this is deserving of support, particularly since some of the substances have been proved to be carcinogenic and can, among other things, cause cancer of the bladder.

On closer inspection, however, the proposal appears very inadequate. Numerous exceptions undermine the basic theory that these substances must be banned, the aims and area of application are hard to define, no changes will occur in existing legislation in Member States, as existing legislation has already been incorporated and harmonization will not be achieved, as minimum standards are laid down which can be exceeded. Finally, the Commission has chosen an unusual method: three or four substances are mentioned in the annex, but this list can be extended at will without Parliament being able to give its opinion.

The Group of the European People's Party calls on the Commission to submit an overall framework regulation as quickly as possible, which would then apply to all carcinogenic substances at places of work. We were extremely surprised when, in committee, the Commission representative agreed with us, and informed us that the Commission intends to submit a framework directive along these lines at the beginning of 1985 which is not only to define maximum exposure limits but will also specify methods of control and analysis for the individual substances. Information for workers is also to be included.

We are disappointed, Mrs Squarcialupi, that your report does not mention this at all, although in committee you expressed support for our view. But this does not appear in your report. What better opportunity does Parliament have of putting these demands! If the Commission keeps to its present schedule on this directive, it will take hundreds of years before even the necessary groundwork has been done.

Our amendments, in particular Nos 16 to 18, call upon the Commission to submit as quickly as possible the promised framework directive which will define in detail the handling and possible prohibition of hazardous and carcinogenic substances.

We also call upon our colleagues in other groups to support our amendments and to reject the Commission's totally inadequate draft.

Mrs Squarcialupi (COM), rapporteur. — (IT) Mrs Schleicher says that I have not accepted what was proposed. Obviously, Mrs Schleicher has not read paragraphs 10 and 11 of the motion for a resolution.

Furthermore, the proof that Mrs Schleicher has not read my resolution lies in the fact she has put forward, as an amendment, a text that is already part of my

resolution. And so, Mrs Schleicher, it is not my fault if you do not read the document: your amendment No 11 is the same as my preamble D.

Mr Filinis (COM). — (GR) Mr President, on behalf of the internal Greek Communist Party I would like to stress that we greatly approve of the report presented by Mrs Squarcialupi, and the amendments to the Commission's directive. We shall therefore vote in favour of them.

We believe that protecting the health of working people against the use of certain harmful, and indeed carcinogenic substances is a matter so essential that it speaks for itself. We now need one more step towards a European policy for the protection of working people, of course involving the active participation of the working people themselves.

However, we would like to emphasise two points in particular: One concerns the transfer of production technologies which we ourselves prohibit, to countries of the Third World. Mr President, our moral obligation towards those countries is very great, because the technologies in question were developed in our own countries, we ourselves ascertained their harmful nature, and the companies that will introduce these methods to the Third World are likely to be European ones.

For this reason we particularly applaud point 8 of the proposed resolution, which calls upon the Commission to take steps to prevent the exporting of products whose preparation involved the use of proscribed substances or processes.

This brings us to the second matter we wish to raise. The most effective possible control of the use and propagation of such substances and processes can only be ensured if a list is drawn up specifying all the uses to which they may be put. Because the public at large, and indeed most of us here are unaware how and where these substances are used. Thus, we cannot exercise the necessary control, which remains exclusively in the hands of experts. However, the health of working people is not a problem that should remain the province of specialists; it concerns us all, and everyone should be able to monitor and check the application of the prohibitions.

We therefore agree wholeheartedly with the conclusions reached by the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, and propose that the Commission should set about compiling the list in question.

Mr Roelands du Vivier (ARC). — (FR) Mr President, when I look at the Commission's proposals, I have a picture of a snail and a few rounds of sausage. The snail is for the speed with which the Commission acts — because banning what is already banned in the

Roelands du Vivier

Community does not seem to me to constitute a great deal of progress and is not the way to get the Community to advance in the field of the environment.

I think of the rounds of sausage because of the method the Commission uses. It is happy to cut different things into little slices, as, for example, we are happy to ban certain substances here and forget others.

What we need is a more global view of things and the Commission would do well, as my predecessors said, to take a global approach to all carcinogens. I should also like to insist on something I think is important, something that is underlined in the amendments from the Committee on the Environment and that is the fact that the substances that are banned here can still be exported to third countries. We have insisted on the fact that we should ban the export outside the Community of substances that are banned within the Community. This is absolutely vital for the workers of the third world.

We also need fresh initiatives from the Commission on carcinogenic substances where people work. And when we say work, we must not confine ourselves to the factory floor. We must also cover offices. As you know, a recent enquiry by the American EPA showed that staff health is at risk from insulating materials and office carpets. These carpets and these insulating materials are potentially carcinogenic. I think that this is an example of something the Community could do. It shows we are ambitious for it.

Mr Sutherland, Member of the Commission. — Mr President, I should like to begin by commending Mrs Squarcialupi for the support which she has given in general terms to the Commission for its initiative. I think also that it has to be said that I have listened with a great deal of attention to the various points which have been made and I am anxious to commend those who have made oral contributions today which have been helpful.

By way of preface to my remarks I should say that, of course, it is always fair in a sense to comment on the inadequacy of measures, but the inadequacy of measures in regard to the protection of people from dangerous substances is in a sense a reflection of the inadequacy of resources made available to the Commission in terms of preparing its policies. I do not say that with a note of apology, but by way of explanation.

The second point that I should make is that the Commission itself is participating in this instance in a programme, not in one particular proposal which is to be taken as *sui generis*. It is part of an ongoing proposal. It is important to make that point also.

In general terms, I may say that many of the amendments which I will identify are acceptable. Some give rise to difficulties and could not be incorporated into

the proposal, even though I would have sympathy with them in terms of the reason for their proposal. Prominent amongst these are the amendments dealing in one way or another with the export of banned production processes to the Third World and the importation of banned processes. Whilst I would agree wholeheartedly with the concept, this particular proposal is not the appropriate vehicle for such wide-ranging regulations. The question raised by the Bhopal incident comes within the provisions of the Seveso Directive which is under review at present.

This particular proposal has as its aim to increase the protection of workers' health by means of a general or limited ban on certain named dangerous agents and/or work processes where use of other means available does not make it possible to ensure adequate protection. It responds to the second programme of action of the European Communities on safety and health at work, the context into which it has to be placed. This contains, of course, an action to develop preventive and protective measures in respect of substances recognized as being carcinogenic and other dangerous substances and processes which may have serious harmful effects on health and is based on Directive 80/1107.

Mr Hughes, who is not here now, made the comment that measures were not taken to ensure that workers and their representatives in the undertakings or establishments received sufficient information. In fact, that matter is covered in Article 5 of the Council directive which provides that:

appropriate measures should be taken to ensure that workers and their representatives in the undertaking or establishment receive adequate information concerning the health and safety risks pertaining to the agent or the work activity to which they are exposed or likely to be exposed, together with the measures to be taken against the risk.

So that particular issue is, in fact, covered.

Lastly, before referring to the specific amendments, I would like to raise the question of the date of application of the directive. I accept that the rapporteur would like to see the directive adopted as quickly as possible, and so indeed would the Commission. Nevertheless, the Commission must ensure that Member States translate the directive into national legislation by the due date. The date proposed allows too short a time for the steps required, even if the directive has already been adopted. It is not possible to predict the date of adoption by the Council of the directive, but I do consider that 1 January 1987 is a much more realistic date than 1 January 1986. The suggested delay is merely a recognition of reality.

Given the provisos which I have mentioned, the Commission will prepare a revised proposal in the light of

Sutherland

the comments which have been made. A total of 19 amendments have been tabled and I can accept 13 of these. I should like to indicate very briefly my difficulties with the remaining six. Amendments Nos 2 and 7 have been motivated, I believe, in part by the Bhopal incident. I have already indicated that in my view the present draft directive is not the appropriate place to deal with that particular issue. The Commission will, however, as a matter of urgency be considering the appropriate context in which to approach that particular question.

Amendment No 8 is also inappropriate in the view of the Commission. Discussions in the Council have not yet begun and even if the directive were adopted this year, it would not be realistic, as I have already pointed out, to expect Member States to have it embodied in their national laws by 1 January next. Amendments Nos 13 and 14 tend to question the basic usefulness of the directive. I cannot therefore subscribe to them and would be opposed to them. Amendment No 18 is unacceptable because once again it would tend to undermine the use and effectiveness of the whole directive. I would also ask that it be opposed.

In conclusion, I would like to thank both those who have helped to draw up the report and those who have spoken in this debate.

Mr Sherlock (ED). — Mr President, I notice that two distinct precedents have been set this evening by members of the College of Commissioners. One declined to comment on amendments to a motion for a resolution. Commissioner Sutherland has just given us the benefit of his opinions. I wonder perhaps if, some time when they are locked in their rooms, they can reach some consistency of attitude on this subject.

President. — I am always pleased to pass on any praise.

The debate is closed.

The vote will take place at the next voting time.

Mrs Lentz-Cornette (PPE). — (DE) I should like to ask whether you said that voting on this report and on the Jackson report will take place tomorrow at 9.00.

President. — The vote will take place following the Council's motions for resolutions by urgent procedure.

Mrs Lentz-Cornette (PPE). — (DE) Could we move that voting be taken straight away at 9.00?

President. — Between 9 a.m. and 10 a.m. tomorrow morning only votes are scheduled. The normal debates will resume with the Cassidy report.

Mr Rogalla (S). — (DE) Mr President, did I understand you to say that the Cassidy report will be dealt with after the voting? Can I assume that the Commission will be represented by the Commissioner responsible? Thirdly: the Cassidy report deals with important everyday matters, which affect people entering the Community. If the vote is put off until tomorrow, more publicity would be given to this matter, which I would welcome.

President. — In the first place, votes will take place tomorrow morning on those reports on which the debate is closed. Then the Musso and Galland urgency motion will be taken, and finally we shall consider the Cassidy report. It is not possible at the moment to say how long the debate on the Musso and Galland motions will last.

Mr Rogalla (S). — (DE) Mr President, I asked whether the Commission will be represented tomorrow by the Commissioner responsible for the internal market and fiscal matters.

My mind would be set at rest if he were to be present.

President. — The Commission will be represented tomorrow by Commissioner Varfis.

(The sitting was closed at 8 p.m.)¹

¹ Agenda for next sitting: see Minutes.

SITTING OF FRIDAY, 15 FEBRUARY 1985

Contents

1. Votes <i>Mrs Jackson; Mrs Squarcialupi; Mr Bocklet; Mr Alavanos; Mrs Squarcialupi; Mr Christiansen</i>	240	4. Mediterranean regions - Report (Doc. 2-1667/84) by Mr Musso <i>Mr Musso; Mr Varfis (Commission)</i>	247
2. Food aid - Report (Doc. 2-1708/84) by Mr Galland <i>Mr Galland; Mrs Focke; Mr Jackson; Mr Guerneur; Mr Balfe; Mr Varfis (Commission); Mrs Focke</i>	242	5. Goods contained in travellers' personal luggage - Report (Doc. 2-1568/84) by Mr Cassidy <i>Mr Cassidy; Mr Rogalla; Mr Pearce; Mr Varfis (Commission); Mr Rogalla</i>	248
3. Dairy sector - Proposal from the Commission (Doc. 2-1592/84 — COM(85) 13 final) to the Council <i>Mr Mosar (Commission); Mr Eyraud</i>	247	6. Adjournment of the session	251

IN THE CHAIR: MR SEEFELD

Vice-President

(The sitting was opened at 9 a.m.)¹

1. Votes

Report (Doc. 2-1563/84) by Mrs Caroline Jackson, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, on the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-190/84 — COM(84) 5 final) for a regulation on the designations used in the marketing of milk and milk products

Explanations of vote

Mrs Caroline Jackson (ED), rapporteur. — I shall obviously be voting in favour of the report. I hope the

remainder of the House will do likewise. I want to use this opportunity to explain to the House why I am not using Rule 36. It was quite clear from what the Commissioner said last night that the Commission does not intend to accept the majority of the amendments which Parliament has passed. The most important thing that the Commission does not intend to accept is the idea that this proposal should come forward in the form of an amendment to the existing food labelling directive and not as a regulation. Quite frankly, I do not think it would have done any good to take this back to the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, although I was tempted to do so. There is very little more that we can do on this. The most we have done is to give some Commission officials some very unpleasant afternoons in our committee. I think they deserved it. I do not know whether they enjoyed it. The proposal that came to us was very badly drafted. There was no evidence of consultation with the people who should have been consulted, and the Commission officials were completely unable to answer our questions. What I hope we will do now is follow up this report through questions to the Commission and later on also to the Council. However, as I say, I think there was no point in locking it up in the Consumer Protection Committee again. I am most grateful to the House for the support that I have had on this report from all sides

¹ *Approval of the Minutes — Verification of credentials — Membership of committees — Documents received — Petitions — Written declarations (Rule 49) — Authorization to draw up reports — Referral to committees — Change of referral — Procedure without report: see Minutes.*

Jackson

and I hope that you will now go on and vote for the report in entirety.

Mrs Squarcialupi (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, we shall be voting in favour of Mrs Jackson's report, particularly the amendment, tabled by the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection and approved by Parliament, which entrusts, so to speak, the protection of the consumers to a directive on the labelling of food products rather than to a regulation. We feel that the consumer is a 'social partner' that should be taken seriously and that we cannot simply avail ourselves of instruments such as regulations in order to absorb the Community's milk surpluses. Furthermore, we were rather dismayed by what we heard yesterday evening from some colleagues, particularly British colleagues who obviously are not producers of milk surpluses, who argued that milk was a highly dangerous product. I feel that we are not helping the consumers by talking along these lines. We must acknowledge the undoubted nutritional value of milk, while also being alive to possible negative aspects of milk-based foods. Above all, however, we must not allow ourselves to be influenced — and I am saying this quite bluntly to various political quarters here in this House — by the anti-milk publicity being churned out by many American multinationals that specialize in the production of maize.

Therefore, Mr President, we shall definitely be voting in favour of the Jackson report.

Mr Bocklet (PPE), in writing. — *(DE)* In many respects the proposal from the Commission to the Council for a regulation on the designations used in the marketing of milk and milk products has met with an ill-deserved fate. Because of a complete failure to appreciate the real purpose of this regulation, the matter was entrusted to the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection as the committee responsible. However, what was really intended was that a first step should be taken toward drawing up sensible and adequate Community rules that would take into account the provisions existing in the Member States for the protection of milk products. The Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food should therefore have been designated as the committee responsible. To make matters worse, both the Committee on the Environment and the Committee on Agriculture appointed British colleagues as rapporteur and draftsman respectively. They come from a Member State which differs from all other Member States in its outlook on the objectives to be achieved by any such regulation. However, while the Committee on Agriculture did succeed in taking account of Community interests, the Committee on the Environment allowed itself to be misled by the title of the regulation and misinterpreted the designation of milk and milk products as a mere labelling problem.

What was really needed was a regulation that would ensure at Community level effective protection, such as exists in the majority of the Member States, against substitute milk products. Because of the blinkered manner in which the Committee on the Environment, ploughing its own furrow, failed to recognize this problem and did not follow the lead of the Committee on Agriculture, I cannot vote in favour of its report. The approach adopted by the Committee on the Environment would also lead in the long-term to an enormous fall in milk consumption in the Community.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)¹

*
* *

Report (Doc. 2-1567/84) by Mrs Squarcialupi, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, on the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 2-621/84 — COM(84) 456 final) for a directive on the protection of workers by the proscription of specified agents and/or work activities

Explanations of vote

Mr Alavanos (COM). — *(GR)* Mr President, up to now in Greece there has been no statutory order relating to the three substances referred to in the proposed directive. There are, however, the internationally ratified agreements 13, 42, 115 and 136. The Members of the Greek Communist Party will vote in favour of the proposed directive and the motion for a resolution tabled by our colleague, Mrs Squarcialupi, though with grave reservations owing to the lack of protective measures for the Third World. However, we believe that:

Firstly, the measures are inadequate and there should be penal sanctions for employers who contravene the prohibitions established by the directive.

Secondly, in cases when exemptions from the general prohibition of the three substances are granted, the workers and their representatives must not only be kept fully informed concerning the contents of the exemptions, but should also have the right to join in the decision-making process or to impose a veto.

Thirdly, the employment of children and pregnant women on such work should be forbidden.

Fourthly, workers having to do with the three substances in question must undergo compulsory medical examinations at least every six months.

¹ The rapporteur was:

— IN FAVOUR OF Amendments Nos 1 to 18 and 20;
— AGAINST Amendments Nos 21 and 23 to 25.

Mrs Squarcialupi (COM), rapporteur. — (IT) Mr President, I must obviously, as rapporteur, express my satisfaction at the fact that the amendments tabled by the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection have been adopted and that other amendments that would have changed the entire thrust of the report have been rejected.

I should like, however, to express my regret that Amendments Nos 2 and 7 on the transfer of harmful agents and work activities to the Third World have been rejected, and it amazes me that this should happen just one month after this Parliament, when debating the enormous tragedy of Bhopal, spoke out against the transfer of these substances to developing countries and in favour of greater vigilance over the products transferred to them.

I feel that Parliament should have shown greater consistency in this matter and should have availed itself of this opportunity to corroborate the views previously expressed by it. One does not mourn the dead only while the corpse is still warm. We must avert inevitable disasters while we still have the means and the time to do so.

(Applause from the left)

Mr Christiansen (S), in writing. — (DA) It is a pretty well-known fact that the Social Democrats in Denmark are extremely dissatisfied with the all too many words and the all too few results emerging from the EEC institutions. We have always preferred discussion to idle talk. We are pleased therefore to be able to vote for this report by Mrs Squarcialupi, which represents a common solution to a common problem. Too many workers are killed or physically shattered as a result of a bad working environment or toxic substances. The content of the Commission's proposal for a directive is, to be sure, hardly epoch-making, but the report does tighten it up somewhat. Nonetheless, it is an important step in the right direction and an innovation in the fight for a better working environment.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)¹

*
* *

2. Food aid

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 2-1708/84) by Mr Galland, on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation, on the pro-

posal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 2-628/84 — COM(84) 481 final) for an interim regulation laying down implementing rules for Regulation (EEC) No 3331/82 on food aid policy and food aid management.

Mr Galland (L), rapporteur. — (FR) Mr President, the subject of this report has to do with the fact that by letter of 31 January 1985, the Council requested urgent procedure pursuant to Rule 57 of our Rules of Procedure, and I wish to point out that we shall only be dealing with the problem of food aid.

In response to the request that this report be debated together with the motions for resolutions by Mr Jackson on the famine in many regions of Africa, by Mr Poniatowski and Mr Chiraud on the famine in Ethiopia, by Mr de la Malène and others on the famine in Africa and by Mr Bersani and others on the Sudan refugees, our committee took the view that these problems were too important to be inserted in a debate that now has to be taken under urgent procedure on this report on food aid. They will therefore be dealt with at the next part-session in March.

The motion for a resolution, which was adopted unanimously, deals with the problem in three parts. With regard to the Council's request for consultation by urgent procedure, we note that the present regulation is no more than interim in nature and that it will be reconsidered after adoption of the 1985 budget by the European Parliament, and we instruct the Commission to draw up without delay new budgetary proposals for 1985, a new proposal for an implementing regulation on food-aid management in 1985 and, finally, a new proposal for a basic regulation on food-aid management respecting — this is an essential point — the European Parliament's budgetary powers. Subject to these conditions, we agree to the Council's request for urgent procedure.

With regard to the 1985 food-aid programme, we repeat our opposition to any use of food aid as a means of disposing of surpluses of Community agricultural produce and recall that it was in accordance with this principle that the European Parliament, during the first reading, decided to reduce food aid in the form of milk powder and butter-oil and to increase the quantities of cereals, sugar and vegetable oils. By the same token, we request the Commission, wherever possible in the matter of food aid, to conduct three-way operations in which developing countries can be supplied with commodities produced in other developing countries and also to promote projects in place of food aid.

We condemn the Commission's failure to take advantage of this possibility in 1984. It is, of course, necessary — and the committee points this out — for the Commission to encourage the build-up of emergency food stocks so that swifter and more effective aid can be provided in urgent cases.

¹ The rapporteur was:
— IN FAVOUR OF Amendments Nos 1 to 9 and 19;
— AGAINST Amendments Nos 10/rev. to 15/rev. and 18/rev.

Galland

You are, of course, aware, ladies and gentlemen, that our food aid has been criticized as being too slow. We therefore, finally, request the Commission to investigate in advance the best ways of channelling and transporting food aid.

The third problem is institutional. Naturally, we stress that the Commission's proposal, which specifies the quantities entered in the preliminary draft — quantities which were substantially amended by Parliament during the first reading — is wholly unacceptable.

I draw your attention, ladies and gentlemen, to the fact that in paragraph 15 of the motion there would seem to be an error or an omission in all the language versions and in some of them this paragraph is even unintelligible. I should therefore like to read the whole of the text in order to avoid ambiguity and to enable the sessional services to put things right in agreement with the Committee on Development and Cooperation and its chairman.

Paragraph 15 should read as follows:

Reiterates once again that the quantities of food aid are laid down through the budget by the budgetary authorities, and by the European Parliament in particular as regards non-compulsory expenditure.

The phrase 'by the European Parliament' has been omitted in the French version, and this renders the paragraph meaningless, although it had been the subject of a very long discussion in the Committee on Development and Cooperation.

We then formally request the Commission to put an end to a situation which is detrimental to the proper provision of food aid, a situation in which the powers of this Parliament are not respected, and to submit a new proposal for a basic regulation on the provision of food aid.

All these points contained in the motion for a resolution will serve to explain the reasons for the 11 amendments that were unanimously adopted in committee and tabled in its name. I will go through the main points.

Every reference to the implementing regulation of 1982 we wish to see replaced by a reference to the implementing regulation of 1975, the difference between the two being that while the regulation of 1975 is obsolete — a fact that we regret — it respects the budgetary powers of the European Parliament, and the regulation of 1982 does not.

As to the other amendments, No 7, to Article 6, relates to the question of three-way operations and projects in place of food aid, and lays down that products may be purchased in a developing country when they are available.

Amendment No 10 introduces a new paragraph making it quite clear that this regulation is only interim in nature and will have to be reviewed after a new proposal from the Commission based on the quantities of food aid entered in the 1985 budget.

Finally, you will find an amendment to Annex I, which, of course, restores the quantities adopted by Parliament during the first reading instead of those proposed by the Commission in the preliminary draft budget and also — this is extremely important — deletes a footnote inserted by the Commission after it has indicated the quantities of products made available for food aid. This footnote reads as follows:

The Commission reserves the right to change these quantities according to the outcome of the budgetary procedure or in the event of increased food crises in certain regions.

This would mean that, however we voted and whatever the outcome of the budgetary procedure, the Commission still claimed the right to modify the quantities, and this is unacceptable.

This is what I had to say on a matter to which, in view of the urgent procedure requested by the Council, our committee has had to respond very rapidly, a fact which explains the printer's errors which I have indicated and for which we apologize and also the translating difficulties we have had to face.

The report was finally adopted unanimously in committee, for the Committee on Development and Cooperation did not want to lay itself open to the reproach that food aid, under a régime of provisional twelfths, could not be carried out normally. I believe we have taken precautionary measures, in both the motion and the amendments, to protect the rights of this Parliament, to make it quite clear that this is an interim regulation and to institute a procedure enabling food aid to be managed under better conditions in the future.

(Applause)

Mrs Focke (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like first of all to thank our rapporteur, Mr Galland, for his work and for the clarity with which he has led us through a fairly complicated matter. We agreed this time to the Council's request for urgent procedure. Of course, we still believe that even without a regulation we could have got on with food aid for 1985, using the provisional twelfths system, and indeed the Commission also felt the same way about it.

However, if the Council feels that it cannot do it any other way, we at any rate do not want to give anybody a pretext for saying by way of excuse that the European Parliament was to blame for the delay in providing food aid for 1985. Alright then, we are in agree-

Focke

ment, but on one very strict condition, namely, that the Commission and the Council will regard this as an *interim* proposal for a regulation and that, as soon as the 1985 budget is adopted, we will receive a proper proposal for a regulation, drawn up on the basis of the actual figures that will then obtain, on the implementation of the 1985 food aid programme.

I hardly need to say that in this proposal for a regulation we have inserted our own figures from the European Parliament's first reading instead of the by now completely outdated figures from the Commission's preliminary draft, which was drawn up even before the beginning of the 1985 budgetary procedure. Furthermore, our rapporteur has just made it quite clear once again, with all the emphasis at his command, that we are still entirely unable to approve the basic regulation on food aid, which is designated by the remarkable number 3331/82.

I shall avail myself of the fact that the Commission is here present to ask it very urgently to look upon this as an area in which effective cooperation between Parliament and the Commission is indeed of the utmost importance. I would remind it of what the President of the new Commission, Mr Delors, said to us here in this House in January and appeal to it to heed his words by demonstrating its goodwill in this matter and forwarding to us within the next few weeks a new draft basic regulation instead of 3331/82, thus loosening up what has become a real log-jam.

This interim food aid programme for 1985 — and even more so, of course, the final programme, which will, we hope, soon be decided upon — relates to so-called 'normal' food aid, that is to say, food aid that is delivered year after year frequently to the same recipient countries, even when no situations of disaster proportions arise.

Doubts will inevitably arise about the extent to which this food aid is calculated to promote development aid, particularly in the form in which it is still carried out. Much to our sorrow, we have had to learn once again from the 1983 report of the Court of Auditors that it is very often badly implemented and that frequently even the quality has suffered considerably by the time it arrives in the recipient countries. There are sure to be some further stern words spoken about this in April when we are discussing the budget discharge here in this House. The Committee on Development and Cooperation will once again present its proposals for reform — for the umpteenth time! I hope that in the long run all this will lead to improvements in the administration of the permanent food aid.

There is only one further remark that I should like to make here and now. A not inconsiderable part of this 'normal' food aid for 1985 is going to Africa to people that are suffering from hunger there. We would appeal urgently to the Commission and the Council to lean over backwards to see to it that, even while we are

awaiting the urgently needed reforms, this food aid is delivered to where it is needed promptly, speedily and in unobjectionable condition, thus enabling our implementation of the 1985 food aid programme to match up to the magnitude of the problems and to the enormity of the hardship with which we have to contend. We would also ask the Commission and the Council to try to make this food aid serve the purpose of development — for example, by providing incentive in the form of 'food for work' programmes — and in any case to try to prevent their food deliveries from putting any brake on the motivation of the farmers in these countries, thus keeping them from stepping up their production to the point where they will eventually reach self-sufficiency.

Subject to these conditions, my group, the Socialist Group, will vote for the report and the proposal for a regulation. Many thanks once again to Mr Galland.

(Applause)

Mr Christopher Jackson (ED). — Mr President, on behalf of my group I would like to join Mrs Focke in congratulating the rapporteur on an absolutely first-class report. The subject is one to which Parliament returns regularly, but this particular report is of especial importance because of the clarity with which the rapporteur has set out Parliament's position and concerns. I ask the new Commission to be under no illusions about this. It must not regard this report as a pot-boiler. We in our committee will expect Commissioner Natali to come and discuss the issues therein with us.

May I now briefly place on record my group's support for certain of the basic principles. First of all, we join with the rest of Parliament in contesting the validity of Regulation 3331/82. Food aid is, under the joint declaration of June 1982, noncompulsory expenditure and under our control. It is therefore in direct conflict with the regulation, which gives the Council the right to decide on the quantities of each product. This we find intolerable.

Furthermore, Parliament insists that, where it is desirable, food aid should be purchased locally in the developing countries themselves, for the simple reason that developing countries should not be habituated to expensive imported food from Europe. Yet the regulation allows this only if the product is unavailable on the Community market, which is transparently absurd. My group joins with the rapporteur in expecting the new Commission to review this and make new proposals.

Among the detailed amendments in particular, we welcome the amendments cutting the quantity of expensive butter-oil and milk powder. Our food aid funds must as a matter of principle be used to provide those products which can most economically and effectively

Jackson

fill the needs of developing countries. It is a fact that the key need in combating widespread hunger is for more calories. Yet butter-oil and milk powder are unduly expensive when compared with other products. It is a disgrace that the Commission attempts to put such a high proportion of these products into the budget.

We are, alas, at a time when far more of our food aid budget than normal is required for emergency aid because of the terrible famine in Africa. I would like at this point to pay tribute to the dedicated and effective work of the Commission staff who have been dealing with the emergency programme. In the case of Ethiopia the European Commission was the first of the major donors to mount a major increase in food supplies. Indeed, when the famine hit the world's headlines, the European Community had already sent more food aid to Ethiopia, I am told, than all the other donors put together.

However, I am aware that the staff, which works so hard, is small in relation to the task. I am told that per ECU spent on aid, our aid administration is half the size of comparable national aid administrations. I obviously applaud a tight ship, but this should not endanger efficiency in this vital area.

Both Commission and Parliament have asked the other half of the budgetary authority, the Council, for more staff for this vital area, and we have generally been refused. Why have we been refused? The Council, I gather, claims that there is some unspecified overstaffing somewhere in the Commission. The Commission's response to this is that the staff regulations are so restricting that it is exceptionally difficult to move staff. Indeed, we in Parliament, who have the same staff regulations governing our own staff, know this to be true. Who, then, is responsible for the staff regulations? The answer is, of course, that it is the Member State governments and the Council of Ministers who give them quasi treaty status. So any way we look at it, it is the Council which is at root responsible for the problem here. I see a representative of the Council in the Chamber, and I ask him to insist that the Council should look again at this matter.

Finally, I heard this week some severe and ill-informed criticism of European food aid broadcast by a member of another parliament who was out in the Sudan. It so happens that in certain respects he was ludicrously wrong. Well, we also have our criticisms of food aid. Without going into the detail, it does make me reflect that the European Community should blow its own trumpet more. The European Community is, after all, one of the world's major providers of food aid. We know that much of our food aid goes through the UNHCR and through the world food programme, but do other people? I ask the Commission now to make sure that its publicity services, as a matter of priority, brief the media of the Community and the UK in

particular as to the extent and successes and efforts of our emergency programme.

(Applause)

Mr Guermeur (RDE). — *(FR)* Like preceding speakers, I should like to congratulate our rapporteur heartily on what is an extremely difficult and complex report. I think that Parliament did well to give him the job and so enable us to take all precautions necessary to prevent the rejection of the budget from having any bad effects on aid to developing countries, particularly food aid to the countries suffering from famine.

I think this is the right moment to point out the necessity, after the meeting of the Joint Committee at Bujumbura, of planning an immediate increase in aid in order to fill the gap until the next harvest, because, unfortunately, there is every reason to believe that requirements will not remain at their present level.

I think we also have to congratulate the rapporteur on advocating the diversification of products for food aid. For my part, I should have liked to see the range increased to include seafoods, as, I believe, the Germans have already begun doing. It would be a good idea. I should also like to point out the illogicality of increasing Community imports from Thailand of manioc as an animal feedstuff when manioc is an item of food for human consumption. It would be better to buy the manioc in Thailand and send it to countries prepared to use it as an item of food for human consumption. But that could be the subject of a question later on.

I should also like to see the scale of food aid extended beyond that normally envisaged by the media. We talk of Ethiopia, and that is perfectly in order. Everyone knows that Ethiopia is suffering from a serious famine, that our contacts, with African countries make it clear that refugees in the neighbouring countries — Sudan, Somalia and Djibouti — are suffering frightfully from famine, although there is much less talk of this. Another thing that is not said is that although one cause of the famine is the drought, another is the warfare that prevents crops from being cultivated. That is the situation of the refugees I have just mentioned.

Finally, I urge the Council to do everything to prevent a repetition of the scandal reported in the press, particularly by Mr Clifford May in the *New York Times*, who reports that ships loaded with arms coming from the Soviet Union have been given priority in Ethiopian ports over vessels loaded with food aid, which had to wait before unloading their precious cargo. I think something has to be done about it. It would be intolerable to find that food aid collected by the European Economic Community had to wait outside the ports while Russian tanks and machine-guns were being unloaded.

(Applause)

Mr Balfé (S). — Mr President, I want to speak very briefly on one particular subject. But, first of all, I wish to say that I welcome this initiative and, secondly, to say that I join with previous speakers in paying tribute to the work of the Commission. In particular I have had the benefit of visiting the Sudan recently and seeing the work of the Commission staff there, who, under the delegate Jean-Paul Jessé, were working under tremendous pressure.

The situation in the Sudan today is at least as bad as it is portrayed on our televisions. Whatever one says about looking at the television and it bringing things into the living-room, there is nothing quite as moving as actually being in a refugee camp and seeing the people who are on the point of death.

The EEC's record is actually a very good one. We have tried to cut through the bureaucracy and the red tape, and I am quite convinced from seeing things on the ground that we have made a major contribution to the relief of starvation in the Sudan and in Ethiopia. What I hope the Council will now do is to call on the member governments to act together, to stop their various attempts to play political games with governments in the region and to realize that whether you are an Eritrean, a Tigrean, an Ethiopian, a Sudani, whether you are in the rebel-held areas of Southern Sudan or whether you are in Eritrea, you are hungry and you need food. This must be the concern of all the governments of the Member States. I hope we shall endeavour to redouble our efforts and also to remember that if there is to be a harvest again, it is not just food that is needed but also seed corn and corn to plant, so that new harvests can be grown when the rains come.

Mr Varfis, Member of the Commission. — (GR) Mr President, the Commission has been trying to find a realistic solution for the management of food aid until such time as the budget for 1985 is approved. For its part, the Council considers that a regulation must exist, even if it be only a provisional one. At the point we have reached today, I think it is important to concentrate on fulfilling the prerequisites that will enable direct implementation of the new measures. One way or another, until the budget is finally approved the Commission will continue to follow the guidelines sketched out during the debate on the budget; in other words, obligations will be assumed in relation to the amounts approved by Parliament at the budget's first reading, or by the Council at its second reading. Consequently, the implementation of the programme for food aid during the present period of administration, involving the system of provisional twelfths, does not in any way prejudice the sums that might be decided on when the budget is approved. As soon as that has happened, the Commission will amend its original proposed regulation to adapt the quantities involved to the appropriations approved.

Mr President, the Commission considers that differences of a legal and institutional nature must be

brought to an end. It offers especial thanks both to the rapporteur, Mr Galland, and to those who have spoken in this debate in an effort to find a satisfactory solution, so that humanitarian aid can be provided without delay for the populations that need it.

I would now like to refer briefly to the Commission's attitude to the amendments proposed. Firstly, the Commission accepts the explicit reference, in the title and content of the text, to the provisional nature of the regulation. The amendments relating to the basic regulation — I think they are numbered 1, 6, 8 and 9 — are not acceptable as matters stand today, and this is in order that the procedure for approving the provisional regulation will not be interrupted. As for the amendment on three-way operations, Amendment No 7, the idea is a good one. However, the Commission cannot agree with a text whose general application conflicts with the basic regulation in force today. We ask you to remember, however, that the regulation is applied with the greatest possible flexibility, and this will continue to be the case, as indeed has been shown recently. In other words, the three-way operations will be implemented flexibly because, I repeat, the idea itself is good.

As for Amendment No 11, I have already mentioned that the Commission will introduce an amended proposal for a regulation as soon as the budget has been finally approved, and that for the system of provisional twelfths the Commission will adopt the basis, for the various products, of the lowest number of quantities approved by one or other of the two competent bodies for the initial budget.

Finally, the Commission will drop the note referred to by the asterisk, which reserves its right to amend the quantities in relation to the final size of the budget. Needless to say, the Commission will retain the right, if necessary, to produce a supplementary budget while fully respecting the prerogatives of the budgetary authority. In reply to a number of speakers, I can assure you that on 26 February Mr Natali will outline the situation and present an analytical table of the aid granted to African countries within the scope of food aid. He will also deal with many other matters raised by speakers today.

Mrs Focke (S). — (DE) Very briefly, I should just like to make it quite clear that what the Commissioner has said to us just now does not tally with what we were told during preliminary consultations and in committee. With a view to ensuring effective cooperation between the Commission and Parliament, I would urgently appeal at this point to the Commission to abide by what we were told on previous occasions. There is no point in simply changing the various quantities set out in the Annex. What we expect, as soon as the budgetary appropriations are fixed, is a new definitive proposal for a regulation, not just a change in the quantities.

President. — The debate is closed.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)

3. Dairy sector

President. — The next item is the debate on

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 2-1592/84 — COM(85) 13 final) for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 804/68 on the common organization of the market in the milk and milk products sector and Regulation (EEC) No 857/84 adopting general rules for the application of the levy referred to in Article 5c of Regulation (EEC) No 804/68 in the milk and milk products sector.

Mr Mosar, Member of the Commission. — *(FR)* Mr President, this is a relatively minor matter, no more than the modification of details of a regulation already in force. And so I shall be brief.

The purpose of the document in question is to adjust the figures for Belgium in paragraph 2 of Article 5 (a) of Regulation No 804/68 concerning total quantities of milk deliveries and also those in the annex to Regulation No 857/84 concerning direct sales.

It is therefore simply a matter of adjusting figures: the total quantities for milk deliveries are increased by 25 000 tonnes and those for direct sales of milk are correspondingly reduced by the same figure of 25 000 tonnes.

I would point out that the Commission has had occasion in the past to propose to the Council a modification of these figures for the United Kingdom in order to take account of a statistical error. This is therefore, in a way an analogous adjustment.

IN THE CHAIR: MR GRIFFITHS

Vice President

Mr Eyraud (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in view of the importance of the subject — milk quotas — and also because it was essential that the basic regulation should come before Parliament, the Committee on Agriculture has taken the view that a debate should take place this morning in plenary sitting on these proposals from the Commission to the Council, even though the first and the third proposals are only for implementing regulations.

The Commission acknowledges the need for alleviating the stringency of Community mechanisms, at any

rate during their first year, and by this token recognizes the justness of certain criticisms that we had made about the system right from its adoption. This we naturally find gratifying.

Let us recall the arrangements proposed: the possibility, in special situations, of considering 1980 as a reference year; the placing at the disposal of the outgoing tenant of a part of the reference quantity when his lease expires; the possibility of transferring quantities forming part of the direct sales reserve to the deliveries reserve; the possibility in certain areas where milk undertakings are very small in size for the groups to which the said purchasers belong to be recognized as purchasers; and the possibility of transferring quotas from one region to another. This last point represents a considerable relaxation, but it must still be stressed that it entails some risks.

Since one of the three proposals concerns Belgium — the very one on which in effect we are being consulted —, let us take that as an example. In the Ardennes, where the average age is high, as in most hilly regions, a number of elderly producers have asked to benefit from measures favourable to them and so have made available quotas over and above the percentage required. Before transferring them to other regions better favoured with regard to altitude, climate and the proximity of ports receiving products to replace cereals, it is, we feel, necessary to allocate priorities for distribution on the spot. At all events, the quotas must be restored the following year to the region that surrendered them.

The difficulties of all sorts that are met with in the allocation of quotas make the injustice of the system evident. While we do not dispute the necessity of mastering production levels, particularly of milk because of the surplus, we do dispute the method, and we shall continue to reiterate that imposing a ceiling on aids and fixing levies in proportion to the volume produced would enable us to master the problem better and would certainly promote greater justice.

President. — The debate is closed.

(Parliament approved the Commission proposal)

4. Mediterranean regions

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 2-1667/84) by Mr Musso, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, on

the proposals from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 2-963/84 — COM(84) 554 final) for

I. a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 1760/78 on a common measure to improve public amenities in certain rural areas

President

II. a directive amending Directive 78/627/EEC on the programme to accelerate the restructuring and conversion of vineyards in certain Mediterranean regions in France

III. a directive amending Directive 79/173/EEC on the programme for the acceleration and guidance of collective irrigation works in Corsica

IV. a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 269/79 establishing a common measure for forestry in certain Mediterranean zones of the Community.

Mr Musso (RDE), rapporteur. — (FR) Mr President, what we are concerned with here are the amendments to be made to two regulations and two directives. What is proposed is that the period of validity of these regulations and directives should be extended to 31 December 1985, in the hope that by that time the integrated Mediterranean programmes will be in operation and that they will then take up the strain.

The Committee on Agriculture recommends that the House should accept the proposals and extend the regulations and directives, subject, however, to some amendments to the proposals put forward by the Commission.

First of all, with regard to the first regulation, Regulation No 1760/78, the Committee on Agriculture would point out that certain regions which are covered by the provisions of this regulation will not, in fact, benefit from the integrated Mediterranean programmes. It calls therefore on the Commission to make proposals to ensure that the work being carried out in these regions can be continued. Secondly, with regard to Directive 78/627, the Committee on Agriculture asks that the restriction proposed by the Commission be set aside and that all the traditional wine-growing regions should be able to benefit by its provisions. Subject to these two remarks, the Committee on Agriculture calls on Parliament to agree to the extensions which have been proposed.

Mr Varfis, Member of the Commission. — (GR) Mr President, on behalf of the Commission, and particularly our Vice-President Mr Andriessen, I would like to express warm thanks to the honourable Members for their attitude towards the Commission's four proposals relating to the continuation of common action while approval and implementation of the integrated Mediterranean programmes is still pending.

The geographical area covered by the measures in question comprises on the one hand less-favoured areas and on the other hand regions which will be subjected to particular strain by the Community's enlargement. In consequence, the Commission believes that these structural measures will prove their worth, to the benefit of agricultural and forestry enterprises, while

they remain in force. As for the utilization of the appropriations granted, the Commission's services will of course monitor and supervise this very closely to ensure that they are used in the best possible way.

President. — The debate is closed.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)

5. Goods contained in travellers' personal luggage

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 2-1568/84) by Mr Cassidy, on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy, on

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 2-1171/84 — COM(84) 626 final) for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 918/83 and No 950/68 in respect of the tariff treatment applicable to goods contained in travellers' personal luggage or sent in small consignments to private individuals.

Mr Cassidy (ED), rapporteur. — Mr President, the report in my name on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy indicates that the usual explanatory statement will be given orally, so here it is.

The current level of exemption from customs duty for goods coming from outside the Community in travellers' personal luggage stands at 45 ECU, which may be reduced at the option of a Member State to 23 ECU for travellers under 15 years of age. I am happy to be able to say that my country, the United Kingdom, does not discriminate against under-15s. The exemption from customs duty for small consignments from outside the Community to private individuals, often as gifts, is currently 35 ECU. In its draft the Commission proposes to increase the value limit for relief on small consignments to 45 ECU, that for goods contained in travellers' personal luggage to 60 ECU, the optional reduction for under-15s being raised to 30 ECU.

My view, which was accepted without dissent by my colleagues on the committee, is that the Commission's proposed level for goods in travellers' luggage should be increased to 150 ECU for people over fifteen and to 50 ECU for people younger than fifteen. My reasons for recommending these increases were two-fold. Firstly, Parliament voted at its January part-session to increase duty-free allowances for travellers from third countries to 150 ECU and 50 ECU for under-15s, and therefore there is merit in standardization. Secondly, the present value limits are low and have not been increased to take account of inflation.

The Commission's proposals, insofar as they concern relief on small consignments sent to private indivi-

Cassidy

duals, are acceptable to the committee. I hope that this increase will have the beneficial effect of reducing the disappointment felt by those who, having received gifts from outside the Community, often found themselves having to pay duty on the value above 35 ECU.

One other point is covered in the proposal for a Council Regulation. It concerns the preliminary provisions of the Common Customs Tariff annexed to EEC Regulation No 950/68 for a flat-rate duty of 10% to be applied in the case of goods worth up to 115 ECU contained in personal luggage or sent in small consignments to private individuals. If I may, I will clarify this point. Present regulations permit the first 45 ECU in value of goods in personal baggage to be imported into the Community free of customs duties. One would then have to pay duty at the rate of 10% on the next 70 ECU in value. The Commission proposes an increase from 115 ECU to 150 ECU. The committee as its last meeting amended the Commission's proposal to 250 ECU.

In summary, my reasons for suggesting all these increases is that they will alleviate problems for travellers and lighten the burden of work for customs officials, thereby freeing them to concentrate on more important matters such as the battle against drug smuggling.

Mr Rogalla (S). — (DE) Mr President, I am very happy to speak on this subject because here again the citizen is affected, and in this particular case the citizen who is entering the EEC from third countries or who is being sent Christmas gifts from Canada, Australia, Korea or wherever.

On this occasion I would like to discuss the problem as a whole and show that we as a Parliament would very much appreciate it if in future the Commission made some effort to regulate these matters more simply and clearly. This regulation is concerned with exemption from customs duty for gift consignments from third countries, and for small consignments of all kinds, as at Christmas for example.

On consignments from third countries we have to impose customs duty, and *vis-à-vis* those countries and the people coming from them we really need give nothing away. This is a different problem from that confronting us in the internal EEC market in relation to neighbouring states of the EEC. Within the internal market quite different laws must, of course, prevail.

My first observation and my first request to the Commission is, therefore, that in future proposals it should make clear in what sphere we are operating. Are we concerned with the internal market, which needs strengthening, where in the long run duty-free quotas for travellers cease to have any meaning, since there are no longer any taxes at its borders either on highly taxable goods or on normal gifts, or are we dealing, as

in this case, with goods coming from third countries? This is the first clarification I should like to have from the Commission.

My second request to the Commission is that it express itself in such a way as to be intelligible to everyone. This applies first and foremost to the drafting of these regulations. When they say, for instance: replace this figure with that one, no one has any idea what they are talking about. If they pointed out that reference was being made to third countries, we would then know that we are bound by certain rules of reciprocity to third countries, the USA and other states and therefore cannot be as generous as we are in the case of duty-free goods and tax exemptions in respect of Member States.

My second point is this: suppose someone is being sent a Christmas gift from Canada and has indicated the value in dollars. In the meantime — and this is a case which occurred recently — the dollar exchange rate has increased. When the consignment arrives at the customs office, they say that the full value must be paid since it exceeds 35 ECU. This is of course a great pity as far as the recipient of the gift is concerned, since he would like to be able to take advantage of tax immunity. It then occurs to the customs official to check whether the value of the gift has not possibly been covered by an insurance payment. This can be deducted and tax immunity is then restored. I give this example merely to demonstrate that we are dealing here with practical matters which need to be presented more clearly by the Commission.

We ask you to vote for this report and to support the amendments of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy. We also ask you to ensure that the public are made more aware of what we are doing in the Community to make things easier for the citizen and how we in this House are concerned to see that step by step the internal market finally becomes a free market within the next five years.

(Applause)

Mr Pearce (ED). — *bore da*, Mr President. I should like to say at the outset that I am speaking in a personal capacity and not on behalf of my group.

First of all I should like to congratulate my colleague, Mr Cassidy, on the sterling report which he has prepared and on the emotive and enthusiastic speech which he gave in presenting that report. We are all, as ever on these occasions, inspired by the high politics of adding an ECU here and an ECU there. Mr Cassidy gave full weight to the importance of the moment, and I congratulate him on his oratory in this regard.

I always find this kind of discussion rather comic, because we have a picture of tens of thousands of solid

Pearce

customs officers with big flat feet pounding around the frontiers of Europe, and indeed the frontiers between our Member States, rummaging about in people's luggage to see whether there is a couple of ECUs too much in Christmas presents here or 3 ECU too much there. I ask myself whether the customs administration of the Community has its priorities right. We are not living in a wartime siege economy. We are trying to be liberal in international trade and certainly trying to be completely liberal in intra-Community trade. And yet we have these absurd goings-on at the frontiers between the Member States and around them.

You have only to go through a customs post to see how there are in some places clutches of officers. When it is cold, they tend to stay indoors and stay away from it. I experienced that myself this morning on the border at Kehl. Cold weather suppresses the frontiers between the Member States of the Community. When it is fine or there are some nice girls to look at, out they come and make themselves a plain nuisance. Indeed, at one customs division in the UK there are apparently more customs officers than the trade would warrant, simply because it is a declining port and they cannot get rid of the old customs officers. I weep for these people. I am very sorry for old, sad disillusioned customs officers that have nothing else left to do. However, I do not see why we should have to pay for this. It is an impediment to free trade and it is also, I believe, an interference in the democratic rights of people.

So, I say to the Commission, jolly good; this is marvellous stuff, it is worth every penny of the cost of the paper it is written on. Thank you, Mr Cassidy, for inspiring us with this, but for heaven's sake let us get on to something that brings about real free trade inside the Community and a more liberal attitude towards international trade in a world which is growing too protectionist. Let us try and look at the big things for once and stop fiddling about with the minutiae. I only hope that when I go home today, I count out any spare ECUs or presents or anything else that I have and that I do not have a drop too much whisky in the duty-free that I take — and I recognize that the Belgians have an 11% tolerance on each bottle of whiskey that you can take across. I hope I am a good boy and don't transgress all these rules. I hope also that the Community manages to get on to the big things in customs procedures in future and stops fiddling around with the little ones.

(Applause)

President. — Mr Pearce, I am sure that everybody has been waiting for 4 minutes and 11 seconds to know what those two words you said at the beginning of your speech were. They were *bore da*. It means 'Good Morning', just in case anybody wants to know.

Mr Varfis, Member of the Commission. — (GR) Mr President, I would like to thank Mr Cassidy, and more generally the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and Industrial Policy, for their work in examining the specific proposed regulation. In its report the parliamentary committee has very rightly related the duty-free allowances for travellers to tax exemptions. It is indeed appropriate, so far as the level of duty-free allowances for people arriving from third countries is concerned, to apply the same system whether exemptions from duty or exemptions from tax are involved.

I should like to take this opportunity to announce to Parliament that Lord Cockfield has informed the Commission of the position adopted by Parliament in January concerning an increase in the level of tax exemption, and the Commission agreed on a sum of 100 ECU. I realise that this increase is not as high as the 150 ECU Parliament had asked for, but it goes a long way towards what Parliament wanted.

I think it is entirely logical, and consistent with what I said earlier, for the Commission to submit to the Council a proposal for a corresponding increase in the duty-free allowance for travellers. However, once again the Commission cannot satisfy Parliament completely, because this would more than treble the present allowance to travellers, i.e. from 45 to 150 ECU, whereas approximately the same very substantial increase would apply to the flat-rate duty proposed by Parliament. As I said earlier, so large an increase would be quite disproportionate in relation to the much smaller increase in allowances granted to travellers moving within the Community itself, and the allowances that third countries are prepared to grant travellers from the Community.

At any rate, to take account yet again of Parliament's concern and comments, the allowance granted to travellers arriving from third countries could, in the Commission's view, be increased as soon as possible to 100 ECU for travellers over 15 years and 50 ECU for those under 15. As for the level of the flat-rate duties, this could in contrast be increased to 200 ECU. I think that with these last statements I have answered Amendments Nos 2 and 3 to the proposal for a regulation. As for the first amendment calling for a rewording of the title, the Commission considers this unnecessary. It serves no purpose because in any case it refers to regulations applying to products coming from third countries. Consequently, at least from the legal standpoint, there is no need for the title to refer explicitly to third countries.

Mr Rogalla (S). — (DE) I should like to make a request to the Commissioner, since he has not gone any further in response to my wish to make the drafting of his legislation more accessible to ordinary people. He should make the text more intelligible at least by adding the words 'goods from third countries', since not everyone is aware that customs duties are no

Rogalla

longer levied between Member States. I would appreciate it if he could do that, for we must together see to it that the citizen takes an interest in this Community. There is a major German newspaper called 'Bild kämpft für Sie'. This newspaper now concerns itself with the problems of the common market, including the problems of the citizen who is bothered by petty charges on gift consignments and so on. In our own interest we must put an end to these nuisances and promote cooperation in the Community.

President. — We note your comment, Mr Rogalla, but we can now move to the vote.

The debate is closed.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)

6. Adjournment of the session

President. — I declare adjourned the session of the European Parliament.¹

(The sitting was closed at 11.05.a.m.)

¹ *Written declarations entered in the Register (Rule 49) — Forwarding of resolutions adopted during the part-session — Dates for next part-session: see Minutes.*

**Salg og abonnement · Verkauf und Abonnement · Πωλήσεις και συνδρομές · Sales and subscriptions
Vente et abonnements · Vendita e abbonamenti · Verkoop en abonnementen**

BELGIQUE / BELGIË

Moniteur belge / Belgisch Staatsblad
Rue de Louvain 40-42 / Leuvensestraat 40-42
1000 Bruxelles / 1000 Brussel
Tél. 512 00 26
CCP/Postrekening 000-2005502-27

Sous-dépôts / Agentschappen:

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

CREDOC

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

DANMARK

Schultz Forlag

Møntergade 21
1116 København K
Tlf: (01) 12 11 95
Girokonto 200 11 95

BR DEUTSCHLAND

Verlag Bundesanzeiger

Breite Straße
Postfach 10 80 06
5000 Köln 1
Tel. (02 21) 20 29-0
Fernschreiber:
ANZEIGER BONN 8 882 595

GREECE

G.C. Eleftheroudakis SA

International Bookstore
4 Nikis Street
Athens (126)
Tel. 322 63 23
Telex 219410 ELEF

Sub-agent for Northern Greece:

Molho's Bookstore

The Business Bookshop
10 Tsimiski Street
Thessaloniki
Tel. 275 271
Telex 412885 LIMO

FRANCE

**Service de vente en France des publications
des Communautés européennes**

Journal officiel
26, rue Desaix
75732 Paris Cedex 15
Tél. (1) 578 61 39

IRELAND

Government Publications Sales Office

Šun Alliance House
Molesworth Street
Dublin 2
Tel. 71 03 09

or by post

Stationery Office

St Martin's House
Waterloo Road
Dublin 4
Tel. 68 90 66

ITALIA

Licosa Spa

Via Lamarmora, 45
Casella postale 552
50 121 Firenze
Tel. 57 97 51
Telex 570466 LICOSA I
CCP 343 509

Subagente:

Libreria scientifica Lucio de Biasio - AEIOU

Via Meravigli, 16
20 123 Milano
Tel. 80 76 79

GRAND-DUCHÉ DE LUXEMBOURG

**Office des publications officielles
des Communautés européennes**

5, rue du Commerce
L-2985 Luxembourg
Tél. 49 00 81 - 49 01 91
Télex PUBOF - Lu 1322
CCP 19190-81
CC bancaire BIL 8-109/6003/200

Messageries Paul Kraus

11, rue Christophe Plantin
L-2339 Luxembourg
Tél. 48 21 31
Télex 2515
CCP 49242-63

NEDERLAND

Staatsdrukkerij- en uitgeverijbedrijf

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

UNITED KINGDOM

HM Stationery Office

HMSO Publications Centre
51 Nine Elms Lane
London SW8 5DR
Tel. 01-211 3935

Sub-agent:

Alan Armstrong & Associates

European Bookshop
London Business School
Sussex Place
London NW1 4SA
Tel. 01-723 3902

ESPAÑA

Mundi-Prensa Libros, S.A.

Castelló 37
E-28001 Madrid
Tel. (91) 276 02 53 - 275 46 55
Telex 49370-MPLI-E

PORTUGAL

Livraria Bertrand, s.a.r.l.

Rua João de Deus
Venda Nova
Amadora
Tél. 97 45 71
Telex 12709-LITRAN-P

SCHWEIZ / SUISSE / SVIZZERA

Librairie Payot

6, rue Grenus
1211 Genève
Tél. 31 89 50
CCP 12-236

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

**European Community Information
Service**

2100 M Street, NW
Suite 707
Washington, DC 20037
Tel. (202) 862 9500

CANADA

Renouf Publishing Co., Ltd

61 Sparks Street (Mall)
Ottawa
Ontario K1P 5A6
Tel. Toll Free 1 (800) 267 4164
Ottawa Region (613) 238 8985-6

JAPAN

Kinokuniya Company Ltd

17-7 Shinjuku 3-Chome
Shinjuku-ku
Tokyo 160-91
Tel. (03) 354 0131

Debates of the European Parliament, published as an annex to the Official Journal of the European Communities, comprise:

- report of proceedings,
- annual indexes.

Sales

Annual subscriptions run from March, the beginning of the Parliamentary Year, until February.

Orders may be placed with the Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Payments to be made only to this Office.

Price (excluding VAT) in Luxembourg:

Annual subscription 1984/1985 ECU 63.30 BFR 2 900 IRL 46 UKL 36.50 USD 55

Single issue price set accordingly in each case and shown on cover.

Prices do not include postage.

ECU 19.62 BFR 900 IRL 14.40 UKL 11.70 USD 18



OFFICE FOR OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS
OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

